Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee Meeting on Aircraft Certification Procedures Issues

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's Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to discuss aircraft certification procedures issues.

DATES: The meeting will be held on April 11, 1996, at 9:00 a.m. Arrange for oral presentations by April 4, 1996.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Suite 801, 1400 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jeanne Trapani, Office of Rulemaking, 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267–7624.

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 be held on April 11, 1996, at the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Suite 801, 1400 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. The agenda for the meeting will include:

- Opening remarks
- Training
- Working Group status reports
- Production Certification
- Parts
- Delegation
- ICPTF
- ELT
- New Business

Attendance is open to the interested public, but will be limited to the space available. The public must make arrangements by April 4, 1996, to present oral statements at the meeting. The public may present written statements to the committee at any time by providing 25 copies to the Assistant Executive Director for Aircraft Certification procedures or by bringing the copies to him at the meeting. Arrangements may be made by contacting the person listed under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 21, 1996.

Ava Robinson,

Assistant Executive Director for Aircraft Certification Procedures, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 96–7427 Filed 3–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Collected at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), Los Angeles, CA

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 use the revenue from a PFC at Los Angeles International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed in triplicate to the following mailing address: Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, P.O. Box 92007, WWPC, Los Angeles, CA 90009, or delivered in triplicate to the following street address: Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, 15000 Aviation Blvd., Hawthorne, CA 90261.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Jerald K. Lee, Deputy Executive Director, Los Angeles Department of Airports, One World Way, Los Angeles, CA 90045.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Los Angeles Department of Airports under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John P. Milligan, Supervisor, Standards Section, AWP–621, Airports Division, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Blvd., Hawthorne, CA 90261, Tel. (310) 725–3621. 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 to use the revenue from a PFC at LAX under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158).

On February 28, 1996 the FAA determined that the application to use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the Los Angeles Department of Airports 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 May 31, 1996.

The following is a brief overview of the application, PFC application number AWP–96–03–C–00–LAX:

Level of the PFC: $3.00.

Actual charge effective date: July 1, 1993.

Actual charge expiration date: December 31, 1995.

Total estimated net PFC revenue collected: $168,000,000.

Total estimated PFC revenue to be used: $52,000,000.

The balance of approximately $116,000,000 in PFC revenue is concurrently proposed for the Ontario Terminal Development Program at Ontario International Airport (ONT) under a separate PFC application.

Brief description of proposed projects:

ONT: Airport Drive-West End; Transmitter/Receiver Relocation; Access Control; Taxiway N Westerly Extension, and LAX: Taxiway K Easterly Extension-Phase II; Remote Aircraft Boarding; Facilities/Boarding Facilities Special Equipment; Interline Baggage Remodel-Tom Bradley International Terminal (TBIT); Approach Lighting System Runway 6R; Southside Taxiways 19, 24, 43 & Extensions 48 & 49; Runway 24R Paved Stopway; High Speed Taxiway 85V; TBIT Improvements including: Flight Information Displays System (FIDS), In-transit Lounge, Baggage System Realignment (Interline), Domestic Carousels, and 2nd Level Structure.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Air Taxi/Commercial Operators (ATCO) filing Form 1800–31, including: American Trans Air Execujet; CFI, Inc.; Chrysler Aviation; Corporate Flight, Inc.; Elliott Aviation; Geneva International; Key Air; KMR Aviation; Louisiana Pacific Corporation; Mayo Aviation, Inc.; Mcathco Enterprises, Inc.; Modesto Executive Air Charter; Morgan Equipment; Raleigh Jet Charter; Samaritan Health Services; Valko, Inc.; Windstar Aviation Corp.; Yecny Enterprises, Inc.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office

listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Los Angeles Department of Airports, Los Angeles International Airport.

Issued in Los Angeles, California on March 7, 1996.

Herman C. Bliss,

Manager, Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 96–7428 Filed 3–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95–76; Notice 2]

Ford Motor Company; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

Ford Motor Company (Ford) of Dearborn, Michigan determined that some of its vehicles fail to comply with the display identification requirements of 49 CFR 571.101, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 101, ''Controls and Displays,'' and filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.'' Ford also applied to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301—''Motor Vehicle Safety'' on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on September 18, 1995, and an opportunity afforded for comment (60 FR 48195). This notice grants the application.

Footnote 3 in Table 2 of Standard No. 101 specifies that ''[i]f the odometer indicates kilometers, then 'KILOMETERS' or ''km'' shall appear, otherwise, no identification is required.'' Ford manufactured approximately 300,000 vehicles (1995 model year Rangers, Explorers, Crown Victorias, and Grand Marquis, certain 1994 and 1995 Mustangs, and certain 1995 Ford-built Mazda B-Series pickup trucks) a relatively few of which do not comply with the display identification requirements of Standard No. 101. Of that total population of 300,000 vehicles, at least 24, but not more than 124 vehicles were manufactured with an odometer that measures distance in units of kilometers but is not labeled as such as Standard No. 101 requires. Ford has already found and corrected 24 of these noncompliant odometers in service; therefore, up to 100 of them could still exist.

Ford supported its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

In Ford's judgment, this condition is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. [Ford's] basis for this belief is that: 1) an owner of an affected vehicle will readily recognize the condition and return the vehicle to a Ford dealer for correction; 2) even if the condition were to go undetected, the role of the odometer in alerting drivers to potential safety-related problems is minimal; and 3) no reports of accidents or injuries related to this condition are known or expected.

Ford believes, as evidenced by those odometers already identified by owners, that this condition becomes obvious to an owner early in the ''life'' of a vehicle because of more rapid mileage accumulation, better than expected fuel economy, etc., and that an owner will seek repair for the condition through a Ford dealer. Ford will continue to remedy the condition of any of the vehicles brought to its attention at no cost to the owners, under normal warranty terms.

With respect to the relationship of the odometer to safety, in past rulemaking (FR Vol 47, No. 216 at 50497) the agency concluded that the role of the odometer in alerting drivers to potential safety-related problems is not crucial. This conclusion was among those leading to the rescission of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 127, Speedometers and Odometers. That standard contemplated that the purpose of the odometer requirement was twofold. First, it was to inform purchasers of used vehicles of the actual mileage of the vehicles they were purchasing to enable them to ascertain the probable condition of the vehicle. Second, it was to provide an owner with information so that he or she could maintain a periodic maintenance schedule. In rescinding Safety Standard No. 127, the agency acknowledged that its reliance on the Tri-Level Study of the Causes of Traffic Accidents by the Indiana University Institute for Research in Public Safety, which led to the odometer requirement, was misplaced. The agency concluded that although the study found that problems with vehicle systems were causal or contributing factors in up to 25 percent of the accidents studied—such as problems with the brake system, tires, lights and signals, for example—all of those causes involved components which must be periodically replaced or serviced regardless of mileage. The agency thereby concluded that deterioration in performance, such as brake pulling, or in appearance, such as tire wear, etc., are readily apparent to the driver and should do more to alert the driver to potential safety-related problems than the distance traveled indication on the odometer.

Ford agrees with the agency's conclusion that the odometer reading is not a crucial factor in alerting drivers to potential safety-related vehicle problems, and, therefore, it submits that the absence of the ''km'' designation is not crucial in this regard. We believe the vehicles that are the subject of this petition present no direct or indirect risk to motor vehicle safety. Furthermore, in the case of the vehicles in question, even if the odometer indication were a crucial indicator or required periodic maintenance, the odometer reading, if relied on for this purpose, would cause a driver to seek maintenance sooner than required because the indicated mileage would be approximately 1.6 times greater than the distance actually traveled.

Therefore, while the absence of the ''km'' designation is technically a noncompliance, and the odometer of the affected vehicles registers distance traveled in kilometers while the speedometer registers in miles per hour, we believe, for the reasons cited above, the condition presents no risk to motor vehicle safety.

No comments were received on the application.

An accurate recording of mileage on a vehicle is relevant to complying with the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule. When the schedule is expressed in miles and the odometer records in kilometers, a vehicle owner who is not cognizant of the noncompliance will be alerted to the apparent time for maintenance before it is, in fact, needed under the maintenance schedule. This cannot be termed a negative impact upon safety. NHTSA agrees with the applicant that ''the condition presents no risk to motor vehicle safety''.

Ford believes that an owner of a noncompliant vehicle will readily recognize the seemingly excessive accumulation of mileage and ''seek service through their Ford dealers.'' This service most probably is replacement of the metric odometer with one that registers miles. NHTSA urges Ford to ask its dealers to provide the vehicle owner, at the time of odometer replacement, with a statement noting the distance accumulated prior to replacement so that the owner will be able to provide an accurate mileage statement at the time the vehicle is transferred to its next owner, as required by 49 CFR Part 580, *Odometer Disclosure Requirements.*

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby found that the applicant has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance herein described is inconsequential to safety. Accordingly, Ford Motor Company is hereby exempted from providing notification of the noncompliance pursuant to Sec. 30118, and from remedying the noncompliance pursuant to Sec. 30120.

(49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8).