

to provide foreign scheduled air transportation of persons property and mail between a point or points in Bulgaria and the coterminal points New York, New York, and Detroit, Michigan, United States of America, via Malta, with local traffic rights between Malta, on the one hand, and Detroit and New York, on the other hand.

Paulette V. Twine,

Chief, Documentary Services Division.

[FR Doc. 95-22061 Filed 9-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

Aviation Proceedings; Agreements Filed During the Week Ended August 25, 1995

The following Agreements were filed with the Department of Transportation under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 412 and 414. Answers may be filed within 21 days of date of filing.

Docket Number: OST-95-432.

Date filed: August 21, 1995.

Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.

Subject: TC1 Reso/P 0456 dated August 18, 1995.

Expedited TC1 Longhaul Resos r-1 to r-12.

Proposed Effective Date: Expedited October 15, 1995.

Docket Number: OST-95-433.

Date filed: August 21, 1995.

Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.

Subject: TC1 Reso/P 0457 dated August 18, 1995.

Within South America Expedited Reso 002e.

Proposed Effective Date: Expedited October 15, 1995.

Docket Number: OST-95-434.

Date filed: August 21, 1995.

Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.

Subject: COMP Reso/P 1058 dated August 18, 1995.

Composite Expedited Resolutions r-1 to r-8.

Effective Date: Expedited October 1, 1995.

Paulette V. Twine,

Chief, Documentary Services Division.

[FR Doc. 95-22062 Filed 9-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

Coast Guard

[CGD 95-064]

National Environmental Policy Act: Agency Procedures for Categorical Exclusions

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of agency policy.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is announcing a change to its policy concerning agency actions that are categorically excluded from additional environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The change concerns operations to carry out maritime safety, maritime law enforcement, search and rescue, domestic ice breaking, and oil or hazardous substance removal programs.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David Reese, Environmental Compliance and Restoration Branch, (202) 267-1942.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508), each Federal agency is required to adopt procedures to supplement those regulations (40 CFR 1507.3). The Coast Guard's procedures and policies are published as a Commandant instruction entitled, "National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures and Policy for Considering Environmental Impacts" (COMDTINST M16475.1B). On July 29, 1994, the Coast Guard published a notice in the **Federal Register** (59 FR 38654) announcing the revision of section 2.B.2 of the instruction. Section 2.B.2 lists the proposed agency actions that are categorically excluded from the requirement that the actions undergo the analysis that accompanies preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Discussion of Change

The Coast Guard is amending section 2.B.2.e.(22) (the section) of COMDTINST M16475.1B, which categorically excludes operations to carry out maritime safety, maritime law enforcement, search and rescue, domestic ice breaking, and oil or hazardous substance removal programs that have been the subject of a programmatic NEPA analysis and documentation. It is being amended to remove the phrase "that have been the subject of a programmatic NEPA analysis and documentation."

A review of the implementation of the section disclosed that the phrase "that have been the subject of a programmatic NEPA analysis and documentation" imposes a requirement for a specific level of NEPA analysis and documentation (i.e., a programmatic level) that may not be necessary or appropriate for the actions included in

the section. By removing the phrase, the Coast Guard can eliminate unnecessary documentation and provide itself flexibility in determining the appropriate means of complying with NEPA for the listed activities. By removing the phrase, the Coast Guard will have the flexibility to use the section, a programmatic EA or EIS, or an EA or EIS for the specific activity, depending on the nature of the activity being planned. This change also brings the section more in line with the stated purpose and intent of NEPA and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations, which include the requirement in 40 CFR part 1500.4(p) to reduce excessive paperwork by using categorical exclusions to define categories of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This change does not effect the Coast Guard's responsibility to comply fully with NEPA before engaging in an activity listed in the section. It can be applied only if there are no extraordinary circumstances, as described in section 2.B.2.b., that would limit its use.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard announces the following amendment to section 2.B.2.e.(22) of COMDTINST M16475.1B:

2.B.2.e. Categorical Exclusion List

* * * * *

(22) Operations to carry out maritime safety, maritime law enforcement, search and rescue, domestic ice breaking, and oil or hazardous substance removal programs.

* * * * *

Dated: August 30, 1995.

RADM Edward J. Barrett,

Chief, Office of Engineering Logistics and Development.

[FR Doc. 95-22026 Filed 9-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Use the Revenues From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Baltimore Washington International Airport, Baltimore, MD

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 use the revenues from a PFC at Baltimore Washington 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 October 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Washington Airports District Office, 101 West Broad Street, Suite 300, Falls Church, Virginia 22046.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Theodore E. Mathison, Administrator of the Maryland Aviation Administration at the following address: P.O. Box 8766, BWI Airport, Baltimore, Maryland 21240-0766.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Maryland Aviation Administration under Section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Mendez, Manager, Washington Airports District Office, 101 West Broad Street, Suite 300, Falls Church, Virginia 22046. 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 use the revenue from a PFC at Baltimore Washington 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 August 10, 1995, the FAA determined that the application to use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Maryland Aviation Administration 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 November 11, 1995.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: October 1, 1992.

Proposed charge expiration date: April 31, 2009.

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$286,057,383.

Brief description of proposed project(s): This application requests the authority to use the PFC revenues previously authorized to impose for the design and construction of a new ARFF

facility to be located southwest of the intersection of Runways 10-28 and 15R-33L.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Air Taxi/commercial operators filing FAA Form 1800-31.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA regional Airports office located at: Fitzgerald Federal Building, John F. Kennedy International Airport, Jamaica, New York 11430.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Maryland Aviation Administration.

Issued in Jamaica, New York on August 28, 1995.

Anthony P. Spera,

Acting Manager, Airports Division, Eastern Region.

[FR Doc. 95-22069 Filed 9-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

FAA Approval of Noise Compatibility Program; Fort Worth Spinks Airport; Fort Worth, TX

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its findings on the noise compatibility program submitted by the city of Fort Worth under the provisions of Title I of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-193) and 14 CFR Part 150. These findings are made in recognition of the description of Federal and nonfederal responsibilities in Senate Report No. 96-52 (1980). On February 13, 1995, the FAA determined that the noise exposure maps submitted by the city of Fort Worth under Part 150 were in compliance with applicable requirements. On August 11, 1995, the Administrator approved the Fort Worth Spinks Airport noise compatibility program. All of the recommendations of the program were approved. No program elements relating to mandatory new or revised flight procedures for noise abatement were proposed by the city of Fort Worth.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of the FAA's approval of the Fort Worth Spinks Airport noise compatibility program is August 11, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mike Nicely, DOT/FAA, Texas Airport Development Office, 2601 Meacham Boulevard, Fort Worth, Texas 76193-0653, (817) 222-5606. Documents reflecting this FAA action may be reviewed at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces that the FAA has given its overall approval to the noise compatibility program for Fort Worth Spinks Airport, effective August 11, 1995.

Under section 104(a) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), an airport operator who has previously submitted a noise exposure map may submit to the FAA a noise compatibility program which sets forth the measures taken or proposed by the airport operator for the reduction of existing non-compatible land uses and prevention of additional non-compatible land uses within the area covered by the noise exposure maps. The Act requires such programs to be developed in consultation with interested and affected parties including local communities, government agencies, airport users, and FAA personnel.

Each airport noise compatibility program developed in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150 is a local program, not a Federal program. The FAA does not substitute its judgment for that of the airport proprietor with respect to which measures should be recommended for action. The FAA's approval or disapproval of FAR Part 150 program recommendations is measured according to the standards expressed in Part 150 and the Act and is limited to the following determinations:

a. The noise compatibility program was developed in accordance with the provisions and procedures of FAR Part 150;

b. Program measures are reasonably consistent with achieving the goals of reducing existing non-compatible land uses around the airport and preventing the introduction of additional non-compatible land uses;

c. Program measures would not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, unjustly discriminate against types or classes of aeronautical uses, violate the terms of airport grant agreements, or intrude into areas preempted by the Federal Government; and

d. Program measures relating to the use of flight procedures can be implemented within the period covered by the program without derogating safety, adversely affecting the efficient use and management of the navigable