have a Great Lakes Load Line Certificate under 46 CFR part 45 if they have a Limited Service Domestic Voyage Load Line Certificate and meet certain special operating restrictions and conditions.

The Coast Guard received 16 comments on the March 31, 1995, notice.

Discussion of Comments and Changes

1. One comment stated that river barges should not be permitted to operate on the Great Lakes unless they meet the same requirements as lakes barges.

This comment was based on the misunderstanding that the barges operating in this service are exempt from all load line requirements. Although the barges do not receive a Great Lakes load line certificate, thereby precluding their use in unlimited Great Lakes service, they are required to have a limited service domestic load line. The limited service domestic load line is required to be maintained like any other load line (i.e., the barges must be surveyed annually, be kept in good repair, and be drydocked every 5 years).

2. One comment supported the requirement in paragraph II.4. that a rake barge be used as the lead in the tow. Fourteen comments opposed the requirement and requested that it be dropped. Several comments pointed out that this requirement was not part of the original policy for the Chicago to Milwaukee route and should not have been added later.

The main oppositions to the rake-barge requirement seem to be economic, that a rake barge carries less cargo than a box barge, and logistical, that there are not enough rake barges currently certified to operate on Lake Michigan. The rake-barge requirement was based on the fact that the use of a rake barge in the lead tends to reduce transit time and better enable the tow to escape rough weather. However, in light of the burdens imposed by this requirement and the good safety record on the Chicago-to-Milwaukee route, the Coast Guard is removing this requirement until it can assess operations on the new Chicago-to-St. Joseph route.

For the reasons set out above, the Coast Guard, under 46 U.S.C. 5108 and 46 CFR 45.15(a), amends paragraph II.4. of the exemption announced in the notice of March 31, 1995, (60 FR 16693) to read as follows:

Limited Service Domestic Voyage Load Line Routes: Chicago, Illinois, to Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Chicago, Illinois, to St. Joseph, Michigan

II. Operating Restrictions

* * * * *

4. The towing vessel must have adequate horsepower to handle the size of the tow, with a minimum of 1,000 horsepower. The tow is limited to a maximum of three barges.

* * * * *

Dated: September 22, 1995.

Joseph J. Angelo,

Director For Standards, Office of Marine Safety, Security, and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 95–24110 Filed 9–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

[CGD 95–074]

Oil Spill Removal Organization Classification Guidelines

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard has developed revised guidelines for classifying Oil Spill Removal Organizations (OSRO). These organizations provide oil spill response capabilities to vessel and facility owners and operators. OSROs are classified based on their oil spill response resources. The revised OSRO guidelines make fundamental changes in the Coast Guard's OSRO classification process. This notice announces the availability of the revised OSRO guidelines and solicits comments on them.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to Commandant (G–MRO–3), Room 2100, U.S. Coast Guard, 2100 Second Street, SW, Washington, DC, 20593–0001, ATTN: LT Terry Hoover.

Copies of the revised OSRO guidelines may be obtained by contacting LT Terry Hoover at (202) 267–0448 or faxing a request at (202) 267–4085.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LT Terry Hoover, Response Division (G–MRO), U.S. Coast Guard, 2100 Second Street, SW, Washington, DC, 20593–0001, telephone (202) 267–0448.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Vessel and facility owners and operators are required to have oil spill response plans which identify oil spill response resources. The OSRO program was established to allow vessel and facility owners and operators to list an OSRO in an OPA 90 response plan instead of providing a detailed list of oil spill response equipment. Through the plan development and plan review processes, inefficiencies have been identified in the OSRO classification process. Because of these identified inefficiencies, the Coast Guard has revised the OSRO classification process. The process has been changed to make the classification process a better representation of an OSRO's capability to respond to an oil spill.

Dated: September 21, 1995.

J.C. Card,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Marine Safety, Security and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 95–24109 Filed 9–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–14–M

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE–95–35]

Petitions for Exemption; Summary of Petitions Received; Dispositions of Petitions Issued

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of petitions for exemption received and of dispositions of prior petitions.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to FAA's rulemaking provisions governing the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for exemption (14 CFR Part 11), this notice contains a summary of certain petitions seeking relief from specified requirements of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Chapter I), dispositions of certain petitions previously received, and corrections. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, this aspect of FAA's regulatory activities. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion or omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of any petition or its final disposition.

DATES: Comments on petitions received must identify the petition docket number involved and must be received on or before October 18, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on any petition in triplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attn: Rule Docket (AGC–200), Petition Docket No. _____, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

Comments may also be sent electronically to the following internet address: nprmcmtsmail.hq.faa.gov. The petition, any comments received, and a copy of any final disposition are filed in the assigned regulatory docket and are available for examination in the Rules Docket (AGC–200), Room 915G, FAA Headquarters Building (FOB 10A), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 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, DC, on September 25, 1995.

Michael Chase,

Acting Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: 28296
Petitioner: FlightSafety International
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.57 (c) and (d), 61.58(b), and 61.157 (a) and (f)(1)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit FlightSafety International to establish a continuous qualification training program for pilots flying for operations conducted under part 91 that would allow the participants to (1) Satisfy certain training and recent flight experience requirements in Level B and Level C simulators; (2) act as pilot in command of aircraft type certificated for more than one required pilot without satisfactorily completing, within the previous 12 calendar months, one of the flight checks or tests specified in § 61.58(b); and (3) obtain an airline transport pilot certificate or an additional type rating without passing the practical test as prescribed in § 61.157(a).

Docket No.: 28318
Petitioner: Ogden-Hinckley Airport
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.215(b)(2)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit operations at Ogden-Hinckley Airport to be conducted in aircraft that are not equipped with transponders that have automatic pressure altitude reporting capability.

Docket No.: 28338
Petitioner: Rich International Airways, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.310(m)
Description of Relief Sought: To allow Rich International Airways, Inc., to operate two L–1011–385–3 aircraft, also known as L–1011–500 aircraft, that have more than 60 feet between emergency exits.

Dispositions of Petitions

Docket No.: 20049
Petitioner: T.B.M., Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.529(a)(1)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 2956, as amended, which permits T.B.M., Inc., to operate McDonnell Douglas DC–6 and DC–7 aircraft without a flight engineer during flightcrew training, ferry operations, and test flights that are conducted to prepare for firefighting operations conducted under part 137.
Grant, September 11, 1995, Exemption No. 2956I

Docket No.: 24041
Petitioner: Butler Aircraft Co.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.529(a)(1)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 2989, as amended, which permits Butler to operate McDonnell Douglas DC–6 and DC–7 aircraft without a flight engineer during flight crew training, ferry operations, and test flights that are conducted to prepare for firefighting operations conducted under part 137.
Grant, September 11, 1995, Exemption No. 2989H

Docket No.: 27832
Petitioner: John L. Geitz
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.109 (a) and (b)(3)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To allow Mr. Geitz to conduct certain flight training and to provide simulated instrument flight experience in certain Beech airplanes that are equipped with a functioning throwover control wheel.
Grant, September 11, 1995, Exemption No. 6165

Docket No.: 28223
Petitioner: Executive Air Fleet, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.25 (b) and (c)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit Executive Air Fleet, Inc., (EAF) to operate its aircraft without having the executive use of at least one aircraft that meets the requirements for at least one kind of operation authorized by EAF's Operations Specifications.
Grant, September 11, 1995, Exemption No. 6158

Docket No.: 28244
Petitioner: Puget Sound Seaplanes
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.203(a)(1)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To allow Puget Sound Seaplanes to conduct operations under visual flight rules (VFR) outside controlled airspace, over water, at an altitude below 500 feet.
Grant, September 11, 1995, Exemption No. 6157

Docket No.: 28277
Petitioner: Great Lakes Helicopters, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 133.1(d) and 133.34(e)(1)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit external-load operations in support of rescue operations with live personnel (both rescuer and victim) for the Sonoma County, California, Sheriff Department.
Denial, September 11, 1995, Exemption No. 6160

[FR Doc. 95–24127 Filed 9–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Civil Tiltrotor Development Advisory Committee

Pursuant to Section 10(A)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act Public Law (72–362); 5 U.S.C. (App. I), notice is hereby given of the cancellation of a meeting of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) sponsored Civil Tiltrotor Development Advisory Committee (CTRDAC) previously announced for October 11 in Washington, DC. The meeting will be rescheduled on a later date. A Federal Register announcement will be published once a date has been chosen.

For further information, contact Ms. Karen Braxton (202) 267–9451.

Dated: September 22, 1995.

Richard A. Weiss,

Designated Federal Official, Civil Tiltrotor Development Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 95–24125 Filed 9–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

RTCA, Inc.; "Technical Management Committee"; Notice of RTCA Technical Management Committee Meeting To Be Held September 29, 1995; Cancellation

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Cancellation.

SUMMARY: The RTCA Technical Management Committee meeting scheduled to be held on September 29, 1995, announced in a notice published on page 47640 on the third column in the issue of September 13, 1995, volume 60, has been canceled due to unforeseen circumstances. The meeting has been rescheduled for October 20, 1995. An announcement containing further details of the October 20 meeting will be published within the next few days.