The FAA concurs with the commenter's request. We have revised paragraph 5.a.(2)(c) of the final AC to state: ''Category C: A temporary (time-limited) repair that will need to be reworked or replaced prior to an established time * * *''

Airplane Cycle Age Equal to or Less Than Implementation Time on Effective Date of Rule

One commenter requests that the FAA clarify the guidance on when the assessment process would begin for airplanes whose flight cycle age is equal to or less than the implementation time on the date the associated final rule becomes effective. Specifically, the commenter points out that the deadline for repair assessment does not include a ''not to exceed'' value like the other airplanes addressed in the proposed AC.

The FAA concurs that clarification is necessary. We have changed paragraph 6.g.(1) of the final AC to state that the assessment of an airplane in this group should take place before it exceeds the design service goal (DSG), plus an equivalent C-check. (This is parallel to the limit of the assessment deadline specified in paragraph 6.g.(2) for airplanes whose cycle age is greater than the implementation time, but less than the DSG, on the date that the associated final rule became effective.)

Maintenance Program Changes

One commenter requests that the FAA revise the proposed AC to make its intent clearer concerning maintenance program changes. The proposed wording states: ''If the interval escalation reduces the frequency of inspection of the affected area below the BZI * * *''.

The commenter considers that this wording is confusing, and suggests that it could be clearer if changed to: ''If the revised maintenance or inspection program intervals are greater than those in the BZI * * *''

The FAA concurs. We have changed the wording in paragraph 6.h. of the final AC accordingly.

Sale and Transfer of Airplanes

One commenter requests changes concerning the time for implementing the required repair assessment for airplanes that previously have been operated under an FAA-approved maintenance program and are now being sold or transferred. The commenter requests that the phrase, ''* * * whichever would result in an earlier accomplishment date for the assessment,'' be eliminated. The commenter states:

- Such a requirement to adopt previous operators' programs into the new operator's FAA-approved program adds needless administrative complexity and confusion.
- The FAA applies specific oversight of maintenance program integration for fleet additions, whether by acquisition of new or used aircraft of by lease.
- Ample FAA guidelines cover the integration of airplanes transitioning from one maintenance program to another, and there is no need to add an across-the-board provision which may not be appropriate in may cases.

The FAA does not concur. We consider it essential that operators ensure that transferred airplanes are maintained in accordance with the repair assessment program on the same basis as if there were continuity in ownership. Scheduling of the repair assessments for each airplane must not be delayed or postponed because of a transfer of ownership; in some cases, such postponement could continue indefinitely if an airplane is transferred frequently from one owner to another. The stipulation contained in the AC is intended to prevent the situation where an airplane is transferred so often that it never gets assessed.

Miscellaneous Changes

Title of AC: We changed the title of the final AC to ''Damage Tolerance Assessment of Repairs to Pressurized Fuselages.'' We consider that this new title more clearly reflects the content of the AC and the guidance provided.

Paragraph 3., Discussion: We revised this paragraph in the final AC provide a comprehensive list of all airplane models that are subject to the requirements of 14 CFR parts 91, 121, 125, and 129 for a structural integrity assessment of repairs to the fuselage pressure boundary.

Paragraph 6.j., Operation of Leased Foreign-Owned Airplanes: We revised this paragraph to point out that the applicant is not required to implement the assessment program only in accordance with the ''model-specific *manufacturer's* repair assessment guidelines.'' We deleted the word ''manufacturer's'' from that phrase in the final AC. The applicant may use the manufacturer's guidelines or may use any others that have been developed and approved for the specific airplane model.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on January 23, 2001.

Dorenda D. Baker,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–3309 Filed 2–7–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

RTCA, Inc. Special Committee 198; Next Generation Communications (NEXCOM)

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for an RTCA NEXCOM Special Committee 198 meeting to be held February 22–23, 2001, starting at 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be held at the RTCA Inc., 1140 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 1020, Washington, DC, 20536.

At the request of the Federal Aviation Administration, RTCA established a new Special Committee (SC–198) to develop recommendations for the Next Generation Communications (NEXCOM) program. The FAA will implement an integrated system for digital air/ground voice and data communications in the National Airspace System. Special Committee 198 will undertake a multiphase work program that will initially focus on operational considerations and identify, then characterize, basic operational issues. this results of the first phase effort will be published in a Principles of Operation document as well as a report on responses to recommendation of the RTCA Chairman's Committee on NEXCOM. In subsequent phases, Special Committee 198 will address detailed demonstration and transition planning.

The agenda will include: (1) Welcome and Introductory Remarks; (2) Review Terms of Reference, discuss multi-phase work program; (3) Organize work groups, determine leadership, establish interim milestones to deliver two products for Phase 1: (a) Report on Responses to Recommendations to the RTCA Chairman's Committee on NEXCOM (Delivery: August 2001); (b) RTCA DO NEXCOM Principles (Delivery: September 2001); (4) Working Group meetings. Plenary Session: (5) Review Work Group reports; (6) Review Proposed schedule for subsequent meetings to include Plenary meetings in February, April, June, and August, as well as Plenary in September 2001 to approve phase 1 documents; (c) Plenary

in November 2001 to review other committee work; (d) and Editorial meetings; (7) Other Business; (8) Date and Location of Next Meting; (9) Closing.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the Co-chairmen, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the RTCA, Inc., at (202) 833–9339 (phone), (202) 833–9434 (facsimile).

Issued in Washington, DC on February 1, 2001.

Janice L. Peters,

Designated Official.

[FR Doc. 01–3310 Filed 2–7–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

RTCA Special Committee 172; Future Air-Ground Communications in the VHF Aeronautical Data Band (118–137 MHz)

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for Special Committee 172 meeting to be held February 27–March 1, 2001, starting at 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be held at RTCA, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 1020, Washington, DC 20036.

The agenda will include: February 27: Plenary Session Convenes; (1) Introductory Remarks; (2) Review Meeting Agenda; (3) Review Previous Meeting Minutes; (4) Working Group (WG)–2 Convenes to work on Minimum Aviation System Performance Standards (MASPS); (5) WG–3 Convenes to work on VHF Data Link 2 and 3 Minimum Operational Performance Standards (MOPS). February 28: (6) Working Group 3 continues. March 1: Plenary Sessions Reconvenes: (7) Review ICAO Aeronautical Mobile Communications Panel (AMCP) Activities; (8) Report on Next Generation Communications (NEXCOM) Advisory Rulemaking Committee and other FAA digital activities; (9) Report on Airlines Electronic Engineering Committee, Systems Architecture Interfaces work on NEXCOM; (10) Review Status of EUROCAE WG–47; (11) Other Business; (12) Date and Location of Next Meeting; (13) Closing.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the RTCA Secretariat, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 1020, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 833–9339 (phone); (202) 833–9434 (fax); or http://www.rtca.org (web site). Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 1, 2001.

Janice L. Peters,

Designated Official.

[FR Doc. 01–3311 Filed 2–7–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Approvals and Disapprovals

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Monthly Notice of PFC Approvals and Disapprovals. In December 2000, there were seven applications approved. Additionally, 11 approved amendments to previously approved applications are listed.

SUMMARY: The FAA publishes a monthly notice, as appropriate, of PFC approvals and disapprovals under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101–508) 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: Milwaukee County, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Application Number: 00–06–U–00–MKE.

Application Type: Use PFC revenue.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total PFC Revenue to be used in this Decision: $2,158,333.

Charge Effective Date: April 1, 1999.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: May 1, 2004.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: No charge from previous decision.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Use: Surface movement guidance control system. School/church sound insulation, phase II.

Decision Date: December 5, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sandra E. DePottey, Minneapolis Airports District Office, (612) 713–4363.

Public Agency: Monterey Peninsula Airport District, Monterey, California.

Application Number: 00–06–C–00–MRY.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: $3.00.

Total PFC Revenue Approved in this Decision: $335,031.

Earliest Charge Effective Date: March 1, 2001.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: September 1, 2001.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: Unscheduled Part 135 air taxis.

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

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use:

Rehabilitate terminal storm drain.

Expand safety building.

Reconstruct southeast hangar pavement.

Year 2000 assessment/upgrade security access system.

South ramp security fence.

Taxiway D reconstruction.

Southeast water main extension.

Upgrade airfield lighting system.

South ramp storm drain extension.

Environmental study for runway 10R/28L service road.

Environmental study for airport road extension, phases 2 and 3.

North side perimeter fence replacement.

Upper mezzanine elevator.

Fire apparatus pump upgrade.

Brief Description of Disapproved Project: Vegetation/wildlife management plan.

Determination: Disapproved. This project is not eligible planning or development under the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), appendix 2, FAA Order 5100.38A, AIP Handbook (October 24, 1989). The project description submitted in the application did not include sufficient detail to allow the FAA to make a positive eligibility determination. Therefore, this project does not meet the requirements of § 158.15(b).

Decision Date: December 6, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marlys Vandervelde, San Francisco Airports District Office, (650) 876–2806.

Public Agency: City of Billings, Aviation and Transit Department, Billings, Montana.

Application Number: 00–03–C–00–BLI.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.