

Affected Public: U.S. Steamship and intermodal equipment leasing companies.

Abstract: The collection consists of an intermodal equipment inventory that provides data essential to both the government and the transportation industry in planning for the most efficient use of intermodal equipment.

Need and Use of the Information: The information contained in the inventory provides data about U.S.-based companies that own or lease intermodal equipment and is essential to both government and industry in planning for contingency operations.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 66 hours.

Estimated Annual Respondents: 22 companies.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention DOT Desk Officer.

Comments are invited on: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 19, 1997.

Vanester M. Williams,

Clearance Officer, United States Department of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 97-22518 Filed 8-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Aviation Proceedings Agreements Filed During the Week of August 11, 1997

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-97-2793.

Date Filed: August 11, 1997.

Parties: Members of the International Air Transport Association.

Subject:

CAC/Reso/188 dated May 14, 1997. Finally Adopted Resolutions r1-11. Minutes—CAC/Meet/118 dated July

14, 1997.

Summary attached.

Intended effective date: September 1, 1997.

Paulette V. Twine,

Chief, Documentary Services.

[FR Doc. 97-22538 Filed 8-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Notice of Application for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Foreign Air Carrier Permits Filed Under Subpart Q During the Week Ending August 15, 1997

The following Applications for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Foreign Air Carrier Permits were filed under Subpart Q of the Department of Transportation's Procedural Regulations (See 14 CFR 302.1701 et seq.). The due date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motions to Modify Scope are set forth below for each application. Following the Answer period DOT may process the application by expedited procedures. Such procedures may consist of the adoption of a show-cause order, a tentative order, or in appropriate cases a final order without further proceedings.

Docket Number: OST-97-2794

Date Filed: August 11, 1997

Due Date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motion to Modify Scope: September 8, 1997

Description:

Application of Tradewinds Airlines, Inc., pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Section 41102 and Subpart Q of the Regulations, requests a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing Tradewinds to engage in interstate charter air transportation of persons, property and mail.

Docket Number: OST-97-2795

Date Filed: August 11, 1997

Due Date for Answers, Conforming Applications, or Motion to Modify Scope: September 8, 1997

Description:

Application of Tradewinds Airlines, Inc., pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Section 41102 and Subpart Q of the Regulations, requests a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing Tradewinds to engage in foreign charter air transportation of persons, property and mail.

Paulette V. Twine,

Chief, Documentary Services.

[FR Doc. 97-22537 Filed 8-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Availability

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability of draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), notice of public comment period and schedule of public hearings; correction.

SUMMARY: This document contains a correction to the Notice referenced in ACTION above, as published in the **Federal Register** on August 15, 1997 [62 FR 43768]. The Notice announces numerous times, that public hearings will be held Wednesday, September 17, 1997, and Thursday, September 18, 1997. At one location the date is incorrectly listed as Thursday, October 18, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerome D. Schwartz, Environmental Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Wind Shear Products Team, AND-420, 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267-9841.

Correction of Publication: In the notice document on page 43768 in the issue of Friday, August 15, 1997, make the following correction:

In the **DATES** section on page 43768, second column, at the last of four references to the hearing on Thursday the 18th, the month is listed as October. The month should be changed to read September.

Issued in Washington, DC on August 19, 1997.

Carl P. McCullough,

Product Lead, Wind Shear Products Team, AND-420.

[FR Doc. 97-22501 Filed 8-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Notice of Revision to Airport Capital Improvement Plan

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice of revision to Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) National Priority System.

SUMMARY: On May 22, 1996, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued a Notice requesting comments regarding the National Priority System (NPS) (61 **Federal Register** 25731). The NPS is used to assist in the development of the Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) as well as provide a basis for the

distribution of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) monies. Provided herein is a summary of the comments received and FAA responses. Based on these comments and additional direction from the Congress contained in the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-264), the FAA has modified its NPS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Stan Lou, Manager, Programming Branch, APP-520, (202) 267-8809.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In response to the **Federal Register** notice of May 22, 1996, the FAA received forty-eight letters containing comments. Eighteen letters were received from State organizations; nine letters were received from trade organizations; fifteen were received from airports; and six were received from other respondents such as airport consultants.

The FAA has divided these comments into the following categories for evaluation: general comments, formula modifications, and consideration of other factors. A discussion of each category is provided below. FAA's response to all three categories follows this section.

The summary of comments is intended to represent the divergence or correspondence of industry views. It is not intended as an exhaustive restatement of comments received. All comments received were considered by the FAA, even if not specifically identified in this summary.

Background

Historically, the demand for discretionary funds has exceeded the amount available for distribution. As a result, a priority system was developed primarily to standardize evaluation of airport development projects. The priority system is a process that supports agency goals and objectives by ensuring that the highest priority development work is being completed nationwide. It uses a formula which generates a numeric value (national priority rating, NPR) for each project item taking into account project type and airport size. Under this system, project types are ranked by their purpose; projects ensuring airport safety and security are ranked as the most important priorities, followed by maintaining current infrastructure development, mitigating noise and other environmental impacts, meeting standards, and increasing system capacity. This system is designed to facilitate routine prioritization for all proposed AIP projects, and most AIP discretionary monies are distributed based on these numeric values. While

the FAA's grant allocation process provides sufficient flexibility to consider other factors in addition to a project's priority rating, the use of these other factors has not been formalized.

General Comments

The three comments of a general nature suggested using the priority system to develop a National Plan of airport development, to develop a structured project selection process under AIP, and to provide more flexibility for individual airport innovation.

FAA Should Modify NPS Formula

Sixty-eight separate comments addressed some aspect of the formula used in rating projects under the NPS. The largest number of these comments objected to the higher weight that the NPS gives large and medium hub airports. Twenty-eight respondents indicated that the NPS formula favors larger airports to the detriment of smaller airports. In many of the comments, the argument was made that large airports are more likely to have access to non-federal sources of revenue to fund airport development and should not be granted an advantage over smaller airports which are more dependent on federal aid to fund airport development. The respondents included fifteen State organizations, three trade organizations, seven individual airports, and three others.

The second largest number of comments addressed the actual formula, discussing either the points assigned to each project category or the number and type of project categories. Twenty-four respondents either suggested some adjustment to points assigned a category or suggested additional categories.

A total of eight comments suggested that the categories used in the formula need to be better defined so that the aviation industry has an improved understanding of how the FAA ranks the importance of projects. Another six comments recommended that the use of the point totals should be reversed so that the FAA's highest priorities are reflected in highest scores (rather than the lowest score representing the highest priority).

Finally, two comments addressed the use of airport size as a factor for selection of noise projects. The respondents argued that airport size can be irrelevant to exposure to noise, e.g., two structures in the 75 DNL have similar noise exposure whether the airports are large hub airports or small hub airports.

FAA Should Consider Other Factors in AIP Project Selection

Twenty-nine comments supported use of the NPS, but in conjunction with input from FAA Regional Offices and Airports District Offices and from airport sponsors at time of AIP allocation decisions. A common objection was that the FAA's NPS only uses a single value to select projects and does not provide a formalized ability to account for factors both quantitative and qualitative such as local priorities, financial resources and risk assessments when selecting projects for Federal funding.

Twenty comments requested that local priorities or state priorities be considered in AIP project selection. Some suggested including the economic benefit of the airport to its community. Seven comments suggested assigning identical numeric priorities to all phases of a project. Under the existing system, for example, land acquisition required to construct a runway extension may have a lower priority than the construction of the runway extension itself, causing delays in the baseline project. Commenters suggested that all work elements contain the same priority as the baseline project.

Finally, two comments addressed issues such as prior commitments in project selection. Five comments addressed the role of cost factors in project selection. Two comments suggested consideration of future airport growth in project selection. Seven comments addressed use of Pavement Condition Index in pavement rehabilitation projects. Six comments suggested considering "economy of scale," whereby other development at the same airport may be raised in priority to take advantage of a contracting opportunity at that airport.

FAA Response: We agree that the formulation of a National Plan is essential to the safe and efficient operation of the National Airspace System (NAS). The National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), as required by Section 47103 of Title 49 of United States Code (USC), is the FAA's document that provides long and short range cost estimates of AIP eligible projects associated with establishing a system of airports adequate to meet the needs of the NAS. The NPS has been created to prioritize these needs in accordance with the FAA's goals and objectives and rank them accordingly.

One element within the NPS is the NPR. The NPR has been used successfully as a screening tool to identify projects of sufficient national interest to warrant investment of

Federal funds. The priority system has taken on greater importance as AIP appropriations have decreased and as the FAA has been required to adopt performance measures and investment criteria to support grant allocation decisions.

The FAA realizes that a numerical rating alone cannot account for all quantitative and qualitative factors that may effect the importance of an individual airport development project. Factors such as benefit-cost analysis, impact on safety, and system performance should be considered when selecting projects for Federal funding. In addition, section 47115(d) of Title 49 USC, requires consideration of airport improvement priorities of the States, and regional offices of the Administration, to the extent such priorities are not in conflict with the effect the project will have on the overall national air transportation system capacity and the project benefit and cost.

The NPR serves as an initial screen for the majority of projects selected; and, on a more limited basis, the NPR is used in tandem with other factors. These other factors, in addition to the list provided in the previous paragraph, include environmental issues, regional, state and metropolitan system plans, airport growth, and market forces, which are considered in AIP project selection today. However, the current system does not have a formal process to account for these factors in project selection. As a result, the FAA will develop a process to serve as a secondary screen to the NPR and account for these other factors.

Although there is an element of the airport size in the priority calculations, the net effect of this element has been minimal in practice. This is due in part to discretionary set-asides and specific apportionments contained in the statutory distribution of AIP funds. Airport size will continue to be considered along with other factors for project selection. However, the introduction of the new priority calculation formula will permit a greater reliance on the actual project type as opposed to the airport type.

The FAA agrees that the current system has created confusion concerning the formula and how it is used. As a result, the FAA has included a definition section in this Notice for further clarification. Further, the FAA agrees that the point totals should be reversed for ease of application. Henceforth, under the revised system, the higher the point rating, the higher priority assigned to a project.

The FAA also agrees that all work items associated with a major airport

improvement be treated as having one priority value. This policy is reflected in Appendix I.

In response to the comments that the NPS and the categories used in the National Priority Calculation should be better defined, we offer the following:

The ACIP is a product which helps identify, plan, fund, and execute airport development in such a way as to ensure that the highest and most critical needs are met with limited funding. It communicates needs and funding plans for airport sponsors, states, FAA, and others who have a stake in the development of the NAS.

The NPS is a tool by which FAA evaluates projects, contained in the ACIP, for AIP funding. NPS uses many factors: national plans; goals and objectives; anticipated AIP funding levels; a numerical project rating; and other regional and/or local factors as described in this notice.

In order to implement these concepts, a standard database has been established. This database (NPIAS-CIP) provides a common data structure to compile and analyze airport development needs. It is used by FAA to help determine the distribution of AIP discretionary funds in compliance with Title 49 USC.

An element of the NPS is the determination of objective priority ratings for airport projects. A numerical priority calculation ranks work items in accordance with agency goals and objectives. Priority numbers are calculated based on the size and type of airport (service level) and the type of project (as described by the NPIAS-CIP project codes). The revised NPS calculation provides a standard means to sort airport needs from highest to lowest priority, evaluates funding plans (the ACIP) versus the highest priority needs, improves upon the existing AIP priority system, and aids in project selection for discretionary funding.

The NPS calculation and project selection process are outlined in Appendix I.

The FAA appreciates the time and effort of the respondents. After carefully considering these comments and after evaluation of the additional statutory direction contained in Public Law 104-264, the FAA hereby issues the following Policy.

This policy is issued pursuant to the authority of Title 49, United States Code.

Issued in Washington, DC on August 19, 1997.

Ellis A. Ohnstad,

Manager, Airports Financial Assistance Division.

Appendix I

Policy/Procedure

a. Internal guidance will be published and revised as needed to carry out the intent of this notice. This guidance will be shared with states, sponsors and others as determined by each Regional Office.

b. It is the intent of this notice that all work items associated with major airport improvements should be treated as one priority value under the NPS, e.g., lighting and marking with runway reconstruction; land acquisition with obstruction removal. In these instances, ACIP program submittals should provide a complete schedule of projects for the entire major airport improvement.

c. Sound and consistent ACIP concepts must be employed by FAA, states, and sponsors for effective project selection.

d. The FAA Headquarters Office of Airport Planning and Programming will publish standard project descriptions and project coding requirements to ensure consistency nationally.

e. Use of passenger, cargo, and state area population entitlement funds is encouraged on high priority NPS projects. Final determination of actual discretionary funds availability may be based on entitlement usage as well as other factors.

f. Project justification for projects not included in the priority level or the listing of national program of candidate projects must be based on additional qualitative evaluation to be formalized prior to fiscal year 1999. Larger projects, requesting \$5 million or more in discretionary funds, will require more in depth analysis both at the regional and national level, including benefit-cost analysis.

g. The FAA Headquarters Office of Airport Planning and Programming will publish recommended project evaluation analysis criteria which may be used for project selection and project justifications. This analysis will be consistent with Title 49 USC, related policy, and national FAA goals and objectives.

Airport Improvement Program (AIP) Project Selection Process

a. Regional Offices initiate the ACIP process through coordination and input from planning studies, sponsors, states, the NPIAS, national planning and other sources. An ACIP program of development for the upcoming fiscal year and beyond is submitted annually to FAA Headquarters Office of Airport Planning and Programming.

b. FAA Office of Airport Planning and Programming will apply numerical priority ratings to the ACIP program using an anticipated AIP funding level. The numerical priority ratings will serve as an initial screen to produce a listing of projects.

c. The projects that have successfully competed using the numerical ratings will be identified to the FAA Regional Offices.

Regional Offices, after review, may appeal to the FAA Office of Planning and Programming for any projects that have not qualified for further consideration. Acceptable projects plus those that rate above the priority level make up the national program of candidate projects.

d. After any limitation on contract authority is enacted through an appropriation act, the FAA Headquarters will advise FAA Regional Offices of actual funds availability based upon the appropriations act's enactment, ACIP programs, and other factors.

e. FAA will then make final selection of projects from the listing of candidate projects identified in step c., above, based on qualitative factors such as benefit-cost analysis, risk assessment, environmental issues, regional priorities, state and metropolitan system plans, airport growth, and market forces.

f. FAA Headquarters will evaluate national performance of the completed development program and make adjustments to the NPS as needed to ensure attainment of national goals and objectives. All adjustments to the NPS will be done in accordance with this Notice.

National Priority Rating

The following general equation was developed:

$$\text{Priority Rating} = (k_1 * P) * [k_1 * \text{APT}] + (k_2 * P) + (k_3 * C) + (k_4 * T)$$

Where:

$$k_1 = 1.00$$

$$k_2 = 1.40$$

$$k_3 = 1.00$$

$$k_4 = 1.20$$

$$k_5 = 0.25$$

P = Purpose

C = Component

T = Type

APT = Airport

Various coefficients were evaluated to generate a NPR consistent with FAA objectives. This resulted in the following equation

$$\text{Priority Rating} = .25P * (\text{APT} + 1.4P + C + 1.2T)$$

The purpose code is used twice within the equation to signify added importance. The airport code is assigned a range of 2 to 5 to provide sufficient variability to the size of the airport; whereas, each of the other factors range from 0 to 10. These factors are assigned point values (pts) consistent with FAA goals and objectives.

APT=Airport Code

Primary Commercial Service Airports

Large and Medium Hub=5 pts

Small and Non Hub=4 pts

Non Primary Commercial Service, Reliever, and General Aviation Airports

Based Aircraft or Itinerant Operations

100 or 50,000=5 pts

50 or 20,000=4 pts

20 or 8,000=3 pts

<20 and <8,000=2 pts

P=Purpose Points (0 to 10 pts). (Purpose code definitions follow the listing of all codes)

CA=Capacity=7 pts

EN=Environment=8 pts

OT=Other=4 pts

PL=Planning=8 pts

RE=Reconstruction/Rehabilitate=8 pts

SA=Safety/Security=10 pts

SP=Statutory Emphasis Programs=9 pts

ST=Standards=6 pts

C=Component Points (0 to 10 pts). (Some codes are defined for clarification)

AP=Apron=5 pts

BD=Building=3 pts

EQ=Equipment=8 pts

FI=Financing (refers to financing costs associated with bond retirement)=0 pts

GT=Ground Transportation (refers to people movers and rail/road access)=4 pts

HE=Helipad=9 pts

HO=Homes (refers to noise mitigation measures for residences)=7 pts

LA=Land=7 pts

NA=New Airport=4 pts

OT=Other (refers to varying project elements; ie. fuel farms, airport drainage, etc.)=7 pts

PB=Public Bldg (refers to noise mitigation measures for public buildings)=7 pts

PL=Planning=7 pts

RW=Runway=10 pts

SB=Seaplane=9 pts

TE=Terminal=1 pt

TW=Taxiway=8 pts

VT=Vertiport=4 pts

T=Type Points (0 to 10 pts)

60=Outside 65 DNL=0 pts

65=65-69 DNL=4 pts

70=70-74 DNL=7 pts

75=Inside 75 DNL=10 pts

AC=Access to Airport=7 pts

AD=Administration Costs=0 pts

AQ=Acquire Airport=5 pts

BO=Bond Retirement=0 pts

CO=Construction=10 pts

DI=De-Icing Facility=6 pts

DV=Development Land=6 pts

EX=Extension/Expansion=6 pts

FF=Fuel Farm Development=2 pts

FR=Runway Friction=9 pts

IM=Improvements to Existing Infrastructure=8 pts

IN=Instrument Approach Aid=7 pts

LI=Lighting=8 pts

MA=Master Planning=9 pts

ME=Metropolitan Planning=7 pts

MS=Miscellaneous=5 pts

MT=Environmental Mitigation=6 pts

NO=Noise Plan/Suppression=7 pts

OB=Obstruction Removal=10pts

PA=Automobile Parking=1pt

PM=People Mover=3pts

RF=Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting (ARFF) Vehicle=10pts

RL=Rail=3pts

SE=Security=6pts

SF=Runway Safety Area=8pts

SG=Runway/Taxiway Signs=9pts

SN=Snow Removal Equipment=9pts

SR=Sensors=8pts

ST=State Planning=8pts

SV=Airport Service Road=6pts

SF=Safety Zone (RPZ)=8pts

VI=Visual Approach Aid=8pts

VT=Construct V/Tol RW/Vert Plan=2pts

WX=Weather Reporting Equipment=8pts

Applying the above relationship produces a numerical value between 0 and 100 depending upon the associated values for APT, P, C and T. In general, projects with higher numerical values are most consistent with national goals. It is anticipated that

periodically the individual point values and equation coefficients may be adjusted slightly to reflect modified system needs and priorities and experience gained in using the revised NPS.

Purpose Category Definitions

Safety/Security

Definition: This category includes items required by regulation in 14 CFR Part 107, 14 CFR part 139 or the Airport Certification Manual and those safety/security items that cannot be accommodated by any other operational procedures to maintain an equivalent level of safety/security. Also included is airport hazard removal/markings.

Statutory Emphasis Programs

Definition: This category includes items included in Title 49 USC, such as, runway grooving, friction treatment, and distance-to-go signs on all primary and secondary runways at commercial service airports; vertical visual guidance systems on all primary runways; and runway lighting, taxiway lighting, sign systems, and marking for all commercial service airports.

Reconstruction/Rehabilitate

Definition: This category is defined as development required to preserve, repair, or restore the functional integrity of eligible airport infrastructure.

Environment

Definition: This category includes actions necessary to carry out the statutes set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and 14 CFR part 150. Such actions are defined within Environmental Assessments (EA), Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), and/or Noise Compatibility Programs (NCP).

Planning

Definition: This category includes the preliminary studies needed to define and prioritize specific airport needs. Items such as airport system and master planning are included in this category.

Capacity

Definition: This category includes development required to increase system capacity by increasing the airport's capacity beyond its present designed activity level. In this case, system capacity is defined as increasing capacity at individual airports experiencing or expecting to experience 20,000 hours or more of delay.

Standards

Definition: Development to bring existing airports up to recommended FAA design standards based on the current design category.

Other

Definition: This category includes development items other than those necessary to safely operate an airport or for improvement of airside capacity. Items such as people movers, rail systems, access roads, parking lots, fuel farms, and training systems are included in this category.

[FR Doc. 97-22494 Filed 8-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M