paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2), and inserting in its place "$1250".

William von Raab,

Commissioner of Customs.

Approved: August 25, 1989.

Salvator R. Martoche,

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

[FR Doc. 89-20532 Filed 8-30-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 166

[CGD 87-038]

RIN 2115-AC78

Port Access Routes; Approach to Freeport, TX

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of study results.

SUMMARY: This notice publishes the results of a Port Access Route Study to determine if the Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area should be modified to facilitate recovery of hydrocarbon reserves which lie within the fairway anchorage. The Report of Study concluded that the fairway anchorage is an integral and necessary part of the fairway system that provides safe access to the Port of Freeport and should not be changed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lieutenant Junior Grade Jeffrey D. Irino, Project Officer, Eighth Coast Guard District at (504) 589-4686 or Margie G. Hegy, Project Manager, Coast Guard Headquarters at (202) 267-0415.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Report of Study upon which this notice is based, is available for inspection and copying at the Marine Safety Council, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, Room 3600, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593-0001 or at the Eighth Coast Guard District office, Room 1141, Hale Boggs Federal Building, 500 Camp Street, New Orleans, LA 70130-3396 between the hours of 8 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays.

Background

The Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area was established by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) on October 25, 1968 (33 FR 15787). After the 1978 amendments to the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (PWSA) (33 U.S.C. 1223) authorized the Coast Guard to designate necessary shipping safety fairways to provide safe access routes to U.S. ports, the Coast Guard adopted the shipping safety fairway regulations originally promulgated by the COE and placed them in 33 CFR part 166 (May 13, 1982, 47 FR 20580). On June 30, 1983 (48 FR 30108), the Coast Guard defined shipping safety fairways and fairway anchorages.

A shipping safety fairway is an area in which no fixed structures are permitted, and therefore may inhibit exploration and exploitation of mineral resources. A fairway anchorage is an anchorage area contiguous to and associated with a fairway, in which fixed structures may be permitted with a two-mile spacing limitation (33 CFR 166.100(c)(1)).

Regulatory History

Pursuant to the 1978 amendments to the PWSA, the Coast Guard undertook a port access route study of the potential traffic density and the need for safe access routes for vessels proceeding to or from U.S. ports.

The port access route study, which included the Freeport Harbor area, was opened on April 16, 1979 (44 FR 22543). The Notice of Study Results, published on October 8, 1981 at 46 FR 49989, recommended no change to the existing shipping safety fairway or fairway anchorage area in the approach to Freeport, TX.

On July 2, 1987 (52 FR 25039), the Coast Guard opened a port access route study of the Freeport area in response to a request from the Amoco Production Company (USA) to modify the existing Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area.

Amoco's Request

Amoco Production Company requested that 18.40 square miles of the southwestern section of the Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area be deleted. Amoco desires to drill a 14,000' wildcat well within the southwestern section of the Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area. Federal regulations (33 CFR 166.200(c)(1)) prohibit Amoco from placing a structure in their preferred location because structures located within a fairway anchorage must be at least two nautical miles apart. The southwestern section of the fairway anchorage presently contains three production structures. With the requested modification, Amoco could obtain a drilling permit for their preferred location, State Tract 307L SE/4.

Amoco currently has a permit to drill the 14,000' wildcat well from a location in the northeastern section of the fairway anchorage which meets the two-mile spacing requirement. This is not the preferred location because it will require Amoco to drill a directional well at a steep angle from their permitted surface location. Amoco feels that a directional hole will greatly increase their risk and significantly reduce their ability to successfully drill the well to its objective, as well as substantially increase the cost of the well. In light of this and the current economic climate, Amoco states they cannot justify the drilling of a well from the northeastern section.

The requested modification would open an area within the southwestern section of the fairway anchorage to exploration and production drilling without any spacing limitations. Amoco believes the adjustment is necessary and that present resource exploration and exploitation cannot be reasonably accommodated if the fairway anchorage is not changed. They believe the present estimated costs to directionally drill are not reasonable for oil and gas exploration in this immediate area.

Amoco suggested a specific alternative which would reconfigure, but not reduce the net size of, the Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area. They proposed that the 18.40 square miles of anchorage area deleted from the southwestern section be added to the northeastern section of the fairway anchorage.

Amoco contends that the requested modification would have a negligible effect, if any, on vessels seeking anchorage, because the southwestern section of the fairway anchorage is not presently used for anchoring. To support their contention, Amoco photographed the southwestern section of the fairway anchorage during the month of February 1988 and showed no ships anchored.

The Study

The port access route study area encompassed part of the present Freeport Harbor Safety Fairway, the existing and proposed Freeport Harbor Anchorage Areas, and part of adjacent safety fairways in the offshore approach to Freeport, Texas.

The port access route study involved contacts with other Federal agencies, state government officials, and representatives of a wide variety of interests in the area. Comments were specifically solicited from Federal, state and local agencies who have an interest in the accessability to Freeport Harbor or the development of offshore oil leases in the area.

Uses of the Area

The Port of Freeport is known as the Star of the Mid-Coast because it is the most accessible port in the Gulf Coast, only 45 minutes from deep water via three miles of soon to be completed 45-

foot deep channel. The Port has direct connections to all inland rail, barge, and highway transportation systems. The Intracoastal Waterway intersects the harbor less than one mile from dockside and provides barge access to all the major river ports of mid-America.

The Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area is located approximately 3 square miles outside of the entrance to Freeport Harbor. The anchorage area consists of two sections, one on each side of the Freeport Harbor Safety Fairway. The southwestern section of the anchorage area consists of 51.6 square miles and the northeastern section has approximately 59.7 square miles.

The southwestern section currently has three production platforms located within the inshore half. The northeastern section has no structures, but two oil companies have permits to build structures. Amoco has a permit to build a structure on the inshore side of the northeastern section.

The Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area is the only anchorage serving the Port. The next closest anchorage area is in Galveston, approximately 40 miles northeast.

Dow Chemical reported that over 270 vessels per year use the Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area, but did not specify which section. Phillips 66 Company reported anchoring fifty vessels per year in the northeastern section, as close to the sea buoy as possible. Amoco reported that Jahre Shipping anchored approximately 61 vessels in the northeastern section of the anchorage in 1986 and 1987.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) Dredging Projects and Planned Port Improvements

Freeport Harbor is in competition with the ports of Houston, Texas City, and Galveston to the north and east, and the ports of Matagorda and Corpus Christi to the south and west. In order to stay competitive, both dredging and port improvement projects are planned.

The COE General Design Memorandum for Freeport Harbor provides for deepening, realigning and enlarging the main channels and turning basins from existing depths of 36-feet to depths of 45-feet, and deepening the existing Brazos Harbor side channel and turning basin from a project depth of 30-feet to a depth of 36-feet. The 45-foot project is funded and a 50-foot depth, as authorized by Congress, is being pursued.

In conjunction with the COE deepening project, harbor improvements are planned which will develop 2,000 acres of port space and provide 25 additional 1,000 foot berths.

Study Data

Vessel traffic density data for the port access route study area was obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Center for Waterborne Commerce, New Orleans, LA, and the Brazos Pilots' Association. The Coast Guard also reviewed COE environmental studies of the area containing data on weather conditions, including wind and tidal information, and seasonal conditions.

Vessel statistics compiled by the COE show that over the ten year period 1976–1986, Freeport handled an average of 577 vessels per year with drafts greater than 19 feet. The Brazos Pilots' Association reported an average of 1,157 ship movements per year over the ten year period 1978–1988.

Public Comments

Comments were received from State agencies, oil companies, a pilots' association, marine associations, and various local authorities.

The State of Texas General Land Office supports Amoco's request because it will have a positive effect on the development of minerals owned by the State.

Although it would affect one of Tenneco's active leases, Tenneco Oil Exploration and Production has no objection to Amoco's request as it would not impose an undue hardship on planned operations.

The Apache Corporation and Santa Fe Minerals, Inc. submitted letters stating "no objection" to Amoco's request.

Phillips 66 has no objection to Amoco's request. They feel that vessel operations can continue with the addition of Amoco's platform in the southwestern section of the anchorage area, but state that "any additional platforms would certainly be cause for concern". Phillips 66 is opposed to a drilling platform on Amoco's lease block in the northeastern section of the fairway anchorage. In addition, Phillips 66 requested that the Coast Guard consider establishing a precautionary zone with a three-mile radius around the most seaward channel buoy.

Keystone Shipping Company indicated their support for increased safety margins through improved port facilities. They caution that, in this case, improved access routes must take into consideration anchorage areas and lightering areas. They recognize energy requirements but feel they "must take a back seat to safe navigation in and out of U.S. Gulf ports."

The Brazos Pilots' Association (State and Federal Pilots serving Freeport, Texas) oppose Amoco's request. They agree with Amoco that the southwestern section of the fairway anchorage is "drilled up" and that no more structures can be placed in this section without violating the two-mile spacing rule. The Pilots' feel that allowing even one more structure in the southwestern section would make it "useless and a virtual hazard to safe navigation. Prevailing current and winds make it imperative that areas adjacent to the fairways be kept uncluttered enough to allow safe navigation." Additionally, the Pilots requested that a precautionary zone be established around the seabuoy.

Cities Service Oil and Gas Corporation opposes Amoco's proposed relocation of the anchorage space because it would cover the greater part of their lease block 314, leased prior to the port access route study. The lease block is already partially covered by both the southwestern and northeastern sections of the fairway anchorage.

The Brazosport Economic Development Corporation, Port of Freeport, West Gulf Maritime Association, and Mobil Exploration and Producing U.S. Inc. are opposed to Amoco's request.

The Port of Freeport feels that the present anchorage areas are "marginally adequate" and once the 45-foot dredging project is complete, larger and less maneuverable vessels will be the norm. The Port of Freeport is "diametrically opposed" to changing the fairway anchorage to accommodate a drill rig, citing the future need for anchorage space and the continuing need for safe access to the Port.

The West Gulf Maritime Association refers to the southwestern section of the fairway anchorage as the "last safe haven" under prevailing wind conditions when mechanical problems force vessels into emergency procedures.

The Board of Navigation and Canal Commissioners of the Brazos River Harbor Navigation District and the Brazosport Chamber of Commerce passed resolutions requesting the Coast Guard to disapprove Amoco's request.

Discussion of Comments

The right of navigation is paramount in routing measures designated under the authority of the PWSA. The Coast Guard feels that the present fairway anchorage configuration allows for convenient, safe access to the Port. The study data indicates that larger, less maneuverable vessels and increased traffic will result when channel and harbor improvements are completed. With more ships entering the Port, it is expected that the southwestern section

of the fairway anchorage will have increased utility.

To promote a multiple use approach to offshore waters, the Coast Guard, as far as practicable, will try to minimize impacts on leases which were granted before a study is announced. Accordingly, Amoco's proposed alternative to relocate the 18.40 square miles of anchorage space from the southwestern section to the northeastern section of the fairway anchorage is not a viable alternative because it would place restrictions on the lease block owned by Cities Service Oil and Gas Corporation prior to the port access route study. The Coast Guard examined the study area to see if other locations were available to establish new anchorage areas without infringing upon existing leases. None are available at the present time due to existing structures and rights of current lease block owners.

The port access route study considered whether the requested modification of the fairway anchorage was necessary to recover potential hydrocarbon reserves which lie within the fairway anchorage. Amoco can access the resources, albeit at greater cost, from the northeastern section of the fairway anchorage via directional drilling. Therefore, modification of the fairway anchorage is not necessary because recovery of the resources is not precluded by the existing fairway anchorage boundaries and regulations.

As requested, consideration was given to establishing a precautionary zone around the channel buoy. The Coast Guard feels that at the present time there is sufficient space free from fixed navigational hazards for pilots to embark. Therefore, a precautionary zone is not needed at this time.

Findings

1. The Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area is an integral and necessary part of the fairway system that provides safe access to the Port of Freeport.
2. The number and size of vessels calling on Freeport is expected to increase when the dredging and port improvement projects are completed.
3. There are no acceptable alternative locations for designating new anchorage areas.
4. Amoco can access the resources from their lease block in the northeastern section without modifying the fairway anchorage.
5. Safety of navigation outweighs the additional costs associated with directional drilling from another lease block already owned by Amoco.
6. The Freeport Harbor Anchorage Area should remain as presently configured to meet the needs of navigation safety (See 33 CFR 166.200(d)(9)).

Conclusion

The Coast Guard has concluded that the fairway anchorage, as presently configured, is an essential element of the fairway system in the Port of Freeport and will not be modified as requested by Amoco.

Dated: August 25, 1989.

R.T. Nelson,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Office of Navigation Safety & Waterway Services.

[FR Doc. 89-20450 Filed 8-30-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

38 CFR Part 4

RIN 2900-AD90

Combined Ratings Table; Procedural Usage; Correction

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is correcting previously published information concerning procedural usage of the Combined Ratings Table.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 28, 1989.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles A. Fountaine III, Chief, Directives Management Division (70Y731), Paperwork Management and Regulations Service, Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC, (202) 233-2073.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of June 28, 1989 (54 FR 27161), VA published its regulations to eliminate an ambiguity regarding the stage at which disability evaluations are to be rounded in determining the combined degree of disability. In that final regulation, the amendatory language was incorrectly stated and is corrected.

List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 21

Handicapped, Pensions, Veterans.

Dated: August 28, 1989.

Charles A. Fountaine,

Chief, Directives Management Division.

For the foregoing reason, the Department of Veterans Affairs hereby corrects the amendatory language in FR 89-15238 in the issue of June 28, 1989, on page 27161, middle column, to read as follows:

PART 4—[AMENDED]

In 38 CFR part 4 SCHEDULE OF RATING DISABILITIES, § 4.25 is amended by revising the introductory text, and adding paragraphs (a) and (b) preceding Table I, to read as follows:

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 89-20563 Filed 8-30-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-M

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

49 CFR Part 1002

[Ex Parte No. 246, Sub-No. 7]

Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection With Licensing and Related Services; 1989 Update

AGENCY: Interstate Commerce Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission is required by the regulations in 49 CFR 1002.3 to update user fees annually. The proposed 1989 user fees update was published on June 12, 1989 at 54 FR 24915. This final rule adopts those user fees.

In 1989, the Commission also conducted a cost study of various fee items to ensure that the fee for these items reflects current Commission costs for performing those services. Based on the review of the comments submitted in this proceeding, the Commission has decided to establish the 1989 filing fees for fee items (33)(ii), (38), (41), (55)(i-iii) and (64) at less than the fully distributed cost level. All other fees developed in the cost study are adopted here.

The Commission also adopts its proposal to establish the filing fee for Fee Item (60) and Fee Item (62)(i) complaint-type declaratory order at 10 percent of current costs and gradually to increase that fee by 10 percent each year until the fee reaches the fully distributed cost level.

The revised fee schedule is set forth below.

DATES: These rules are effective on September 29, 1989.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathleen M. King, 202-275-7428. [TDD for Hearing Impaired: 202-275-1721.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission finds that the proposal to increase fees will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the Commission's regulations provide for the waiver of filing fees when the required showing of financial hardship is established.

This decision will not have a significant impact upon the quality of the human environment or conservation of energy resources.

Additional information is contained in the Commission's decision. To purchase a copy of the full decision, write, call, or pick-up in person from Dynamic Concepts, Inc., Room 2229, Interstate Commerce Commission Building, Washington, DC 20423. Telephone: (202) 289–4357/4359. [Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through TDD services (202) 275–1721].

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 1002

Administrative practice and procedure, Common carriers, Freedom of information and User fees.

Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulation is amended as set forth below.

Decided: August 23, 1989.

By the Commission, Chairman Gradison, Vice Chairman Simmons, Commissioners Andre, Lamboley and Phillips. Chairman Gradison commented with a separate expression.

Noreta R. McGee,

Secretary.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, title 49, chapter X, part 1002, of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 1002—FEES

1. The authority citation for part 1002 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(4)(A), 5 U.S.C. 553, 31 U.S.C. 9701 and 49 U.S.C. 10321.

§ 1002.1 [Amended]

2. In § 1002.1, the dollar amount of "$18.00" in paragraph (b) is revised to read "$19.00."

3. In § 1002.1, the dollar amount of "$12.00" in paragraph (c) is revised to read "$13.00."

4. In § 1002.1, the table in paragraph (f)(6) is revised to read as follows:

§ 1002. Fees for records search, review, copying, certification, and related services.

* * * * *

(f) * * *

(6) * * *

Grade	Rate	Grade	Rate
GS–1	$5.55	GS–9	$12.95
GS–2	6.04	GS–10	14.26
GS–3	6.81	GS–11	15.67
GS–4	7.64	GS–12	18.78
GS–5	8.55	GS–13	22.33
GS–6	9.53	GS–14	26.39
GS–7	10.59	GS–15 & over	31.04
GS–8	11.72		

* * * * *

5. In § 1002.2, paragraph (d)(3) is revised to read as follows:

§ 1002.2 Filing fees.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(3) Separate fees will be assessed for the filing of temporary operating authority applications as provided in paragraphs (f) (8), (9) and (10) of this section, regardless of whether such applications are related to an application for corresponding permanent operating authority. A separate fee will be assessed for the filing of an application for temporary authority to operate a motor or water carrier as provided in paragraph (f)(24) of this section regardless of whether such application is related to a corresponding transfer proceeding as provided for in paragraph (f)(25) of this section or a notice of exemption as provided for in paragraph (f)(27) of this section.

* * * * *

6. In § 1002.2, paragraph (f) is revised to read as follows:

* * * * *

(f) *Schedule of filing fees.*

Type of Proceedings	Fees
Part I: Non-Rail Applications for Operating Authority or Exemptions	
(1) An application for motor carrier operating authority; a certificate of registration including a certificate of registration for certain foreign carriers; broker authority; water carrier operating or exemption authority; or household goods freight forwarder authority	$200
(2) A fitness only application for motor common carrier authority under 49 U.S.C. 10922(b)(4)(E) or motor contract authority under 49 U.S.C. 10923(b)(5)(A) to transport food and related products	100
(3) A petition to interpret or clarify an operating authority under 49 CFR 1160.64	2,200
(4) A request seeking the modification of operating authority only to the extent of making a ministerial correction, when the original error was caused by applicant, a change in the name of the shipper or owner of a plantsite, or the change of a highway name or number	40
(5) A petition to renew authority to transport explosives under 49 U.S.C. 10922 or 10923	150
(6) An application to remove restriction or broaden unduly narrow authority under 49 CFR 1160.107–1160.114	250
(7) An application for authority to deviate from authorized regular route authority under 49 U.S.C. 10923(a)	100
(8) An application for motor carrier or water carrier temporary authority under 49 U.S.C. 10928(b)	100
(9) An application for motor carrier emergency temporary authority under 49 U.S.C. 10928(c)(1)	70
(10) An extension of the time period during which an outstanding application for emergency temporary authority as defined in 49 U.S.C. 10928(c)(1) may continue	19
(11) Request for name change of carrier, broker, or household goods freight forwarder	8
(12) A notice required by 49 U.S.C. 10524(b) to engage in compensated intercorporate hauling including an updated notice required by 49 CFR 1167.4	60
(13) A notice of intent to operate under the agricultural co-operative exemption in 49 U.S.C. 10526(a)(5)	60
(14) [Reserved]	
(15) A joint petition to substitute applicant in a pending operating rights proceeding	22
(16) [Reserved]	
Part II: Non-Rail Applications to Discontinue Transportation	
(17) A notice or petition to discontinue ferry service under 49 U.S.C. 10908	9,000
(18) A petition to discontinue motor carrier of passenger transportation in one state	1,000
(19) [Reserved]	
Part III: Non-Rail Applications to Enter Upon a Particular Financial Transaction or Joint Arrangement	
(20) An application for the pooling or division of traffic	1,700
(21) An application involving the purchase, lease, consolidation, merger or acquisition of control of a motor or water carrier or carriers under 49 U.S.C. 11343	850
(22) An application for approval of a non-rail rate association agreement. 49 U.S.C. 10706	11,000
(23) An application for approval of an amendment to a non-rail rate association agreement	
(i) Significant amendment	1,800
(ii) Minor amendment	40
(24) An application for temporary authority to operate a motor or water carrier. 49 U.S.C. 11349	200
(25) An application to transfer or lease a certificate or permit, including a certificate of registration, and a broker's license or change of control of companies holding broker's license 49 U.S.C. 10926, or a transfer of a water carrier exemption authorized under 49 U.S.C. 10542 and 10544	200
(26) An application for approval of a motor vehicle rental contract. 49 CFR 1057.41(d)	150
(27) A petition for exemption under 49 U.S.C. 11343(e)	200
(28)–(32) [Reserved]	
Part IV: Rail Applications for Operating Authority	
(33) (i) An application for a certificate authorizing the construction, extension, acquisition, or operation of lines of railroad. 49 U.S.C. 10901	2,900
(i) Exempt transaction under 49 CFR 1150.31	1,000

Type of Proceedings	Fees
(34) Feeder Line Development Program application filed under 49 U.S.C. 10910(b)(1)(A)(i)	3,500
(35) A Feeder Line Development Program application filed under 49 U.S.C. 10910(b)(1)(A)(ii)	2,000
(36)–(37) [Reserved]	
Part V: Rail Applications to Discontinue Transportation Services	
(38) An application for authority to abandon all or a portion of a line of railroad or operation thereof filed by a railroad (except applications filed by Consolidated Rail Corporation pursuant to the North East Rail Service Act, bankrupt railroads or exempt abandonments under 49 CFR 1152.50)	3,000
(39) An application for authority to abandon all or a portion of a line of railroad or operation thereof filed by Consolidated Rail Corporation pursuant to North East Rail Service Act	150
(40) Abandonments filed by bankrupt railroads. 49 CFR 1152.40	750
(41) Exempt abandonments. 49 CFR 1152.50	1,500
(42) A notice or petition to discontinue passenger train service	9,000
(43) [Reserved]	
Part VI: Rail Applications to Enter Upon a Particular Financial Transaction or Joint Arrangement	
(44) An application for use of terminal facilities or other applications under 49 U.S.C. 11103	7,600
(45) An application for the pooling or division of traffic. 49 U.S.C. 11342	4,100
(46) An application for two or more carriers to consolidate or merge their properties or franchises (or a part thereof) into one corporation for ownership, management, and operation of the properties previously in separate ownership. 49 U.S.C. 11343	
(i) Major transaction	148,200
(ii) Significant transaction	29,600
(iii) Minor transaction	2,500
(iv) Exempt transaction [49 CFR 1080.2(d)]	600
(v) Responsive application	2,500
(47) An application of a non-carrier to acquire control of two or more carriers through ownership of stock or otherwise. 49 U.S.C. 11343	
(i) Major transaction	148,200
(ii) Significant transaction	29,600
(iii) Minor transaction	2,500
(iv) Exempt transaction [49 CFR 1080.2(d)]	600
(v) Responsive application	2,500
(48) An application to acquire trackage rights over, joint ownership in, or joint use of, any railroad lines owned and operated by any other carrier and terminals incidental thereto. 49 U.S.C. 11343	
(i) Major transaction	148,200
(ii) Significant transaction	29,600
(iii) Minor transaction	2,500
(iv) Exempt transaction [49 CFR 1080.2(d)]	600
(v) Responsive application	2,500
(49) An application of a carrier or carriers to purchase, lease or contract to operate the properties of another, or to acquire control of another by purchase of stock or otherwise. 49 U.S.C. 11343	
(i) Major transaction	148,200
(ii) Significant transaction	29,600
(iii) Minor transaction	2,500
(iv) Exempt transaction [49 CFR 1080.2(d)]	600
(v) Responsive application	2,500
(50) An application for a determination of fact of competition 49 U.S.C. 11321 (a)(2) or (b)	29,600
(51) An application for approval of a rail rate association agreement. 49 U.S.C. 10706	27,900
(52) An application for approval of an amendment to a rail rate association agreement. 49 U.S.C. 10706	
(i) Significant amendment	5,200
(ii) Minor amendment	40
(53) An application for authority to hold a position as officer or director. 49 U.S.C. 11322	300
(54) (i) An application to issue securities; an application to assume obligation or liability in respect to securities of another; an application or petition for modification of an outstanding authorization; or an application for competitive bidding requirements of *Ex Parte* No. 158, 49 CFR 1175. 49 U.S.C. 11301	1,300
(ii) An exempt transaction under 49 CFR 1175	600
(55) A petition for exemption (other than a rulemaking) filed by rail carriers. 49 U.S.C. 10505	
(i) Financial exemption petitions	2,500
(ii) Abandonment exemption petitions	2,000
(iii) Other exemption petitions	1,100
(56) An application for forced sale of bankrupt railroad lines. 49 CFR 1180.40–49, 45 U.S.C. 915	1,500
(57)–(59) [Reserved]	
Part VII: Formal Proceedings	
(60) A complaint alleging unlawful rates or practices of carriers, property brokers or freight forwarders of household goods	500
(61) A complaint seeking or a petition requesting institution of an investigation seeking the prescription or division of joint rates, fares or charges. 49 U.S.C. 10705(f)(1)(A)	3,500
(62) A petition for declaratory order	
(i) A petition for declaratory order involving dispute over an existing rate or practice which is comparable to a complaint proceeding	600
(ii) All other petitions for declaratory order	1,100
(63) Requests for nationwide and regional collectively filed general rate increases and major rate restructures accompanied by supporting cost and financial information justifying the increases	6,100
(64) A petition for exemption from filing tariffs by bus carriers	200
(65) An application for shipper antitrust immunity. 49 U.S.C. 10706(a)(5)(A)	2,800
(66) Petition for review of state regulation of intrastate rates, rules or practices filed by interstate rail carriers. 49 U.S.C. 11501	1,000
(67) Petition for review of state regulation of intrastate rates, rules or practices filed by interstate bus carriers. 49 U.S.C. 11501	1,700
(68)–(71) [Reserved]	
Part VIII: Informal Proceedings	
(72) An application for authority to establish released value rates or ratings under 49 U.S.C. 10730 (Except that no fee will be assessed for applications seeking such authority in connection with reduced rates established to relieve distress caused by drought or other natural disaster)	450
(73) An application for special permission for short notice or the waiver of other tariff publishing requirements	50
(74) The filing of tariffs, rate schedules and contracts including supplements	(1)
(75) Special docket applications from rail and water carriers. (There is no fee for requests involving sums of $25,000 or less)	60
(76) Informal complaint about rail rate application	200
(77) (i) An application for original qualification as self-insurer for bodily injury and property damage insurance (BIPD)	3,000
(ii) An application for original qualification as self-insurer for cargo insurance	300
(78) A service fee for insurer, surety or self-insurer accepted certificate of insurance, surety bond other instrument submitted in lieu of a broker surety bond. The fee is based on a formula of $10 per accepted certificate of insurance or surety bond as indication of ICC insurance activity. (There is a $50 annual minimum; but the minimum does not apply to an instrument submitted in lieu of a broker surety bond)	(2)
(79) A petition for waiver of any provision of the lease and interchange regulations. 49 CFR 1057	300
(80) A petition for reinstatement of revoked operating authority	50
(81)–(82) [Reserved]	
(83) Petition for reinstatement of a dismissed operating rights application	300
(84) Filing of documents for recordation. 49 U.S.C. 11303 and 49 CFR 1177.3(c)	(3)
(85) Valuations of railroad lines in conjunction with purchase offers in abandonment proceedings	1,100
(86) Informal opinions about rate applications (all modes)	40
(87)–(95) [Reserved]	
Part IX: Services	
(96) Messenger delivery of decision to a railroad carrier's Washington, DC, agent	(4)
(97) Request for service list for proceedings	(5)
(98) Requests for copies of the one-percent carload waybill sample	100
(99) Verification of surcharge level pursuant to Ex Parte No. 389, Procedures for Requesting Rail Variable Cost & Revenue Determination for Joint Rates Subject to Surcharge or Cancellation	(6)
(100) Application fee for Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners' Exam	70

[1] 8 per series transmitted.
[2] 10 per accepted certificate or other instrument submitted in lieu of a broker surety bond.
[3] 15 per document.
[4] 11 per delivery.
[5] 8 per list.
[6] 15 per movement verified.

[FR Doc. 89–20544 Filed 8–30–89; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7035-01-M