

Potential impacts of the proposed action were analyzed in three major categories, atmospheric impacts, noise impacts, and other environmental impacts. Potential environmental impacts to the atmosphere analyzed include ozone depletion and acid rain formation. Potential noise impacts considered include acoustic energy from launches and sonic booms during flights. Other potential environmental impacts discussed in the PEIS include impacts to the climate and atmosphere of the launch site, land resources, water resources, and biological resources. Potential accident scenarios and marine mammal strike probability were also considered.

Potential environmental impacts associated with the more environmentally-friendly propellant combinations alternative were analyzed in three major categories: atmospheric impacts, noise impacts, and other environmental impacts. The environmentally-friendly propellant alternative is defined as preferentially licensing rockets that are not solely propelled by solid rocket motors. This would reduce the total number of U.S. commercial launches projected from 1998 through 2009 from 436 to 134. The number of launches using liquid, liquid/solid, or hybrid propellant systems is assumed to remain unchanged under this alternative. Thus, the total number of commercial, AST-licensed launches in the U.S. (i.e., programmatic launches) would decrease substantially under this alternative. It is assumed that the decrease in U.S. commercial launches using only solid propellants would be compensated for by an increase in these launches elsewhere in the world.

Under the No Action alternative, the same number of worldwide commercial LV launches would take place. Chapter 701 requires AST to license a launch if the applicant complies and will continue to comply with chapter 701 and implementing regulations. 49 U.S.C. 70105. One of the purposes of chapter 701 is to provide that the Secretary of Transportation, and therefore AST, pursuant to delegations, oversees and coordinates the conduct of commercial launch and reentry, and issues and transfers licenses authorizing these activities. 40 U.S.C. 70104(b)(3). The agency may prevent a launch if it decides that the launch would jeopardize public health and safety, safety of property, or national security, or a foreign policy interest of the United States. 49 U.S.C. 70104(c). Not licensing any U.S. commercial launches would not be consistent with the purposes of chapter 701 in this context. In any event, the no action alternative suffers

from other drawbacks as well. The U.S. space launch industry would be unable to continue LV launch operations regardless of their location because AST would not license U.S. launches. The no action alternative could negatively impact the national security and foreign policy interests of the U.S. Some U.S. government payloads have been launched by the U.S. commercial space launch industry. Therefore, if access to commercial LVs were not available, this overall limit in available capacity could, in a worst case scenario, impact the U.S. government's ability to launch needed payloads and negatively affect programs that rely on access to space. Additionally, under this alternative, parties that plan to launch from U.S. launch sites would be forced to find alternative launch sites outside the U.S., thereby potentially exposing sensitive technologies to countries with competing economic and security interests.

Potential cumulative impacts, including those to the atmosphere and noise, are also addressed in the PEIS. Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources, such as consumption of mineral resources, are addressed in the document.

Finally, the PEIS recommends a variety of mitigation measures to prevent or reduce environmental effects associated with the proposed action. Individual launch sites will monitor water quality, complete archaeological surveys, and survey biological species in the vicinity of the launch area. It is also assumed that all launch sites will comply with permit conditions. Other examples of suggested mitigation measures include: noise control actions, promoting the use of environmentally-friendly propellants, engaging in voluntary waste pollution prevention programs, developing a comprehensive environmental management system, working with interested parties to select the most culturally-friendly site, and implementing effective lighting policies to protect wildlife. Lastly, it should be noted that this PEIS is not site-specific. Any required site-specific environmental documentation would be developed as needed.

Date Issued: August 31, 1999.

Place Issued: Washington, DC.

Patricia G. Smith,

Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation.

[FR Doc. 99-23201 Filed 9-3-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Cyril E. King Airport, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, U.S.A.

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 impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Cyril E. King 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 7, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400, Orlando, Florida 32822.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Gordon A. Finch, Executive Director of Virgin Islands Port Authority at the following address: Virgin Islands Port Authority, Cyril E. King Airport, PO Box 301707, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, U.S.A. 00803-1707.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to Virgin Islands Port Authority under § 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Pablo G. Auffant, P.E., Program Manager, Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400, Orlando, Florida 32822, 407-812-6331 x30. The application may be reviewed in person at this time 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 Cyril E. King 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 27, 1999, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by to Virgin Islands Port

Authority was substantially complete within the requirements of § 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than December 24, 1999.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

PFC Application No.: 99-06-C-00-STT.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: December 1, 1999.

Proposed charge expiration date: December 1, 2001.

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$3,000,000.

Brief description of proposed project(s): Design and Construct a New Air Traffic Control Tower at the Henry E. Rohlsen Airport, St. Croix, Virgin Islands, U.S.A.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: None.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Virgin Islands Port Authority.

Issued in Orlando, Florida, on August 27, 1999.

John W. Reynolds,

Acting Manager, Orlando Airports District Office Southern Region.

[FR Doc. 99-23205 Filed 9-3-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Naples Municipal Airport, Naples, Florida

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 the Naples Municipal Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 7, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Suite 400, Orlando, Florida 32822.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Theodore D. Soliday, Executive Director of City of Naples Airport Authority at the following address: City of Naples Airport Authority, 160 Aviation Drive North, Naples, Florida 34104.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the City of Naples Airport Authority under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Miguel A. Martinez, Program Manager, Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Citadel International, Suite 400, Orlando, Florida 32822, (407) 812-6331, extension 23. 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 the Naples Municipal Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L.

101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On August 25, 1999, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the City of Naples Airport Authority 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 27, 1999.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

PFC Application No.: 99-02-C-00-APF.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: October 1, 1999.

Proposed charge expiration date: June 1, 2003.

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$475,000.

Brief description of proposed project(s): Acquire three Commute-A-Walks; Commercial Airline Terminal Renovations

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Non-scheduled Air Carriers Filing FAA Form 1800-31.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the City of Naples Airport Authority.

Issued in Orlando, Florida, on August 25, 1999.

John W. Reynolds, Jr.,

Acting Manager, Orlando Airports District Office, Southern Region.

[FR Doc. 99-23206 Filed 9-3-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M