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 and e 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 should travel a minimum of 10 percent of the total unloaded travel, as measured from the neutral position. This should be demonstrated for both directions of travel.

(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.

(xi) Cable systems should be checked with the loads applied to ensure that excessive slack does not develop in the system.

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

(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.

(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 the demonstration 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 from the neutral position in each direction is 10 percent of the total unloaded control surface travel.

(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 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 February 22, 2001.

David R. Showers,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–5603 Filed 3–8–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Champaign County, OH

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement may be prepared for a proposed transportation project in Champaign County, Ohio.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark L. Vonder Embse, Urban Programs Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 200 North High Street, Room 328, Columbus, Ohio 43215, Telephone: (614) 280–6854.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Ohio Department of Transportation, will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a proposed improvement in the vicinity of the City of Urbana, Ohio, in the corridor of United States Route 68 (US–68). The project termini are approximately the Clark/Champaign County Line to the south and 1.5 miles south of the Champaign/Logan County Line to the north. The southern terminus overlaps with the recently-constructed final segment of the City of Springfield US–68 Bypass. The study area is approximately 14 miles in length.

The purpose and need of the project are to enhance access to highways in west-central Ohio, and improve roadway operations and safety in the

City of Urbana. Alternatives under consideration include: (1) Taking no action; (2) constructing a new highway on new location; (3) and upgrading existing facilities. FHWA, ODOT, and local agencies will be invited to participate in defining the alternatives to be evaluated in the EIS, and any significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. A series of public meetings will be held in the project area. In addition, a public hearing will be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meetings and hearing. The draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing. Scoping activities will be conducted.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are identified and addressed, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action should be sent to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program)

Issued on: February 23, 2001.

Mark L. Vonder Embse,

Urban Programs Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, Columbus, Ohio.

[FR Doc. 01–5790 Filed 3–8–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket Number: MARAD–2001–9047]

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 STEP TWO.

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 April 9, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to docket number MARAD–2001–9047. 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: STEP TWO. Owner: Glenn & Linda Westervelt.

(2) Size, capacity and tonnage of vessel. According to the applicant: ''Size of Vessel—Length: 46.2′, Beam 14.5″, Tonnage of Vessel—Gross: 29, Net 23.''

(3) Intended use for vessel, including geographic region of intended operation and trade. According to the applicant:

The vessel would be used as a ''Boat & Breakfast'' of sorts, with the clients keeping the boat in one marina for a week-end or weekly period. Or they would be given the option charter similar to a bareboat situation, which I understand is presently allowed. The difference from a bareboat situation would be that a Licensed Captain would be aboard to do the navigation in order to protect our investment. The charterers would pick from a number of destinations and itinerary to suit their needs and desires. As a minor or side opportunity, the vessel would be available for private sunset cruises or inshore fishing excursions. We plan to base the operation of the vessel out of Atlantic City, New Jersey for the summer months, beginning in the latter part of June and ending in September. Depending on the period of charter, clients would have a range of destinations from New York City down the coast to Ocean City, Maryland including Delaware Bay and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(4) Date and Place of construction and (if applicable) rebuilding. Date of construction: 1985. Place of construction: China.

(5) A statement on the impact this waiver will have on other commercial passenger vessel operators. According to the applicant:

Research has found that there are no other commercial vessels operating a venture of this nature in the Atlantic City and Southern New Jersey area. We are not aware of any bareboat vessels. There are about a dozen commercial fishing vessels taking passengers for hire out of Absecon Inlet. Our vessel is a slow trawler and is not really set for serious fishing. Therefore, we should not impede on any other operator. This is due also to the fact that fishing will only be a minor side attraction to what we are offering. Since we live aboard, this business is only a part-time operation to help defray the cost of maintaining our floating home. In order not to create too much of a hardship on our boat and ourselves, we haved set a limit of a dozen charters a season, if in fact, we are fortunate enough to reach that goal. Therefore, we should not impose a threat to any operation working full-time.

(6) A statement on the impact this waiver will have on U.S. shipyards. According to the applicant: