

grassland habitat value on the airport. The No-Action Alternative fails to meet the project's objectives. Therefore, the FAA proposes to implement the Build Alternative, with mitigation measures that reduce adverse environmental impacts to the extent practicable.

Major aspects of the auxiliary area development project are construction of aircraft maintenance hangars, air-freight warehouses, a parallel taxiway, an aircraft parking apron and connector taxiways, an access roadway, auto parking areas; and implementation of the grassland mitigation and management projects and storm water best management practices. Three alternatives are evaluated in the DEIS: two build alternatives and the No-Action Alternative. Build Alternative 1 utilizes the northwest quadrant of the airport, while Build Alternative 2 utilizes the southwest quadrant. Build Alternative 1 causes the most significant environmental impacts. It requires up to 70 acres of grassland to develop, which would result in substantial habitat loss and fragmentation, severely impacting several state-listed grassland bird species. This alternative also conflicts with the SJTA's plan to use the northwest quadrant of the airport for grassland mitigation and management for all of the near-term projects, so mitigation for habitat losses may not be feasible.

Build Alternative 2 would cause less environmental harm when compared with Build Alternative 1. The Build Alternative site is smaller and is centrally located amidst other developed areas. This would reduce habitat loss to 39 acres of grassland and reduce fragmentation, thereby minimizing the potential for adverse effects to state-listed grassland bird species. To compensate for the impacts to their habitat, the *Upland Sandpiper and Grasshopper Sparrow Mitigation and Management Plan* demonstrates that sufficient suitable habitat could be created and managed in the northwest quadrant of the airport so that there would be no net loss of grassland habitat value on the airport. The No-Action Alternative fails to meet the project's objectives. Therefore, the FAA proposes to implement Build Alternative 2, with mitigation measures to minimize and compensate for adverse environmental impacts to the extent practicable.

For the hotel/conference center project, major aspects of the proposal include a two-to-three story building with 150 suites, lobby and amenities, swimming pool, outbuildings, parking, and storm water best management practices. Three alternatives are

evaluated in the DEIS; two build alternatives and the No-Action Alternative. The Build Alternative 1 location is along Amelia Earhart Boulevard, and Build Alternative 2 location is near the Airport Circle. Build Alternative 1 requires 10.5 acres of pine-oak forest to be cleared near a reported Cooper's hawk nest site. It has not been determined for certain whether this nesting territory is currently active, but it is being treated as if it were. In contrast, Build Alternative 2 requires 13.5 acres of pine-oak forest to be removed from two New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) designated protected habitat zones—one for the Cooper's hawk and the other for the barred owl. Although these protected areas do not currently contain nest sites, they may still provide suitable breeding habitat, and the NJDEP recommends that such areas be set aside for habitat protection. The No-Action Alternative fails to meet the project objectives. Although Build Alternative 2 is considered to be the environmental preferred alternative, Build Alternative 1, with mitigation measures to reduce adverse environmental impacts to the extent practicable, is the FAA's preferred alternative, because it better meets the project purpose and need.

For the ILS upgrade, major aspects of the proposal include installation of a glide slope antenna and a medium intensity approach light system. Three alternatives are evaluated in the DEIS: two build alternatives and the No-Action Alternative. Build Alternative 1 would involve installation of a new ILS on Runway 31. Build Alternative 2 would involve relocating the existing ILS from Runway 13 to Runway 31 and installing a new, upgraded ILS system on Runway 13. The potential environmental impacts associated with the two build alternatives are virtually the same. Build Alternative 2, which by definition includes Build Alternative 1, has additional direct loss of biotic communities, but the total is still less than one acre. The same is true for loss of habitat for the grassland bird species upland sandpiper and grasshopper sparrow: the loss of habitat would be less than one-third of an acre, which would be compensated for under the *Upland Sandpiper and Grasshopper Sparrow Mitigation and Management Plan*. The No-Action Alternative fails to meet the project objectives. Therefore, the FAA proposes to implement Build Alternative 2.

In addition to the near-term projects ripe for decision, the DEIS discusses four long-range projects that are not. Because the long-range projects are not reasonably foreseeable, the FAA will not

take an environmental action on them at this time. Once they are ripe for decision, however, additional environmental review and will be necessary. The projects include construction of a direct airport access roadway, extension of Runway 4–22, construction of high-speed taxiway exists, and non-aviation related development along the White Horse Pike. In response to scoping comments, these long-range projects are included in the DEIS so that the agencies and the public have a clear understanding of the entire airport development plan and the potential environmental consequences associated with it.

Obtaining Copies of the DEIS: The complete Draft Environmental Impact Statement is a very large document. It includes a 350-page technical report and nine technical and administrative appendices. Copies are available upon written request to Daisy Mather (see contact information below). The first copy of each printed document is free. Additional copies are available, but may be provided at a reduced cost. Copies of the Executive Summary are free and available upon request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daisy Mather, Federal Aviation Administration, Eastern Region Airports Division, AEA-610, 1 Aviation Plaza, Jamaica, NY 11434; telephone (718) 553-2511; fax (718) 995-5694, or e-mail: daisy.mater@faa.gov.

Issued on September 10, 2002, in Jamaica, New York.

Sharon A. Daboin,
Acting Manager, Airports Division, Eastern Region.

[FR Doc. 02-23618 Filed 9-16-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Proposed Revision to Operations Specifications (OpSpec) A010, Aeronautical Weather Data

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of new requirement for Qualified Internet Communications Provider (QICP) for Internet communications of aviation weather and NOTAMs for Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulation (14 CFR) part 121 and part 135 certificate holders under OpSpec A010 and request for comments.

SUMMARY: This notice announces a new requirement for 14 CFR part 121 and part 135 certificate holders that obtain

approved weather data via the public Internet for use in flight operations. These carriers must use a Qualified Internet Communications Provider (QICP) for Internet communications of aviation weather and NOTAMs. A QICP is a person or organization that provides access to aviation weather and NOTAMs via the public Internet and has FAA-approved Internet communication practices for reliability, accessibility, and security (e.g., protection of data from unauthorized modifications). A current list of all QICPs can be found on the FAA public Web page.

All 14 CFR part 121 and part 135 air carriers that obtain aviation weather and NOTAMs via the public Internet will be required to amend their Operations Specifications to incorporate the use of QICPs. Operations Specification (OpSpec) A010 authorizes the carrier to use any eligible QICP on the FAA public Web page.

OpSpec A010, which amends FAA Order 8400.10 will read: "For Internet communications of aviation weather and NOTAMs used in flight operations, all part 121 and part 135 operators are required to use an approved Qualified Internet Communications Provider (QICP).

(1) The QICPs used by the operator must be listed in OpSpec A010.

(2) The QICP used must be obtained from the approved list provided by the FAA.

(3) For more detailed information with regard to QICPs, refer to the appropriate AC pertaining to Internet Communications of Aviation Weather and NOTAMs and Volume 3, Chapter 7, Section 5, of this Order."

Accessing aviation weather and NOTAM information via the public Internet using an approved QICP enhances public safety as a result of the increased security, reliability, and accessibility of the weather and aviation-related documents that are relied upon by part 121 and part 135 certificate holders.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 17, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Send all comments on the proposed revision to: Federal Aviation Administration, Air Transportation Division (Attention: AFS-260), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, or electronically to connie.streeter@faa.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Connie Streeter, AFS-260, at the address above, by e-mail at connie.streeter@faa.gov, or telephone at (202) 267-8166.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed revision by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Please identify Operations Specification A010, Aeronautical Weather Data, and submit comments, either hard copy or electronic, to the appropriate address listed above. Comments may be inspected at the above address between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. weekdays, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 9, 2002.

Louis C. Cusimano,

Deputy Director, Flight Standards Service.

[FR Doc. 02-23617 Filed 9-16-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application 02-08-C-00-MFR To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, Submitted by Jackson County, Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, Medford, OR

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 PFC revenue at Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 17, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Mr. J. Wade Bryant, Manager; Seattle Airports District Office, SEA-ADO; Federal Aviation Administration; 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Suite 250, Renton, Washington 98055-4056. In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Bern E. Case, Airport Director, at the following address: 3650 Biddle Road, Medford, OR 97504. Air Carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, under section 158.23 of part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Suzanne Lee-Pang, (425) 227-2654, Seattle Airports District Office, SEA-ADO; Federal Aviation Administration; 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Suite 250, Renton, Washington 98055-4056. 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 02-08-C-00-MFR to impose and use PFC revenue at Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On September 10, 2002, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Jackson County, Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, Medford, Oregon, 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 December 19, 2002.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$4.50.

Proposed charge effective date: May 1, 2004.

Proposed charge expiration date: July 1, 2004.

Total requested for use approval: \$105,000.

Brief description of proposed project: Security Enhancements.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFC's: Operations by Air Taxi/Commercial Operators when enplaning revenue passengers in limited, irregular, special service air taxi/commercial operations such as air ambulance services, student instruction, non-stop sightseeing flights that begin and end at the airport and are concluded within a 25 mile radius of the airport.

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: Federal Aviation Administration, Northwest Mountain Region, Airports Division, ANM-600, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Suite 315, Renton, WA 98055-4056.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport.