

**DATES:** The meeting is scheduled for October 16, 2001, unless otherwise notified.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held in Conference Room 6057, of the Department of Commerce, located at 14th Street between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, NW., Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Karen Holderman (principal contacts), at (202) 482-0345, Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 or myself on (202) 395-6120.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** During the opening portion of the meeting the following topics will be addressed:

- Report on October 2001 World Trade Organization (WTO) General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) Negotiations.
- Report on October Financial Services Seminar.
- Proposed Data Privacy Website and Asia Pacific Economic (APEC) Corporation Privacy Initiative.
- Report on TransAtlantic Business Dialogue (TABD) Proceedings.

**Elizabeth A. Gianini,**

*Acting Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Intergovernmental Affairs and Public Liaison.*

[FR Doc. 01-25561 Filed 10-10-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3190-01-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Environmental Impact Statement; Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport, Hebron, Kentucky

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is making available the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for proposed development at Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport, Hebron, Kentucky.

**POINT OF CONTACT:** Peggy S. Kelley, Federal Aviation Administration, Memphis Airports District Office, 3385 Airways Boulevard, Suite 302, Memphis, Tennessee 38116-3841, Telephone: (901) 544-3495 ext. 19.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is making available the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the following proposed

development: A new 8,000-foot Runway 17/35 (future 18R/36L) and all support facilities (i.e., additional taxiways or taxiway extensions, and associated lighting and NAVAIDS), and the development of a 2,000-foot westerly extension to existing Runway 9/27 and all support facilities. This FEIS also assesses the Federal action regarding installation of navigational aides, airspace use, approach and departure procedures and associated terminal and landside projects. One historic structure, the William A. Rouse house, would be affected. This document also assesses the impact of implementing the approved noise abatement air traffic actions recommended in the Kenton County Airport Board's 1999 FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Plan Update. The FAA Record of Approval for the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program was signed December 5, 2000.

The EIS will be available during normal business hours at the following locations:

- Anderson Township City Building, 7954 Beechmont Avenue, Anderson Township, OH 45255.
- Boone County Board of Education, 8330 Highway 42, Florence, KY 41042.
- City of Villa Hills, 719 Rogers Road, Villa Hills, KY 41017.
- Cincinnati & Hamilton County Public Library, 800 Vine Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202.
- Boone County Planning Commission, 2995 Washington Street, Burlington, KY 41005.
- Boone County Public Library, Lents Branch, 3215 Cougar Path, P.O. Box 287, Hebron, KY 41048.
- Boone County Public Library, Florence Branch, 7425 Highway 42, Florence, KY 41042.
- Boone County Library, Scheben Branch, 8899 U.S. 42, Union, KY 41091.
- City of Crescent Springs, 739 Buttermilk Pike, Crescent Springs, KY 41017.
- City of Crestview Hills, Attn: Kevin Celarek, 50 Crestview Hills Mall Road, Crestview Hills, KY 41017.
- City of Erlanger, 505 Commonwealth Avenue, City Hall, Erlanger, KY 41017.
- City of Florence, 8100 Ewing Boulevard, Florence, KY 41042.
- City of Fort Mitchell, Mayor Thomas E. Holocher, 2355 Dixie Highway, P.O. Box 17157, Ft. Mitchell, KY 41017.
- City of Lakeside Park, 9 Buttermilk Pike, Lakeside Park, KY 41017.
- Delhi Township Administration Building, 934 Neeb Road, Delhi Township, OH 45233.
- Green Township Building, 6303 Harrison Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45247.

- Kenton County Public Library, 502 Scott Street, Covington, KY 41011.
- Kenton County Public Library, 3130 Dixie Highway, Erlanger, KY 41018.
- Lawrenceburg Public Library, 123 W. High Street, Lawrenceburg, IN 47025.
- John Dowlin, Hamilton County Commissioner, County Administrative Building, Room 603, 138 E. Court Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202.
- Miami Township Administrative Offices, 112 S. Miami Avenue, Cleves, OH 45002.
- Sayler Park Community Center, 6720 Home City Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45233.
- Village of Addyston, 235 Main Street, Addyston, OH 45001.
- Whitewater Township, 6125 Dry Fork Road, P.O. Box 554, Miami Town, OH 45041.

Issued in Memphis, Tennessee, October 3, 2001.

**LaVerne F. Reid,**

*Manager, Memphis Airports District Office.*

[FR Doc. 01-25593 Filed 10-10-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Policy for Control System Operation Tests

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of policy statement.

**SUMMARY:** This document announces the issuance of a policy statement pertaining to operation tests of normal, utility, acrobatic, and commuter category airplane control systems. This material is neither mandatory nor regulatory in nature and does not constitute a regulation.

**DATES:** On February 22, 2001, the Small Airplane Directorate issued a proposed policy statement. On March 9, 2001, (66 FR 14243) we published the proposed policy statement for public comments. The final policy statement becomes effective on the issue date, which is shown at the end of this policy statement.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Lester Cheng, Federal Aviation Administration, Small Airplane Directorate, Regulations and Policy Branch, ACE-111, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone 316-946-4111; fax 316-946-4407; email Lester.Cheng@faa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Background

On March 9, 2001, (66 FR 14243) we published the proposed policy statement for public comments. Several comments were received, and those comments have been resolved. A copy of the final policy statement will be posted on the internet and directions to the location will be found at the "Latest News" page, which has the following address: [http://www.faa.gov/programs\\_rsvp2/smart/faq\\_home\\_page/certification/aircraft/small\\_airplane\\_directorate\\_news\\_latest.html](http://www.faa.gov/programs_rsvp2/smart/faq_home_page/certification/aircraft/small_airplane_directorate_news_latest.html)

After reviewing the compliance methods in Advisory Circular (AC) 23-17, the Directorate determined there was additional information related to the compliance methods in AC 23-17, paragraph 23.683, that might be beneficial.

## Policy

### *What Is the General Effect of This Proposed Policy?*

Applicants and FAA Aircraft Certification Offices (ACO) involved with certification of small airplanes should generally follow this policy. Applicants should expect that the ACO would consider this information when making findings of compliance. However, in determining compliance with certification standards, each ACO has the discretion to deviate from these guidelines when the applicant demonstrates a suitable need. To ensure standardization, the ACO should coordinate deviation from this policy with the Small Airplane Directorate.

As with all advisory material, this statement of policy identifies one method, but not the only method, of compliance.

Regardless of the amount of travel of a control surface when tested as described above, the airplane must have adequate flight characteristics as specified in § 23.141. Any airplane that is a close derivative of a previous type certificated airplane need not exceed the control surface travel of the original airplane; however, the flight characteristics should be tested to ensure compliance.

The method of showing compliance with § 23.683 presented in AC 23-17, paragraph 23.683, Operation Tests, discusses only the control system. It does not explicitly specify the consideration of loading on adjacent structures and elements. This is consistent with the wording in § 23.683 of the regulations. Testing, not analysis, must be used to show compliance with § 23.683. There are five other regulations, the control system, the control surfaces, and the adjacent fixed

aerodynamic surfaces related to both the control system and the control surfaces, which must also be met. These include the following:

1. The first one, which is noted in AC 23-17, is section 23.305, paragraph (a), [Subpart C—Structure, General] Strength and Deformation. It requires that "At any load up to limit loads, the deformation may not interfere with safe operation."

2. Section 23.307, (Subpart C—Structure, General) Proof of Structure, states that "Compliance with the strength and deformation requirements of § 23.305 must be shown for each critical load condition. Structural analysis may be used only if the structure conforms to those for which experience has shown this method to be reliable. In other cases, substantiating load tests must be made."

3. Section 23.655, paragraph (a), (Subpart D—Design and Construction, Control Surfaces) Installation, requires that "Moveable surfaces must be installed so that there is no interference between any surfaces, their bracing, or adjacent fixed structure, when one surface is held in its most critical clearance positions and the others are operated through their full movement."

4. Section 23.681, paragraph (a), [Subpart D—Design and Construction, Control Surfaces] Limit Load Static Tests, requires that "Compliance with the limit load requirements of this part must be shown by tests in which—

(1) The direction of the test loads produces the most severe loading in the control system; and

(2) Each fitting, pulley, and bracket used in attaching the system to the main structure is included."

5. Section 23.141, (Subpart B—Flight, Flight Characteristics) General, states that "The airplane must meet the requirements of §§ 23.143 through 23.253 at all practical loading conditions and operating altitudes for which certification has been requested, not exceeding the maximum operating altitude established under § 23.1527, and without requiring exceptional piloting skill, alertness, or strength."

To ensure that these requirements will be satisfied in the conduct of the control system operation test, inclusion of loads on the adjacent structures or elements in the testing set-up may be required.

While testing is required for demonstration of compliance to § 23.683, in some cases analysis may be acceptable for showing compliance with § 23.305, paragraph (a). Section 23.307, paragraph (a), provides the criterion for when analysis is not acceptable and testing must be performed.

It is not appropriate to define specific quantitative criterion to determine when testing is required to demonstrate compliance with § 23.305, paragraph (a), in accordance with § 23.307, paragraph (a). One specific criterion will not work for all possible airplane designs. It is better that such determinations are made on a case-by-case basis, in which the appropriate details of a particular design can be considered.

However, this policy describes some of the factors that should be considered when determining if tests are required to demonstrate that clearance between controls and adjacent structure (under load) meets § 23.305, paragraph (a). These factors include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) *The clearance between control surfaces and adjacent structure, when at rest.*

Suppose an applicant has experience with other airplanes that have a half-inch of clearance between controls and adjacent structure at rest. However, a new design is similar except it now has only a tenth of an inch clearance when at rest. Tests to demonstrate compliance with § 23.305, paragraph (a), may be required because the new structure may not conform to those for which experience has shown this method to be reliable in the past. The accuracy of past methods may not be suitable for the smaller clearances. Critical conditions assessed in past analysis may not have included a condition that is critical for the new smaller clearance.

(2) *The amount of deformation (under limit loads) in the control surface or adjacent structure.*

If analysis had been shown to be reliable in the past for a wing that had much smaller deflections than a current design, the current structure may not conform to those for which experience has shown this method to be reliable, and testing may be required. Previous analytical methods may no longer be reliable because the new design behaves in a more non-linear manner. It is possible that types of deflection that were neglected in past analysis may now become critical.

(3) *New control surface attachment configurations or other local design changes could create new types of deformation that are critical for the new design but were not considered in past analysis.*

If the FAA requires (or if an applicant voluntarily chooses) compliance with § 23.305, paragraph (a), to be shown by tests, the following test procedure is one means to simultaneously demonstrate compliance with both § 23.305, paragraph (a), and § 23.683. It also demonstrates compliance with § 23.681,

paragraph (a). These tests may be conducted as follows:

Except where otherwise specified, the tests described below in sections (1), (2), and (3) should be conducted within the following parameters (a. through h.)

#### Parameters

a. Conduct the control system operation tests by operating the controls from the pilot's compartment.

b. All the control surfaces must be installed to their adjacent fixed surface on the airframe (according to the type design).

c. The entire control system and adjacent fixed structure should be loaded.

d. The adjacent fixed surfaces (wings, horizontal stabilizers, vertical stabilizers, and so forth) should be loaded to provide deflections equivalent to critical limit load flight conditions.

e. The structural deflections should correspond to the limit flight conditions that represent the worst case conditions for increased cable tension, decreased cable tension, and control/fixed surface proximity for each control system as appropriate.

f. The entire control system must be loaded to either the limit airloads or the limit pilot forces, whichever is less (§ 23.683, paragraph (b)(1)). Per § 23.397, the automatic pilot effort must be used instead of limit pilot forces if it alone can produce higher control surface loads than the human pilot.

g. Minimum clearances around control surfaces and minimum tensions in cable systems should be defined and incorporated in the airplane's instructions for continued airworthiness. The test article should incorporate these minimum clearances and tensions, unless you otherwise account for them.

h. If reductions in the minimum clearances described in paragraph g above are possible due to environmental conditions expected in service, you must account for this. This can be accomplished through analysis or during testing by adjusting the test article clearances to encompass these effects.

#### Section (1)

Consider all airplane maneuver and gust loads, and inertial loads, represented by the airplane flight envelope (V-n diagram); consider unsymmetrical load cases.

(1) The tests described in this section support the demonstration that the control system is free from jamming, excessive friction, and excessive deflection as required by § 23.683, paragraphs (a)(1), (2), and (3). They also

support the demonstration that structural deformations not interfere with safe operation as required by § 23.305, paragraph (a). Accomplish the following:

(i) Load the adjacent fixed aerodynamic surface (wing, horizontal tail, or vertical tail) in accordance with one of the conditions of paragraphs d, e, and f above.

(ii) Support the control surface being tested while it is located in the neutral position.

(iii) Load the control surfaces to the critical limit loads, as described in paragraph f above, and evaluate their proximity to the fixed adjacent structure for interference (contact).

(iv) Load the pilot's control until the control surface is just off the support.

(v) Determine the available control surface travel, which is the amount of movement of the surface from neutral when the cockpit control is moved through the limits of its travel.

(vi) The control surface under loads described in paragraph f above must have adequate flight characteristics as specified in § 23.141.

(vii) To address the possibility of a critical intermediate control surface loading, gradually remove load from the control surface (while maintaining the load on the adjacent fixed surface) until maximum control surface travel is achieved.

(viii) The above procedure should be repeated in the opposite direction.

(ix) With limit load applied to the adjacent fixed surface and limit or intermediate load applied to the control surface, no signs of jamming, or of any permanent set of any connection, bracket, attachment, and so forth, may be present.

(x) The control system should operate freely without excessive friction.

Excessive friction is any increase under limit loads that results in exceeding the limit control forces and torques specified by the regulations.

(xi) Cable systems should be checked with the loads applied to ensure that excessive slack does not develop in the system. Excessive slack is any change in cables or cable hardware that results in reduced airplane control surface movement.

(xii) Repeat this process for each of the critical loading conditions as defined by paragraphs d and f above.

#### Section (2)

(2) The tests described in this section support the demonstration that structural deformations not interfere with safe operation as required by § 23.305, paragraph (a). Accomplish the following:

(i) Load the adjacent fixed aerodynamic surface (wing, horizontal tail, or vertical tail) in accordance with one of the conditions of paragraph d and e above.

(ii) Operate the unloaded control system from stop to stop.

(iii) No signs of interference (contact) may be present.

(iv) The control system should operate freely without excessive friction.

(v) Repeat this process for each of the critical adjacent fixed surface loading conditions as defined by paragraphs d and e above.

**Note 1:** An alternate procedure may be used to accommodate the testing described in sections (1) and (2) above during structural tests of a partial airplane. This method requires that all control system components that are attached to or enclosed by the loaded test structure be installed per type design. A sufficiently representative mockup of remaining control system components must be used to ensure that the full length of any cables which extend from the loaded test structure are included. This is necessary to make a reasonable assessment that slack that could develop in control cables is not excessive enough to cause an entanglement or jam. The control surface activation may be input at any convenient location between the mockup terminus and the cockpit.

#### Section (3)

(3) The tests described in this section will demonstrate that the control system is free from excessive deflection as required by § 23.683, paragraph (a)(3). These tests complete this means of compliance that the control system is free from jamming and excessive friction, as required by § 23.683, paragraphs (a)(1) and (2). They also demonstrate that structural deformations do not interfere with safe operation, as required by § 23.305, paragraph (a). These tests meet the limit load static test requirements of § 23.681, paragraph (a). Accomplish the following:

(i) With the adjacent fixed surface (wing, horizontal tail, or vertical tail) unloaded, support the control surface being tested while it is located in the neutral position.

(ii) Load the control surfaces to the critical limit loads, as described in paragraph f above, and evaluate their proximity to the fixed adjacent structure for jamming or contact.

(iii) Load the pilot's control until the control surface is just off the support.

(iv) Operate the cockpit control in the direction opposite the load to the extent of its travel.

(v) The above procedure should be repeated in the opposite direction.

(vi) The minimum loaded control surface travel must have adequate flight

characteristics as specified in Sec. 23.141.

(vii) Under limit load, no signs of jamming, or of any permanent set of any connection, bracket, attachment, and so forth, may be present.

(viii) The control system should operate freely without excessive friction.

**Note 2:** The tests described in section (3) above are normally accomplished using a complete airplane. As a minimum, they must be completed using an airframe/control system that completely represents the final product from the cockpit controls to the control surface.

Regardless of the amount of travel of a control surface when tested as described above, the airplane must have adequate flight characteristics as specified in § 23.141. Any airplane that is a close derivative of a previous type 1 certificated airplane need not exceed the control surface travel of the original airplane; however, the flight characteristics should be tested to ensure compliance.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on September 12, 2001.

**Michael Gallagher,**

*Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 01-25085 Filed 10-10-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Maritime Administration

[Docket Number: MARAD-2001-10779]

#### Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

**AGENCY:** Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the coastwise trade laws for the vessel *Dragon Lady*.

**SUMMARY:** As authorized by Pub. L. 105-383, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a description of the proposed service, is listed below. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines that in accordance with Pub. L. 105-383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388 (65 FR 6905; February 11, 2000) that the issuance of the waiver

will have an unduly adverse effect on a U.S.-vessel builder or a business that uses U.S.-flag vessels, a waiver will not be granted.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before November 13, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should refer to docket number MARAD-2001-10779. Written comments may be submitted by hand or by mail to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room PL-401, Department of Transportation, 400 7th St., SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. You may also send comments electronically via the Internet at <http://dmses.dot.gov/submit/>. All comments will become part of this docket and will be available for inspection and copying at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m., E.T., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. An electronic version of this document and all documents entered into this docket is available on the World Wide Web at <http://dms.dot.gov>.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kathleen Dunn, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, MAR-832 Room 7201, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202-366-2307.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Title V of Pub. L. 105-383 provides authority to the Secretary of Transportation to administratively waive the U.S.-build requirements of the Jones Act, and other statutes, for small commercial passenger vessels (no more than 12 passengers). This authority has been delegated to the Maritime Administration per 49 CFR 1.66, Delegations to the Maritime Administrator, as amended. By this notice, MARAD is publishing information on a vessel for which a request for a U.S.-build waiver has been received, and for which MARAD requests comments from interested parties. Comments should refer to the docket number of this notice and the vessel name in order for MARAD to properly consider the comments. Comments should also state the commenter's interest in the waiver application, and address the waiver criteria given in § 388.4 of MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388.

#### Vessel Proposed for Waiver of the U.S.-Build Requirement

(1) Name of vessel and owner for which waiver is requested. Name of vessel: *Dragon Lady*. Owner: Dr. Edson S. Lott.

(2) Size, capacity and tonnage of vessel. According to the applicant: " \* \* \* documented for up to twelve passengers." " \* \* \* displaces 29 net tons."

(3) Intended use for vessel, including geographic region of intended operation and trade. According to the applicant: "I would like to have wedding, funerals, and birthday parties for small groups aboard my vessel. \* \* \* in Honolulu, Hawaii \* \* \*"

(4) Date and Place of construction and (if applicable) rebuilding. Date of construction: 1984. Place of construction: Kaohsiung, Taiwan, Republic of China.

(5) A statement on the impact this waiver will have on other commercial passenger vessel operators. According to the applicant: "As it is right now there are no small vessels offering this service in Honolulu, Hawaii where I plan to operate. Most vessels performing this service in Hawaii are very large and licensed for hundreds of passengers. Small groups cannot afford these ships."

(6) A statement on the impact this waiver will have on U.S. shipyards. According to the applicant: "It is very doubtful that this waiver would have any effect at all on U.S. shipyards."

Dated: October 5, 2001.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

**Joel C. Richard,**

*Secretary, Maritime Administration.*

[FR Doc. 01-25594 Filed 10-10-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Maritime Administration

[Docket Number: MARAD-2001-10780]

#### Requested Administrative Waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws

**AGENCY:** Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Invitation for public comments on a requested administrative waiver of the Coastwise Trade Laws for the vessel *Sovereign of Malahide*.

**SUMMARY:** As authorized by Pub. L. 105-383, the Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to grant waivers of the U.S.-build requirement of the coastwise laws under certain circumstances. A request for such a waiver has been received by MARAD. The vessel, and a description of the proposed service, is listed below. Interested parties may comment on the effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or businesses in the U.S. that use U.S.-flag vessels. If MARAD determines that in accordance with Pub. L. 105-383 and MARAD's regulations at 46 CFR part 388 (65 FR 6905; February 11, 2000) that the issuance of the waiver