

The city of Springfield, Ohio, submitted to the FAA on July 5, 1994, noise exposure maps, descriptions, and other documentation produced during the noise compatibility planning study conducted from September 24, 1993, through December 5, 1995. The Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport noise exposure maps were determined by the FAA to be in compliance with applicable requirements on August 11, 1995. Notice of this determination was published in the **Federal Register** on August 28, 1995.

The Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport study contains a proposed noise compatibility program comprised of actions designed for phased implementation by airport management and adjacent jurisdictions from the date of study completion to beyond the year 2000. It was requested that the FAA evaluate and approve this material as a noise compatibility program as described in section 104(b) of the Act. The FAA began its review of the program on September 19, 1996, and was required by a provision of the Act to approve or disapprove the program within 180 days (other than the use of new flight procedures for noise control). Failure to approve or disapprove such program within the 180-day period would have been deemed to be an approval of such program.

The submitted program contained twenty seven (27) proposed actions for noise mitigation on and off the airport. The FAA completed its review and determined that the procedural and substantive requirements of the Act and FAR Part 150 have been satisfied. The overall program, therefore, was approved by the Associate Administrator for Airports effective March 18, 1997.

Outright approval was granted for twenty six of the twenty seven specific program elements. Land Use Management Element LU-8, "Adopt Large Lot Zoning Policy", was disapproved for purposes of Part 150 unless accompanied by adequate sound insulation during construction. Residential development, even at lower density, is incompatible with Part 150's purpose to prevent the introduction of non-compatible land uses. The prevention of such development is highly preferred to allowing it, even when accompanied by sound insulation.

Seven (7) of the twenty seven measures submitted are listed as "Noise Abatement Measures". The seven measures were approved which relate to civilian and military aircraft runups and aircraft flight procedures to mitigate aircraft noise impacts. Thirteen (13) of the twenty seven measures are listed as

"Land Use Management Measures". Twelve of the thirteen measures were approved. Two of the measures relate to voluntary acquisition of homes in noise sensitive areas; one measure relates to purchasing avigation easements for homes within the DNL 65 dBA noise contour; one measure relates to incorporating land use policies for the Noise Compatibility Plan into local comprehensive plans; one measure will discourage the extension of sanitary sewer systems to residential areas impacted by noise; one measure recommends adopting plan review guidelines for subdivision, rezoning special use, conditional use, and variance applications; one measure recommends adopting joint airport zoning in the airport environs; two measures involve rezoning noise sensitive areas as commercial; one measure recommends informal fair disclosure; one measure recommends revising building code regulations to require sound insulation measures for development within noise contours; and one measure recommends that plat notes should state that the property lies within a high noise area. Seven (7) of the twenty seven measures are listed as "Program Management Measures". All seven measures were approved. Two of the measures concern active participation by the Ohio Air National Guard unit located at the airport in noise abatement procedures; one measure concerns notification of local operators of noise abatement procedures at the airport; one measure concerns the public availability of noise exposure maps; and three measures concern the periodic review and update of the approved Noise Compatibility Program.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval endorsed by the Associate Administrator for Airports on March 18, 1997. The Record of Approval, as well as other evaluation materials and documents which comprised the submittal to the FAA, are available for review at the following locations:

Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 617, Washington, D.C. 20591
Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111
Mr. Matthew J. Kridler, Manager, City of Springfield, Springfield City Hall, 76 East High Street, Springfield, OH 45502

Questions may be directed to the individual named above under the heading, **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Belleville, Michigan, April 18, 1997.

Robert H. Allen,

Assistant Manager, Detroit Airports District Office, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 97-12652 Filed 5-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE-97-28]

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 on 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 June 3, 1997.

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, D.C. 20591.

Comments may also be sent electronically to the following internet address: 9-NPRM-CMNTS@faa.dot.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: Heather Thorson (202) 267-7470 or Angela Anderson (202) 267-9681, Office

of Rulemaking (ARM-1), Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

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 May 9, 1997.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: 28861.

Petitioner: Vertical Flite.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.119 (b) and (c).

Description of Relief Sought: To permit petitioner to operate Air and Space 18A helicopters below the minimum altitude requirements while conducting aerial photography or contracted "police and highway" flights in visual meteorological conditions.

Docket No.: 28881.

Petitioner: McDonnell Douglas.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 25.785(d), 25.807(c)(1), 25.857(e), 25.1447(c)(1).

Description of Relief Sought: To permit carriage of up to four (4) supernumeraries in a Courier Area (aft of the cockpit door and forward of the new rigid cargo barrier), and to allow carriage of up to two (2) supernumeraries in a Courier Module area (aft of the cockpit door and forward of the 9g crash net) on the Model DC-10 freighter aircraft operating with Class E Cargo Compartments.

Docket No.: 28479.

Petitioner: Strong Enterprises.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 105.43(a).

Description of Relief Sought: To amend petitioner's current exemption which allows employees, representatives, and other volunteer experimental parachute test jumpers under Strong's control to make tandem parachute jumps while wearing a dual-harness, dual-parachute pack having at least one main parachute and one approved auxiliary parachute. The requested amendment would modify portions of the conditions and limitations contained in the exemption to include the use of a dual-harness, dual-parachute pack by tandem instructors who are certified by Strong but are not under the direct supervision of Strong.

Docket No.: 28879.

Petitioner: Classic Helicopter Corporation.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 119.71(b).

Description of Relief Sought: To allow Mr. Nicholas Ledington-Fischer, who holds a commercial pilot certificate, to continue serving as Director of Operations without having an instrument rating.

Docket No.: 26302.

Petitioner: FlightSafety International.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR appendix H to part 121, 135.293, 135.297, 135.299(2), 135.337(f) (1) and (2), 135.338(f) (1) and, 135.339(c), and 142.53(b).

Description of Relief Sought: To permit petitioner to continue to use its qualified instructor pilots or pilot check airmen in approved simulators to train and check the pilots of part 135 certificate holders that contract with FSI for training. Petitioner requests an amendment to the current exemption to the extent necessary to permit FSI to substitute the line observation requirements of 14 CFR § 142.53(b) for clients in part 135 nonscheduled operations, in lieu of the requirements of 135.33(f) (1) and (2) and 135.338(f) (1) and (2).

Docket No.: 012SW.

Petitioner: Frank D. Robinson.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 27.695.

Description of Relief Sought: To allow certification of hydraulically boosted controls on the R44 without the necessity of considering the jamming of a control valve as a possible single failure.

Dispositions of Petitions

Docket No.: 27441.

Petitioner: Department of the Army.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 45.29(b)(3).

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition: To permit petitioner to use 9-inch aircraft nationality and registration markings in lieu of 12-inch markings on its Bell Model 206B3 rotorcraft.

Grant, May 6, 1997, Exemption No. 5761B

Docket No.: 27122.

Petitioner: Air Tractor, Inc.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.31(a)(1).

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition: To permit petitioner and pilots of Air Tractor model AT-802 and AT-802A airplanes to operate those airplanes without holding a type rating, although the maximum gross weight of the airplanes exceeds 12,500 pounds.

Grant, May 2, 1997, Exemption No. 5651C

Docket No.: 26599.

Petitioner: Regional Airline Association.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.203.

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition: To allow RAA-member airlines to temporarily operate certain U.S. registered aircraft in domestic airline operations without the certificates of airworthiness or registration onboard the aircraft.

Grant, April 24, 1997, Exemption No. 5515C

Docket No.: 28545.

Petitioner: United Airlines.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.135(a)(3).

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition: To allow petitioner to use electronic digital technology to present certain maintenance information and instructions to ground operations and management personnel without meeting the requirement to have the date of the last revision on each page of the information and instructions.

Grant, April 28, 1997, Exemption No. 6612

Docket No.: 25748.

Petitioner: Popular Rotorcraft Association, Inc.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.319(a) (1) and (2).

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition: To permit petitioner and its member flight instructors to conduct pilot and flight instructor training in an experimental gyroplane for compensation or hire.

Grant, April 30, 1997, Exemption No. 5209D

Docket No.: 25210.

Petitioner: Air Transport Association of America (ATA).

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 63.39(b) (1) and (2), and 121.425(a)(2) (i) and (ii).

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition:

To allow member airlines of ATA and other qualifying part 121 certificate holders to meet the qualification requirements of flight engineer training programs approved in part 121 by permitting applicants in training for that flight check (1) to take the airplane preflight inspection portion of the flight check using an advanced pictorial means instead of the airplane, and (2) to take the normal procedures portion of that flight check in an approved flight simulation device. In addition, the exemption allows applicants they are training in preparation for the flight engineer practical test to take the normal procedures portion of that test in an approved flight simulation device.

Grant, April 30, 1997, Exemption No. 4901E

Docket No: 28650.

Petitioner: University of North Dakota.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 141.15.

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition: To permit petitioner to provide FAA-approved part 141 ground and flight training courses to U.S. citizens at FAA-approved part 141 satellite training facilities located outside of the United States.

Denial, April 28, 1997, Exemption No. 6610

Docket No: 28656.

Petitioner: University of North Dakota.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.187(b).

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition: To permit petitioner to use flight instructors in its flight instructor course who have held a flight instructor certificate for less than 24 months preceding the date of instruction given.

Denial, April 28, 1997, Exemption No. 6613

Docket No: 28705.

Petitioner: Atlantic Aero, Inc., and Mid-Atlantic Freight, Inc.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.51(c)(3).

Description of Relief Sought/

Disposition: To allow petitioners' pilots to log flight time as second-in-command (SIC) when that flight time is in certain turbopropeller-powered, single-engine aircraft during which more than one pilot is not required by either the type certificate of the aircraft or the regulations under which the flight is conducted.

Denial, April 28, 1997, Exemption No. 6613

[FR Doc. 97-12651 Filed 5-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee Meeting on Air Carrier and General Aviation Maintenance Issues

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of the FAA Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to discuss Air Carrier and General Aviation Maintenance Issues.

DATES: The meeting will be held on June 5, 1997, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Arrange for presentations by May 27, 1997.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Helicopter Association International, 1635 Prince Street, Alexandria, VA. 22314.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David B. Higginbotham, Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking (ARM-207), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267-3498; fax (202) 267-5075.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to § 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 June 5, 1997, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., at the Helicopter Association International, 1635 Prince Street., Alexandria, VA. 22314.

The agenda will include:

1. Opening remarks;
2. Committee Administration;
3. New business: Status reports from working groups;
4. A discussion of future meeting dates, locations, activities, and plans.

Attendance is open to the interested public, but will be limited to the space available. The public must make arrangements by May 27, 1997, 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 Executive Director, or by bringing the copies to the meeting. 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, May 8, 1997.

Joseph A. Hawkins,

Executive Director, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 97-12635 Filed 5-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 33379]

CSX Transportation, Inc.—Trackage Rights Exemption—Consolidated Rail Corporation

Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) has agreed to grant overhead trackage rights to CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT) between Conrail's connection with CSXT's line of railroad on the east near the Interstate 70/65 undergrade, at approximately milepost 1.5, through "IU" Interlocking and the Indianapolis Union Station area, and the connection with Conrail's St. Louis Line, formerly the Indianapolis Union Railway Company,¹ near West Street, at approximately milepost 0.4, a distance of approximately 1.1 miles, in Marion County, IN.²

In its notice, CSXT stated its intention that the trackage rights would become effective on April 20, 1997. The earliest the exemption could take effect is Tuesday, May 6, 1997, 7 days after the notice of exemption was filed at the Board.

The purpose of the trackage rights is to allow CSXT to preserve its use of Conrail's trackage in downtown Indianapolis through the Indianapolis Union Station area.

As a condition to this exemption, any employees affected by the trackage rights will be protected by the conditions imposed in Norfolk and Western Ry. Co.—Trackage Rights—BN, 354 I.C.C. 605 (1978), as modified in Mendocino Coast Ry., Inc.—Lease and Operate, 360 I.C.C. 653 (1980).

This notice is filed under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(7). If it contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the

¹ CSXT, Conrail, and The Indiana Rail Road Company are surviving parties to an agreement dated September 20, 1883, whereby all three maintained the right to operate over property owned by the former Indianapolis Union Railway Company (IU). IU's properties were conveyed to Conrail in 1976 by the United States Railway Administration. The track over which CSXT operates consists of Conrail's 13.5-mile Indianapolis Belt Running Track (Belt Track) and the trackage which is the subject matter of this notice. The surviving parties have agreed to terminate the 1883 agreement because many of its provisions have become obsolete. The Board has approved CSXT's notice of exemption to discontinue its trackage rights over the Belt Track in CSX Transportation, Inc.—Discontinuance of Trackage Rights Exemption—in Marion County, IN, STB Docket No. AB-55 (Sub-No. 546X) (STB served Apr. 22, 1997).

² The trackage rights involved in this proceeding are an extension of the trackage rights approved in CSX Transportation, Inc.—Exemption—Trackage Rights—Consolidated Rail Corporation, Finance Docket No. 31242 (ICC served Mar. 30, 1988).