

Washington, D.C. 20591; telephone (202) 267-3132.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. D. Michael Smith, Office of Rulemaking (ARM-1) Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone (202) 267-7470.

This notice is published pursuant to paragraphs (c), (e), and (g) of § 11.27 of Part 11 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 11).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on September 20, 1995.

Michael Chase,
Acting Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: 27833.

Petitioner: Air Tractor, Inc.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.313(d).

Description of Relief Sought: To reconsider Exemption No. 6095, which denied the petitioner exemption that would have allowed a passenger to be carried in Air Tractor models AT-503A and AT-802 restricted category aircraft without that passenger performing one of the functions described in § 91.313(d).

Dispositions of Petitions

Docket No.: 18881.

Petitioner: Experimental Aircraft Association.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.151(a)(1).

Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 5745, which permits the International Aerobic Club (IAC), a division of the Experimental Aircraft Association, and IAC members participating in IAC-sponsored competitions to begin a daytime flight in an airplane under visual flight rules conditions when there is enough fuel to be able to fly for at least 20 minutes after the first point of intended landing. This petitioner had requested a permanent exemption; however, while the exemption is granted, it is not permanent. *Grant, August 14, 1995, Exemption No. 5745A.*

Docket No.: 26552.

Petitioner: United Parcel Service Co.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR appendix H, part 121.

Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 5366, as amended, which permits UPS, and any other operator contracting to use UPS simulators, to conduct training and checking in UPS simulators that do not meet all of the visual requirement necessary to be qualified as Level D (formerly Phase III) simulators. *Grant, August 16, 1995, Exemption No. 5366B.*

Docket No.: 27295.

Petitioner: Monument Valley Air Service.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 43.3(g).

Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 5727, which permits appropriately trained pilots employed by Monument Valley Air Service to remove and reinstall aircraft cabin seats in its aircraft that are type certificated for nine or fewer passenger seats and used in operations conducted under part 135. *Grant, August 10, 1995, Exemption No. 5727A.*

Docket No.: 27837.

Petitioner: Los Angeles Police Department.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 145.53.

Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit the City of Los Angeles Department of General Services Helicopter Maintenance Unit, an FAA-certificated repair station to perform maintenance on the department's military surplus Bell Helicopter Model 204B, an aircraft for which the repair station is not rated. *Denial, August 9, 1995, Exemption No. 6143.*

Docket No.: 27989.

Petitioner: Bidzy Ta Hot Aana d.b.a. Tanana Air Service.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 43.3(g).

Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To allow appropriately trained pilots employed by Tanana Air Service to remove and reinstall passenger seats in its aircraft type certificated for nine or fewer passenger seats that are used in operations conducted under part 135. *Grant, August 10, 1995, Exemption No. 6145.*

Docket No.: 28038.

Petitioner: Doug Geeting Aviation.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 43.3(g).

Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To allow appropriately trained pilots employed by Doug Geeting Aviation to remove and reinstall aircraft cabin seats in its aircraft that are type certificated for nine or fewer passenger seats and used in operations conducted under part 135. The petitioner had requested permanent exemption; however, while the exemption is granted, it is not permanent. *Grant, August 10, 1995, Exemption No. 6144.*

Docket No.: 28084.

Petitioner: Kokomo Aviation, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.165(b)(6) and (7).

Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit Kokomo

Aviation, Inc., to operate turbojet aircraft equipped with one high-frequency (HF) communication system in extended overwater operations. *Grant, August 15, 1995, Exemption No. 6146.*

[FR Doc. 95-23727 Filed 9-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Federal Highway Administration

[FHWA Docket No. 92-24]

Participation in the Congestion Pricing Pilot Program

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Notice; additional solicitation for participation.

SUMMARY: This notice further extends FHWA's open invitation to State, local governments, or other public authorities, including toll authorities, to apply for participation in the Congestion Pricing Pilot Program (Pilot Program) established by Section 1012(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). This notice amends the Pilot Program to support initiatives by toll authorities which involve tolls that vary by time of day and level of congestion. **DATES:** The solicitation for participation in the Pilot Program will be held open until further notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John T. Berg, Highway Revenue and Pricing Team, HPP-13, (202) 366-0570; or Mr. Wilbert Baccus, Office of the Chief Counsel, HCC-32, (202) 366-0780; FHWA, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 1012(b) of the ISTEA (Pub. L. 102-240, 105 Stat. 1914) authorizes the Secretary of Transportation (the Secretary) to create a Pilot Program by entering into cooperative agreements with up to five State or local governments or other public authorities, to establish, maintain, and monitor congestion pricing pilot projects. This section also provides that three of these agreements may involve the use of tolls on the Interstate System notwithstanding 23 U.S.C. 129, as amended, and 301. A maximum of \$25 million is authorized for each of the fiscal years 1992 through 1997 to carry out this program.

In advance of completing its plan for implementing this program, the FHWA published a Federal Register notice on May 29, 1992 (57 FR 22857), which presented general information about the Pilot Program and solicited public

comment on a number of implementation issues [Docket No. 92-94]. The comment period closed on June 29, 1992. The FHWA published the initial solicitation for the Pilot Program in the Federal Register on November 24, 1992 (57 FR 55293). The solicitation period closed on January 25, 1993. The results of the first solicitation were summarized in the Federal Register on June 16, 1993 (58 FR 33293). The June 16 notice also extended the solicitation period until October 14, 1993. A Federal Register notice dated May 25, 1994, extended the solicitation deadline for program participation until further notice and broadened the program to include pre-project activities and pricing of high-occupancy vehicle lanes.

Since that notice was issued, the FHWA has funded a variety of projects involving pre-project studies and implementation projects. Pre-project studies are underway in six cities in California, Minnesota, Oregon, Texas, and Colorado. An implementation project is in the preliminary stages in San Diego, California. In addition, Pilot Program funds are being used to support a monitoring and evaluation study of a privately funded highway project in California that will be the first U.S. toll road using congestion pricing techniques to manage demand. Negotiations are currently underway for additional congestion pricing projects in other States.

Additional Solicitation for Participation

This notice expands the offer of Federal support currently available to toll authorities and others for initiatives that would make use of variable tolls as part of a demand management strategy. Through this notice, the Pilot Program is being amended to make Federal funds available for use as a revenue reserve fund to replace revenue losses associated with adoption of a congestion pricing toll strategy.

The preferred method of charging tolls on existing toll facilities is to set a fixed toll per passenger vehicle and a fixed toll per axle for commercial vehicles. Fixed tolls may be favored because they clearly satisfy bond trust agreements and rate covenants regarding revenue to service debt. Another reason for this method of tolling may be an equity concern that all toll customers in the same vehicle class be charged the same fixed fee.

However, fixed tolls do not necessarily account for the importance of the trip to the user or the additional cost responsibility of peak-period users. They also preclude the possibility of using tolls that vary by time of day or

level of congestion for demand management purposes.

Although much remains to be learned about the response of travelers to congestion pricing practices, the use of variable tolls has the potential of both improving service on congested toll facilities and reducing the need for capacity expansion. To help overcome barriers to the testing and use of variable tolls and to encourage congestion pricing initiatives by toll authorities, the FHWA is modifying the existing offer of support from the Pilot Program. The Pilot Program can already provide support for efforts designed to lay the groundwork for congestion pricing applications, such as the development of public-involvement programs, activities designed to overcome institutional barriers to implementing congestion pricing, and funding for automated vehicle identification or tolling equipment and operational costs for pricing applications.

The new feature being offered through this notice is the availability of Pilot Program funds in the amount of up to \$10 million to a participating toll authority, either directly or as an ISTEA Section 1012 loan of Federal funds from the State to the toll authority, to be used to establish a revenue reserve fund that would be available to replace potential revenue loss that might be associated with adoption of a congestion pricing toll strategy. The purpose of this new feature is to help provide assurance to the toll authority and others that the revenue stream associated with a toll facility would not be jeopardized by the adoption of a congestion pricing toll strategy. For example, a toll authority might propose a revenue-neutral pricing strategy with peak-period surcharges and/or off-peak discounts that would be designed to influence demand patterns to provide improved customer service or reduce the need for future capacity expansion. A revenue-neutral pricing strategy would also respond to the negative perception of congestion pricing as simply a new tax designed to raise additional revenue. An example from a toll road in France provides an interesting illustration where certain peak period tolls are set 25 to 50 percent higher than the base rates and off-peak rates are reduced by 25 to 50 percent. The new toll structure has significantly reduced congestion during the most congested periods and has been viewed as a successful strategy by users of the tollway. The toll authority designed the pricing strategy to be revenue neutral, and while modest revenue losses were noted initially, it appears that overall revenue impacts were low. Alternatively, a toll authority might

propose to increase tolls to raise additional revenue to support capacity expansion or otherwise improve service, but through the adoption of a combination of peak-period surcharges and off-peak discounts the toll authority may be able to influence demand patterns to provide improved customer service or may be able to reduce the level of capacity expansion needed.

In either case, because of the innovative pricing strategy being proposed, toll authorities need to be able to assure bondholders and rating agencies that revenues would not decrease or be lost as a result of the pilot test. The FHWA recognizes that forecasting traffic and revenue changes that might result from adoption of a peak-period pricing initiative is inherently uncertain, even if the objective of the initiative is to maintain revenue neutrality. For this reason, FHWA is offering toll authorities the possibility of using Pilot Program funds to establish a revenue reserve fund that could be drawn upon if revenues do fall below projected levels.

The exact details of the funding arrangement of the Pilot Program would be worked out to suit the unique circumstances of individual proposers, but, in general, the proposer must provide to FHWA an estimate of the expected revenue stream expected to result from a variable toll strategy (based on an estimate by an independent traffic and revenue forecasting firm), assign a downside risk of revenue loss that might occur (e.g., if traffic projections prove to be overstated), and propose to establish a revenue reserve fund that would cover that potential amount of revenue loss. The maximum amount of Federal funds to be available to any proposer for a revenue reserve fund is \$10 million. The proposer would be required to provide the non-Federal share of not less than 20 percent as the initial deposit in the fund. At the time the agreement is executed between FHWA and the proposer, the Federal share of project funds will be obligated. Federal funds will be deposited in the revenue reserve fund immediately after the non-Federal share is deposited.

Any revenue reserve funds that are unused after completion of the congestion pricing initiative may be used for other congestion relief projects, including capacity additions to the facility included in the pilot project or related facilities, transit improvements in the area of the pricing project, other congestion pricing initiatives, or other related uses. Proposals should identify specific plans for use of any excess funds, or describe how such use will be determined at a later date. The

effectiveness of the proposed uses of these funds will be a consideration in the evaluation of proposals.

The selection criteria contained in the FHWA's November 24, 1992, Federal Register notice will continue to be used as general selection criteria for implementation. However, clear priority will be given to projects that can be implemented during fiscal year (FY) 1996 so that the FHWA can evaluate data prior to expiration of ISTEA. Therefore, applications for FY 1996 revenue reserve funding for toll roads should be submitted by October 31, 1995, or as soon thereafter as possible. Proposals should include a brief discussion of the tolling strategy, expected timing of implementation, proposed fund management plan, and approvals needed. Any remaining program funds would continue to be available for pre-project and implementation efforts that would come later than FY 1996. To obtain further information or discuss potential revenue reserve fund projects contact Mr. John T. Berg at the address provided under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 315; 49 CFR 1.48; Sec. 1012(b), Pub. L. 102-240, 105 Stat. 1914, 1938.

Issued on: September 19, 1995.

Rodney E. Slater,

Federal Highway Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-23688 Filed 9-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Domestic Finance; Notice of Open Meeting of the Advisory Committee Community Adjustment and Investment Program

The Department of the Treasury, pursuant to the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. No. 103-182) (the "Implementation Act"), established an advisory committee (the "Advisory Committee") for the community adjustment and investment program (the "Program"). The charter of the Advisory

Committee has been filed in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L. No. 92-463), with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Advisory Committee consists of nine members of the public, appointed by the President, who collectively represent: (1) community groups whose constituencies include low-income families; (2) scientific, professional, business, nonprofit, or public interest organizations or associations, which are neither affiliated with, nor under the direction of, a government; and (3) for-profit business interests.

The objectives of the Advisory Committee are to: (1) provide informed advice to the President regarding the implementation of the Program; and (2) review on a regular basis, the operation of the Program, and provide the President with the conclusions of its review.

Pursuant to Executive Order No. 12916, dated May 13, 1994, the President established an interagency committee to implement the Program and to receive, on behalf of the President, advice of the Advisory Committee. The interagency committee is chaired by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The meeting of the Advisory Committee, which will be open to the public, will be held in Washington, DC, at the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE) Board Room, 1575 I Street, NW, Washington DC 20005 from 2:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. EST, on Wednesday, October 11, 1995. The room will accommodate approximately 100 persons. Seats are available on a first-come, first-serve basis. Due to limited seating, all prospective attendees are encouraged to notify the persons listed below. If you would like to have the Advisory Committee consider a written statement, please submit the material addressed to the Community Adjustment and Investment Program, Advisory Committee, Department of the Treasury, 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room 1124, Washington, DC 20220 no later than Monday, October 2, 1995.

If you have any questions, please call Dan Decena at (202) 622-0637 or Peter Necheles at (202) 622-2139. Please note that these telephone numbers are not toll-free.

Mozelle W. Thompson,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Government Financial Policy.

[FR Doc. 95-23656 Filed 9-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-25-P

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

Announcement of 1996 Solicited Grant Topics

AGENCY: United States Institute of Peace.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The agency is Soliciting Applications for Projects on the following topics:

Solicitation A: New Approaches to Conflict Management, Peacemaking, and Peacekeeping

Solicitation B: Economic and/or Environmental Factors and International Conflict

Solicitation C: Professional Conflict Resolution Training Programs and Materials

Solicitation D: Cross-Cultural Negotiation Research and Training

DATES: Application Material Available in September, 1995. Receipt Date for Return of Applications: January 2, 1996. Notification of Awards: April, 1996.

ADDRESSES: For Application Package: United States Institute of Peace, Solicited Grant Program, 1550 M Street, NW., Suite 700, Washington, DC 20005-1708, (202) 429-6063 (fax), (202) 457-1719 (TTY), usip—requests@usip.org(email).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Grant Program, Phone (202)-429-3842.

Dated: September 19, 1995.

Bernice J. Carney,

Director Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-23641 Filed 9-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3155-01-M