

Endangered Species Act; Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act; Clean Water Act; and Comprehensive Environmental Response and Liability Act.

Other alternatives for shipboard solid waste and waste oil handling considered by the Coast Guard were: (1) No Action; (2) Retention and Transfer; (3) Recycling; and (4) Volume Reduction by using Compactors, Pulpers, and Shredders. These alternatives do not provide a complete solution to the problem, since either the waste still requires some storage on board, or the waste is discharged at sea without sufficient treatment. Therefore, incineration was selected as the preferred alternative.

The EA investigated impacts of incineration on the physical environment (hydrologic and geographic features); biological environment (marine mammals, sea turtle, fish, invertebrates, coastal and marine birds, plankton, and benthos); and the atmosphere (ambient air quality, global warming, and ozone depletion). These factors were considered for all areas of operation, including MARPOL special areas.

Air emission tests were conducted on a prototype incinerator, installed on a Coast Guard cutter. Carbon monoxide (CO), Nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), Sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), Volatile organic compounds (VOCs), Dioxins and Trace metals in the flue were measured and analyzed. Residue ash was analyzed for trace metals. All analyzed constituents were found to be below the International Maritime Organization (IMO) shipboard incinerator standards and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards for municipal incinerators. An air dispersion model was used to analyze the impact of trace pollutants on the sea surface. The concentrations were insignificant.

The EA concludes that the concentrations of pollutants generated by the proposed installation of incinerators on board certain classes of Coast Guard cutters are low enough that the physical, biological, and atmospheric effects on the marine environment are significant for all areas of operation. Consequently, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Dated: September 19, 1996.

Gregory B. Kirkbride,

*CDR, USCG, USCG Engineering Logistics Center, Environmental Branch.*

[FR Doc. 96-30064 Filed 11-25-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

[CGD 96-062]

### Natural Gas as Fuel in Marine Applications

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of meeting; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is studying the use of compressed natural gas (CNG) and liquefied natural gas (LNG) as fuel aboard commercial ships. Use of these types of fuel offers the opportunity to decrease harmful engine exhaust emissions and reduce the potential for oil spills.

**DATES:** A public meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 14, 1997. Comments must be received before Monday, February 3, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street S.W., Washington, DC 20590-0001. Written comments may be mailed to Commandant (G-MSE-3), U.S. Coast Guard, 2100 Second Street, SW., Washington, DC 20593-0001, or faxed to 202-267-4816.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lieutenant Commander R.K. Butturini, Mr. Wayne Lundy or Ensign Felicia K. Rydzewski, Systems Engineering Division, Commandant (G-MSE-3), room 1300, telephone (202) 267-2206 between 7 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Coast Guard is responsible for establishing safety standards for commercial vessels. As a result of concern over marine engine emissions, there has been growing interest in the shipping industry for the use of CNG and LNG as fuel. These fuels burn cleaner than oil fuels and may be more economical in some applications.

One U.S. commercial vessel is currently operating with CNG fuel. The Coast Guard wants to use the lessons learned from this operation, along with public comments, to evaluate the feasibility of future applications for both CNG and LNG as fuel on commercial vessels. Therefore, the Coast Guard is soliciting public comment regarding the use of CNG and LNG as fuel, particularly with respect to the potential pollution hazards, the type of vessels where use of CNG and LNG may be feasible, and current shoreside use of CNG and LNG for transportation.

Dated: November 19, 1996.

Joseph J. Angelo,

*Director of Standards, Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.*

[FR Doc. 96-30063 Filed 11-25-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport, Atlanta, GA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent to rule on application.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before December 26, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Atlanta Airports District Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Ave., Suite 2-260, College Park, GA 30337-2747.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Art Bacon, Airport Business Manager of the city of Atlanta's Department of Aviation at the following address: Mr. Art Bacon, Airport Business Manager, Hartsfield-Atlanta International Airport, P.O. Box 20509, Atlanta, GA 30320.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the city of Atlanta's Department of Aviation under section 158.23 of Part 158.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Southern Region, Atlanta Airports District Office, Ms. Lee Kyker, Program Manager, 1701 Columbia Ave., Suite 2-260, College Park, GA 30337-2747.

The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Atlanta Hartsfield International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On November 18, 1996 the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC

submitted by the city of Atlanta was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than February 27, 1997.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

*Level of the proposed PFC:* \$3.00.

*Proposed charge effective date:* May 1, 1997.

*Proposed charge expiration date:* February 1, 2004.

*Total estimated PFC revenue:* \$491,566,664.

*Application number:* 96-01-C-00-ATL.

Brief description of proposed impose and use project(s): Acquisition of land for airport expansion, engineering design for the commuter runway, planning and environmental studies for eastside terminal, planning and environmental studies for road improvements. Brief description of proposed impose only project(s): Design and construction of eastside terminal, design and construction of roadside improvements.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Air Taxi/Commercial Operators (ATCO) and Commuter or Small Certified Air Carriers (CAC).

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**. In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the city of Atlanta's Department of Aviation.

Issued in College Park, Georgia on November 18, 1996.

Dell T. Jernigan,

Manager, Atlanta Airports District Office, Southern Region.

[FR Doc. 96-30062 Filed 11-25-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## Federal Highway Administration

### Environmental Impact Statement: Kings County, NY

**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed bridge/highway project in Kings County, New York.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Richard A. Maitino, Regional Director, New York State Department of Transportation, 47-40 21st Street—8th Floor, Executive Office, Hunters Point Plaza, Long Island City, New York 11101, Telephone (718) 482-4526; or Harold Brown, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, New York Division, Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building, 9th Floor, Clinton Avenue and North Pearl Street, Albany, New York 12207, Telephone: (518) 431-4141.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FHWA, in cooperation with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to rehabilitate/reconstruct or replace the Gowanus Expressway (I-278) Viaduct in Kings County, New York.

The proposed project is necessary to preserve the transportation services provided by the Gowanus Expressway that are currently in jeopardy due to its accelerating deterioration. The condition of this structure (viaduct deck and structural steel) is continuously monitored and the structure is frequently repaired. The continuous extensive repair work causes traffic diversions and increasing uncertainty over the remaining life of this structure. This, plus the fact that it may take several years to rehabilitate or replace the existing structure, requires that a fiscally viable solution be implemented quickly and cost effectively.

Three ways to achieve this goal include rehabilitating, reconstructing, or replacing the existing expressway. Reconstruction or rehabilitation actions will not only seek to rebuild or preserve the existing facility, but will also include, as practicable, changes to address the structural, operational and safety deficiencies of the existing facility. Replacement actions are of a significantly large scope, but still must be designed so as to provide: (1) Equivalent people and goods moving services to those currently provided by the Gowanus Expressway; (2) continuity with the adjacent portions of the interstate (I-278), and (3) avoidance of community impacts due to an emergency closure of the existing facility.

The Metropolitan Region's Long Range Plan does not recommend increasing the number of general use travel lanes of the Gowanus Expressway or any other portions of Interstate route I-278. It does, however, recommend the implementation of an HOV lane along the corridor and that opportunities for improving operating efficiencies be

considered when portions of this route are upgraded, replaced or rehabilitated.

A Draft Design Report/Environmental Assessment/Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation was prepared for this project and was released for public review on October 16, 1995. In this document, a number of alternatives were extensively evaluated. The following are the general categories of alternatives considered to date: (1) Taking no action other than routine maintenance and structural repair, (2) rehabilitating the viaduct while making safety and operational improvements, (3) reconstructing the viaduct in the same location, (4) reconstructing the viaduct in a different location, (5) replacing the elevated highway with a street level expressway, (6) replacing the elevated highway with a street level arterial, (7) replacing the elevated highway with a street level arterial that includes a light rail line. Alternative 2—Rehabilitation with Operational and Safety Improvements was the alternative that best met the project's needs and objectives. Since then, several innovative ideas have been put forth on how to perform the construction of this alternative that would minimize community disruption during the construction stage. If a new construction approach is believed to be practicable, this along with other alternatives will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. Formal scoping meetings will be held in January 1997. In addition, public hearings will be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meetings and hearings. The draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comments prior to the public hearings.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and this EIS should be directed to the NYSDOT and FHWA at the addresses provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation of Federal Program and activities apply to this program.)