

Inspection, and the Automated Mutual Assistance Vessel Rescue System to the Battery Building in Manhattan. It would not relocate any vessels to this site. The Battery Building would be renovated, but no building demolition or construction would be involved.

(b) The Military Ocean Terminal Bayonne: The proposal would relocate the Aids to Navigation Team (ANT) and several USCG vessels to Bayonne, New Jersey. The vessels are the USCG Cutter (USCGC) RED BEECH, a 157-foot buoy tender; the USCGC PENOBSCOT BAY, a 140-foot cutter; the USCGC STURGEON BAY, also a 140-foot cutter; two 65-foot tugboats; two 46-foot buoy tenders; and tow 21-foot boats. Construction would involve wharf improvements, new floating docks, a new fuel system, and new shore ties. A new building for the ANT would contain modern facilities, parking, and storage. The storage would accommodate hazardous materials (batteries, paints, solvents, and lubricants), vehicles, trailer-mounted vessels (in addition to the USCG vessels discussed above), and ANT supplies.

(c) Rosebank: The proposal would relocate Station New York to Rosebank on Staten Island. Six search-and-rescue vessels and related equipment would be relocated to this site. Construction would include the replacement of existing piers, the addition of wave screens, and the addition of a new fueling system for these vessels. The buildings would be demolished and replaced, and housing in two other buildings would be renovated.

(f) Wadsworth: The proposal would relocate administrative offices for Group New York, the control room for Vessel Traffic Service, and the Marine Safety Office to Wadsworth on Staten Island. It would not relocate any vessels to this site. Construction would include the renovation of one building and of part of another, and the demolition of three buildings for parking.

(e) Sandy Hook: The proposal would relocate engineering functions of Group New York to Sandy Hook, in New Jersey. It would not relocate any vessels to this site. Construction would include the renovation of the administrative building and boathouse, the demolition of the maintenance-and-repair building, the erection of an engineering building for the Group, and improvements to parking.

The EA on which the final FONSI rests discusses two alternatives to no closure of USCG facilities at Governors Island: closure with standard maintenance, and closure with basic maintenance. (The relocation of tenant commands would be the same under the

one alternative as under the other.) The standard-maintenance alternative would provide utility maintenance, full-time fire and security service, and full building maintenance, consistent with the historic-maintenance plan. The basic-maintenance alternative would limit governmental maintenance expenditures to the least amount feasible. (No closure, or *no action*, assumes the continued operation of Support Center New York with tenant commands on Governors Island; it does not meet the purpose and need for the proposal: to reduce costs given strained budgets.)

Closure with standard maintenance is the preferred alternative. This alternative would have no significant environmental impacts. Consequently, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Dated: October 12, 1995.

T. W. Josiah,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Director of Resources.

[FR Doc. 95-25712 Filed 10-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

[CGD 95-049]

Proposed Consolidation of U.S. Coast Guard Training Centers; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Coast Guard is proposing to consolidate its training centers and, as a result, some of its centers could be expanded, realigned, or closed. Based on comments received to a proposed Environmental Assessment (referred to as a Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA)) and a Proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), the Coast Guard supplemented the PEA with a "Summary of Public Comments and Responses" and revised the FONSI. This notice announces the availability of the PEA and FONSI, as adopted by the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard has not determined how it will consolidate its training centers but has determined that no significant impacts on the environment would result from the implementation of several alternatives under consideration and that the preparation of an environmental impact statement is not necessary.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the PEA, FONSI, and "Summary of Public Comments and Responses" may be obtained from Ms. Susan Boyle, NEPA Branch Chief, U.S. Coast Guard Maintenance and Logistics

Command Pacific, Coast Guard Island, Building #54D, Alameda, CA 94501-5100. Copies of these documents were sent to the following libraries: Petaluma Library, 100 Fairgrounds Drive, Petaluma, CA; Cape May Public Library, 110 Ocean Street, Cape May, NJ; Pasquotank-Camden Library, 205 East Main Street, Elizabeth City, NC; Newport News Public Library, 2400 Washington Avenue, Newport News, VA; and the New London Public Library, 63 Huntington Street, New London, CT.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Susan Boyle, NEPA Branch Chief, U.S. Coast Guard Maintenance and Logistics Command Pacific, Coast Guard Island, Building #54D, Alameda, CA 94501-5100, at (510) 437-3626.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 15, 1995, the Coast Guard announced the availability of the proposed PEA and FONSI in the Federal Register [60 FR 31529] and solicited comments. The public was also informed of opportunities to comment through legal notices in 10 newspapers, and through press releases and public meetings at each of the potentially affected communities. The 30-day comment period ended on July 17, 1995, and the Coast Guard accepted comments until July 25.

The Coast Guard received 54 verbal comments and over 470 written comments. Approximately 70% of the written comments were form letters. The Coast Guard considered all the comments. These are documented and addressed in the "Summary of Public Comments and Responses" which supplements the PEA. The analysis of public comments did not reveal any significant environmental concerns.

In the notice, the Coast Guard announced that it was considering consolidating its training activities throughout the country to reduce operational expenditures and achieve long-term savings. The five Coast Guard training centers that might be directly affected by the proposed action include: Training Center (TRACEN) Petaluma, California; TRACEN Cape May, New Jersey; Aviation Technical Training Center (ATTC) Elizabeth City, North Carolina; Reserve Training Center (RTC) Yorktown, Virginia; and the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut. Under the consolidation proposals, some installations could be expanded, some could be realigned, and some could be closed.

The PEA, as adopted, evaluates the potential environmental and

socioeconomic impacts related to the possible alternatives and addresses broad program level issues rather than site-specific effects. It will be used in the process of selecting an alternative. The four alternatives evaluated in the PEA are summarized below.

1. No Action: The Coast Guard would continue to operate the training centers as they currently exist.

2. Consolidate East Coast: TRACEN Petaluma would close and its training functions would be relocated to RTC Yorktown, TRACEN Cape May, and the Coast Guard Academy.

3. Consolidate Tidewater Area: TRACEN Petaluma and TRACEN Cape May would close and their functions would be relocated to RTC Yorktown and ATTC Elizabeth City.

4. Consolidate to a DOD facility: TRACEN Petaluma, TRACEN Cape May, and ATTC Elizabeth City would close. RTC Yorktown would continue to remain a Coast Guard facility but would not continue to be a training center. The other training functions from the four training centers would be transferred to an undetermined Department of Defense (DOD) installation. Other tenant commands at the four Coast Guard installations would remain, with RTC Yorktown being reused by other Coast Guard activities. The impacts at TRACEN Petaluma and TRACEN Cape May for this alternative are the same as those under Alternative 3.

Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Part 15), and the Coast Guard Implementing Procedures and Policies (COMDTINST M16475.1B), the Coast Guard found that Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 will have no significant environmental effects and, therefore, adopting any of these alternatives will not require an environmental impact statement. If Alternative 4 is selected, a specific DOD facility will be considered and an appropriate NEPA analysis will be conducted to address environmental impacts at that DOD facility.

The PEA evaluates the potential environmental impacts of each alternative, including: land use; infrastructure and transportation; hazardous materials and waste management; biological resources; cultural resources; air quality; noise; and water resources. Socioeconomic issues are also evaluated. Other environmental impacts, including impacts on geology, soils, and bathymetry, are not expected to be affected from the action and are not evaluated in detail. Environmental impacts related to potential reuse and

disposal of facilities will be the subject of subsequent NEPA analyses.

As revised, the PEA lists specific planning tasks to be implemented subsequent to approval of one of the alternatives. Compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations and Coast Guard policy will be carried out at every training facility.

Dated: October 12, 1995.

Approval Signature:

T.W. Josiah,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Director of Resources.

[FR Doc. 95-25713 Filed 10-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Noise Certification Issues—Revised Task

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of revised task assignment for the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: Notice is given of a change in the task assigned to and accepted by the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC). This notice informs the public of the activities of the ARAC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Paul R. Dykeman, Assistant Executive Director for Noise Certification, Deputy Director, Office of Environment and Energy (AEE-2), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone: (202) 267-3577; FAX: (202) 267-5594.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) established an Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) (56 FR 2190, January 22, 1991; and 58 FR 9230, February 19, 1993) to provide advice and recommendations to the FAA Administrator, through the Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification, on the full range of the FAA's rulemaking activities with respect to aviation-related issues. This includes obtaining advice and recommendations on the FAA's commitment to harmonize its Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) and practices with its trading partners in Europe and Canada.

One area of the ARAC deals with noise certification issues. These issues involve the harmonization of part 36 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 36) with Joint Aviation Requirements (JAR) part 36, their associated guidance material including

equivalent procedures, and the interpretation of the regulations. The FAR/JAR Harmonization Working Group for Subsonic Transport Category Large Airplanes and Subsonic Turbojet Powered Airplanes will forward recommendations to the ARAC, which will determine whether to forward them to the FAA.

The Revised Task

This notice is to inform the public that the FAA has revised a task previously assigned to ARAC. The revised task has been accepted by ARAC. The FAA has asked ARAC to provide advice and recommendation on the following revised task:

Specifically, the FAR/JAR Harmonization Working Group for Subsonic Transport Category Large Airplanes and Subsonic Turbojet Powered Airplanes is charged with reviewing the applicable provisions of subparts A, B, C, and D, appendices A, B, and C of the 14 CFR part 36 and harmonizing them with the corresponding applicable provisions of the 14 CFR 21 subpart D. Any recommendation on noise issues should consider harmonization with respect to corresponding JAR to the extent practicable. The FAA recommends that any proposed recommendations be coordinated among other working groups to ensure consistency in proposed regulatory language, advisory and guidance material, and any other collateral documents developed by the working groups.

ARAC should consider the current international standards and recommended practices, as issued under the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), Annex 16, Volume 1, and its associated Technical Manual, as the basis for development of these harmonization proposals. ARAC should also consider recommending a process whereby subsequent ICAO Annex 16 changes are properly incorporated into JAR and FAR 36.

ARAC Acceptance of Revised Task

ARAC has accepted the revised task and has chosen to assign it to the FAR/JAR Harmonization Working Group for Subsonic Transport Category Large Airplanes and Subsonic Turbojet Powered Airplanes. The working group will serve as staff to ARAC to assist ARAC in the analysis of the assigned task. Working group recommendations must be reviewed and approved by ARAC. If ARAC accepts the working group's recommendations, it forwards them to the FAA as ARAC recommendations.