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, 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 November 9, 1995.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: 27432.
Petitioner: Daimler-Benz Aerospace
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 25.562(c)(5).
Description of Relief Sought: To extend Exemption No. 5765, as amended, which allows temporary operation of D0328 aircraft with front row passenger seats that exceed the maximum HIC requirements of § 25.562(c)(5), until June 30, 1996.

Docket No.: 28366.
Petitioner: Mr. Donald E. Hubbard
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.383(c).
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Mr. Hubbard to act as a pilot in operations conducted under part 121 after reaching his 60th birthday.

Docket No.: 28372.
Petitioner: Cessna Aircraft Co.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 25.1305(d)(3).
Description of Relief Sought: To permit approval of type design changes on the Cessna Citation II Serial 550–0801 (Citation Bravo) without compliance with the requirements of § 25.1305(d)(3), regarding the installation of an indicator to indicate turbine engine rotor system unbalance.

Dispositions of Petitions

Docket No.: 21789.
Petitioner: Air Transport Association of America.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.49.
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 3474, as amended, which permits the airmen employees of Air Transport Association of America member airline, and similarly situated part 121 certificate holders, to apply for retesting without waiting 30 days after a second (or subsequent) failure of the written or flight test, provided that a part 121-authorized instructor has given that applicant additional flight or ground instruction, as appropriate, and finds that applicant competent to pass the test.
Grant, October 18, 1995, Exemption No. 3474G.

Docket No.: 26657.
Petitioner: Omniflight Helicopters, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 43.3(a).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit appropriately trained and certificated pilots employed by Omniflight to perform daily engine rinses on the Allison C–28C–250 engines installed in Omniflight's BO–105LSA3 helicopters that are used in operations conducted under part 135.
Denial, October 17, 1995, Exemption No. 6188.

Docket No.: 26819.
Petitioner: Jet Flight International, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR part 61.
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To rescind Exemption No. 5496, which permits Jet Flight International, Inc., (JFI) to use FAA approved simulators to meet certain flight experience requirements under part 61, subject to certain conditions and limitations. The FAA finds multiple discrepancies associated with JFI's adherence to various conditions and limitations attached to the current exemption.
Rescission, September 1, 1995, Exemption No. 5496A.

Docket No.: 27491.
Petitioner: Helicopter Association International and Association of Air Medical Services.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.213(b); 135.219; and 135.225(a)(1) and (2), (f), and (g)
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To permit helicopter emergency medical service departures, under IFR, in weather that is at or above VFR minimums, from airports or helicopters at which a weather report is not available from the U.S. National Weather Service (NWS), a source approved by the NWS, or a source approved by the Administrator.
Partial Grant, September 29, 1995, Exemption No. 6175.

Docket No.: 27575.
Petitioner: Delta Air Lines, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.133(c).
Description of Relief Sought/Disposition: To extend and amend Exemption No. 5922, which permits Delta Air Lines, Inc., (DAL) to utilize compact disc read-only memory (CD–ROM) technology to present certain maintenance information and instructions pertinent to aircraft operated by DAL in lieu of printed page form or microfilm. The amendment allows DAL to utilize methods in addition to CD–ROM technology for digital storage and use of certain maintenance information and instructions pertinent to aircraft operated by DAL.

[FR Doc. 95–28224 Filed 11–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Meeting.

SUMMARY: The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of the Federal Aviation Administration Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to discuss general aviation operations issues.

DATES: The meeting will be held on November 29, 1995, at 1:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Helicopter Association International, 1635 Prince Street, Alexandria, VA.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Louis C. Cusimano, Assistant Executive Director for General Aviation Operations, Flight Standards Service (AFS–800), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591. Telephone: (202) 267–8452; FAX: (202) 267–5094.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463; 5 U.S.C. App. II), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to discuss general aviation operations issues. This meeting will be held on November 29, 1995, at 1:00 p.m., at the Helicopter Association International, 1635 Prince Street, Alexandria, VA. The agenda for this meeting will include status reports from the part 103 (Ultralight Vehicles) Working Group and the IFR Fuel Requirements/Destination and Alternate Weather Minimums Working Group. In addition, the VHF Navigation and Communications Working Group will present a status report that may include the working group's decision to declare the task complete.

Attendance is open to the interested public but may be limited to the space available. The public must make arrangements in advance to present oral statements at the meeting or may present written statements to the committee at any time. In addition, sign and oral interpretation can be made available at the meeting, as well as an assistive listening device, if requested 10 calendar days before the meeting. Arrangements may be made by contacting the person listed under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Washington, DC on November 7, 1995.

Mr. Louis C. Cusimano,

Assistant Executive Director for General Aviation Operations, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 95–28223 Filed 11–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Notice of Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Approvals and Disapprovals

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Monthly Notice of PFC Approvals and Disapprovals. In October 1995, there were six applications approved. Additionally, two approved amendments to previously approved applications are listed as is one application approved in September but inadvertently left off the September 1995 listing.

SUMMARY: The FAA publishes a monthly notice, as appropriate, of PFC approvals and disapprovals under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 (Pub. L. 103–272) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158). This notice is published pursuant to paragraph d of § 158.29.

PFC Applications Approved

Public Agency: City of San Jose, California.

Application Number: 95–05–C–00–SJC.

Application Type: Impose and use PFC revenue.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: $9,094,000.

Estimated Charge Effective Date: May 1, 1997.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: January 1, 1999.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: Air taxi/commercial operators exclusively filing FAA Form 1800–31.

Determination: Approved. Based on information contained in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the proposed class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at San Jose International Airport.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use:

Runway 30L reconstruction (B to C),
Runway 30L reconstruction (C to L),
Runway 30L reconstruction (J to L),
Taxiways Y and K reconstruction.

Decision Date: September 1, 1995.

For Further Information Contact: Joseph Rodriguez, San Francisco Airports District Office, (415) 876–2805.

Public Agency: City of Chicago, Department of Aviation, Chicago, Illinois.

Application Number: 95–04–I–00–MDW.

Application Type: Impose a PFC.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: $191,119,328.

Charge Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: July 1, 2007.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: Air taxi operators.

Determination: Approved. Based on information contained in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the proposed class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at Midway Airport.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Collection: Midway terminal development.

Decision Date: October 2, 1995.

For Further Information Contact: Louis H. Yates, Chicago Airports District Office, (708) 294–7335.

Public Agency: Huntsville-Madison County Airport Authority, Huntsville, Alabama.

Application Number: 95–04–C–00–HSV.

Application Type: Impose and use PFC revenue.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: $16,174.

Estimated Charge Effective Date: November 1, 2008.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: December 1, 2008.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: Air taxi/commercial operator, certified air carrier, and certified route air carriers operating at Huntsville International—Carl T. Jones Field (HSV) and having fewer than 500 annual enplanements at HSV.

Determination: Approved. Based on information contained in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the proposed class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at HSV.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use of PCF Revenue:

Lighting control,
Security vehicle.

Decision Date: October 13, 1995.

For Further Information Contact: Elton E. Jay, Jackson Airports District Office, (601) 965–4628.

Public Agency: City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Application Number: 95–04–U–00–PHL.

Application Type: Use PFC revenue.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: $116,700,000.

Charge Effective Date: September 1, 1992.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: September 1, 1997.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: The City of Philadelphia was previously approved to exclude a class of air carriers from the requirement to collect the PFC. This decision does not affect that ruling.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use of PCF Revenue: Rescue boat facility.

Decision Date: October 13, 1995.

For Further Information Contact: L. W. Walsh, Harrisburg Airports District Office, (717) 730–2835.

Public Agency: Port of Pasco, Pasco, Washington.

Application Number: 95–02–C–00–PSC.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: $260,000.

Charge Effective Date: September 1, 1997.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: May 1, 1998.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: None.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Use: Planning study—airport master plan.

Decision Date: October 13, 1995.

For Further Information Contact: Paul Johnson, Seattle Airports District Office, (206) 227–2655.

Public Agency: City of Fayetteville, Arkansas.

Application Number: 95–01–C–00–FYV.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: $2,584,339.

Estimated Charge Effective Date: January 1, 1996.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: August 1, 1999.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: None.

Brief Description of Project Approved in part for Collection and Use of PCF Revenue:

Master plan update,
Airfield safety area improvements,
Terminal expansion,
Land acquisition/easements,
Airfield safety improvements,
PFC application administrative costs.

Decision Date: October 24, 1995.

For Further Information Contact: Ben Guttery, Southwest Region Airports Division, (817) 222–5614.

Public Agency: Onslow County, Jacksonville, North Carolina.

Application Number: 95–01–C–00–OAJ.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: $674,041.

Charge Effective Date: January 1, 1996.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: October 1, 1998.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: None.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use of PCF Revenue:

Preparation of PFC application,
Aircraft rescue and firefighting maintenance bay,
Terminal emergency auxiliary power,
Rehabilitate airport beacon,
High intensity runway lights,
Runup aprons,
Rehabilitate service road,
Sanitary sewer line to municipal facility.

Brief Description of Projects Approved in part for Collection and Use of PCF Revenue: Recover local share of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants numbers 10, 11, 12, and 13.

Determination: Approved in part. The AIP 10 portion of this project, as well as items in the AIP 11 portion of this project, received notices to proceed prior to November 5, 1990; therefore, costs associated with those items are not PFC eligible in accordance with section 158.3.

Brief Description of Withdrawn Projects: Airport interactive training system, National storm water pollution prevention plan.

Determination: These projects were withdrawn for the PFC application by letter dated August 28, 1995.

Decision Date: October 30, 1995.

For Further Information Contact: Walter Bauer, Atlanta Airports District Office, (404) 305–7142.

AMENDMENTS TO PFC APPROVALS

Amendment No. city, state	Amendment approved date	Amended approved net PFC revenue	Original approved net PFC revenue	Original estimated charge exp. date	Amended estimated charge exp. date
93–01–C–04–ORD/94–02–U–01–ORD, Chicago, IL	10/02/95	$484,035,066	$481,806,170	09/01/98	09/01/98
92–01–C–02–STL, Saint Louis, MO	10/10/95	97,297,850	84,607,850	03/01/96	04/01/96

Issued in Washington, D.C. on November 7, 1995.

Donna P. Taylor,

Manager, Passenger Facility Charge Branch.

[FR Doc. 95–28219 Filed 11–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95–90; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1992 Lincoln Mark VII Passenger Cars are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1992 Lincoln Mark VII passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that a 1992 Lincoln Mark VII that was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is eligible for importation into the United States because (1) It is substantially similar to a vehicle that was originally manufactured for sale in the United States and that was certified by its manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) it is capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is December 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9:30 am to 4 pm]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5306).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. § 30141(a)(1)(A) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (the Act)), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. § 30115 (formerly section 114 of the Act), and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR Part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the Federal Register of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the Federal Register.

Champagne Imports, Inc. of Lansdale, Pennsylvania (''Champagne'') (Registered Importer 90–009) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1992 Lincoln Mark VII passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Champagne believes is substantially similar is the 1992 Lincoln Mark VII that was manufactured in the United States and certified by its manufacturer, Ford Motor Company, as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1992 Lincoln Mark VII to its U.S. certified counterpart, and found the two vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Champagne submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the non-U.S. certified 1992 Lincoln Mark VII, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as its U.S. certified counterpart, or is capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.