

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, DC, on July 29, 1997.

**Donald P. Byrne,**

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

#### Dispositions of Petitions

*Docket No.:* 27188.

*Petitioner:* Knighthawk Air Express Ltd.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 61.77(a).

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To permit Knighthawk pilots to be issued special purpose pilot certificates to perform pilot duties on a civil airplane of U.S. registry, a Falcon 20D, Registration No. N950RA, without that airplane meeting the passenger seating configuration and payload capacity requirements of 14 CFR 61.77(a).

*Grant, July 17, 1997, Exemption No. 6660*

*Docket No.:* 28079.

*Petitioner:* General Electric Aircraft Engines.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 21.325(b)(1).

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To permit General Electric Aircraft Engines (GEAE) to obtain export airworthiness approvals for Class I products manufactured under GEAE Production Certificate No. 107 at the Universal Maintenance Center of P.T. Industri Pesawat Terbang Nurtanio in Bandung, Indonesia.

*Grant, July 17, 1997, Exemption No. 6139A*

*Docket No.:* 28760.

*Petitioner:* Douglas Aircraft Company/McDonnell Douglas Corporation.

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

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To allow for the accommodation of up to two supernumeraries immediately aft of the cockpit, and a crew rest facility immediately aft of the smoke barrier and crash net, on MD-11 freighter aircraft equipped with a Class E cargo compartment.

*Grant, July 14, 1997, Exemption No. 6656*

*Docket No.:* 22706.

*Petitioner:* Bankair, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 135.225(e)(1).

*Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition:* To allow Bankair's pilots to operate Bankair's aircraft at any U.S. military base that has adopted the criteria contained in the U.S. Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS) used for determining lower-than-standard departure minimums using takeoff visibility minimums that are less than 1 mile and equal to or greater than the landing visibility minimums established for those airfields.

*Grants, July 22, 1997, Exemption No. 6661*

*Docket No.:* 21605.

*Petitioner:* Alaska Airlines, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 121.574(a) (1) and (3).

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To permit the carriage and operation of oxygen storage and dispensing equipment for medical use by patients requiring emergency or continuing medical attention while being carried as passengers where the oxygen equipment is furnished and maintained by hospitals treating the patients, within the states of Alaska or Washington, subject to certain conditions and limitations.

*Grant, July 21, 1997, Exemption No. 3850F*

*Docket No.:* 27230.

*Petitioner:* Era Aviation, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To allow Era to operate certain helicopters under the provisions of part 135 without TSO-C112 (Mode S) transponders.

*Grant, July 24, 1997, Exemption No. 5718B*

[FR Doc. 97-20566 Filed 8-4-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

##### Federal Aviation Administration

##### Research, Engineering and Development (R,E&D) Advisory Committee

Pursuant to section 10(A)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463; 5 U.S.C. App. 2), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the FAA Research, Engineering and Development Advisory Committee. The meeting will be held on September 9-10, 1997 at the Holiday Inn Rosslyn Westpark Hotel, 1900 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Virginia.

On Tuesday, September 9, 1997 the meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m. and end

at 5:00 p.m. On Wednesday, September 10, 1997 the meeting will begin at 8:30 a.m. and end at 3:00 p.m. The meeting will consist of presentations on the FY 2005 Operational Concept, the NAS Architecture Version 3.0, the Flight 2000 Plan and FAA responses to committee recommendations.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space available. Persons wishing to attend the meeting or obtain information should contact Lee Olson at the Federal Aviation Administration, AAR-200, 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591 (202) 267-7358.

Members of the public may present a written statement to the Committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC on July 29, 1997.

**Jan Brecht-Clark,**

Acting Director, Office of Aviation Research.

[FR Doc. 97-20565 Filed 8-4-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

##### Federal Railroad Administration

##### Petitions for Waivers of Compliance

In accordance with part 211 of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) received requests for waivers of compliance with certain requirements of its safety standards. The individual petitions are described below, including the parties seeking relief, the regulatory provisions involved, the nature of the relief being requested, and the petitioners' arguments in favor of relief.

##### National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Waiver Petition Docket Number PB-94-3)

The National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) seeks a waiver of compliance from certain sections of the Railroad Power Brakes and Drawbars regulations, 49 CFR part 232. In 1995, FRA granted a waiver (Waiver Petition Docket Number PB-94-3) to Amtrak to extend the frequency for the cleaning, oiling, testing, and stenciling (COT&S) of passenger cars equipped with 26-C brake equipment from the required 36 months to 48 months. Amtrak requests that commuter rail passenger cars owned by the following commuter agencies, but operated and maintained by Amtrak under individual contract agreements, be under the maintenance conditions set forth in Waiver Docket Number PB-94-3:

Connecticut Department of Transportation—31 coaches

Maryland Rail Commuter—110 coaches  
 Massachusetts Bay Transportation  
 Authority—358 coaches  
 North Carolina Department of  
 Transportation—14 coaches  
 Virginia Railway Express—59 coaches

Please note that some of the commuter agencies' coaches are cab control cars. 49 CFR 229.14 requires that components added to the passenger car that enable it to serve as a lead locomotive, control the locomotive actually providing tractive power, and otherwise control the movement of the train, are subject to the requirements of 49 CFR part 229. Therefore, only the brake system components not subject to the requirements of 49 CFR 229.14 are to be considered in this petition for any cab control car.

Amtrak declares that the commuter rail equipment is maintained in accordance to all applicable FRA requirements, Association of American Railroad's maintenance practices, and Amtrak's standard maintenance procedures. Amtrak also contends that the service conditions on the commuter car fleets are considered to be consistent with those conditions under which Amtrak's four year test for COT&S was conducted.

**Norfolk Southern Corporation (Waiver Petition Docket Number RST-96-3)**

The Norfolk Southern Corporation (NS) seeks a waiver from the requirements of 49 CFR Part 213.241 to allow it to submit and maintain track inspection records via an electronic system.

In its petition, NS refers to the provisions of § 213.241 which require that each record of an inspection be prepared on the day the inspection is made and signed by the person making the inspection. NS believes that these provisions do not specifically mandate a paper-based recordkeeping system, and states that to the extent that this part implies such a requirement, it be granted a waiver to substitute electronic records for paper ones. NS further requests that it be permitted to input the records of inspection within one day's time of the date on which the inspection is made.

NS states that the use of the electronic system would allow the railroad to significantly reduce the volume of paper reports (estimated to average approximately 600 reports each week) and the associated handling costs. NS also states that the electronic reporting system could be effected without cost to any party and without disrupting or destroying the integrity of the present record system.

Under the proposed reporting procedure, track inspectors would continue to make their inspections and gather information on handwritten notes or, potentially, laptop computers. The proposed filing system would merely alter the way in which the inspection report is submitted, stored, and retrieved. Each track inspector would have his/her own personal electronic identity. The track inspector would call up a form on NS's e-mail network, insert the pertinent information on the form, and send it electronically to the regional offices. Upon receipt via e-mail in the regional offices, hard copy reports would be placed into files along the same lines as are currently used. In the future, NS states that it will develop a separate database to store all track inspection reports.

NS declares that its policy prohibits the sharing and duplication of passwords, thus preserving the uniqueness of each user's identity. Once the inspection report is completed by the inspector, the computer system would not accept subsequent alterations or modifications of the report. The computer system would allow subsequent access to such reports, or compilations of information generated therefrom, but would limit this access to a read-only basis.

NS anticipates that, in virtually all instances, the record of inspection will be prepared and entered into the electronic system on the inspection date. However, NS states that it is possible for the input process to be delayed in rare instances, such as when the system mainframe computer is taken off-line for periodic software maintenance, when the reporting inspector is called out to respond to an emergency situation, or when the inspector is located at a site where he/she does not have access to a terminal. NS asks that it be granted the one-day grace period for these rare circumstances.

NS believes that the granting of the petition would provide positive benefits for all parties involved and an immediate increase in efficiency while reducing costs.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver Petition Docket Number PB-94-3) and must be submitted in triplicate to the Docket Clerk, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Mail Stop 25, Washington, DC 20590. Communications received within 30 days of the date of this notice will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered as far as practicable. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.-5 p.m.) at FRA's temporary docket room located at 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Room 7051, Washington, DC 20005.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on July 29, 1997.

**Grady C. Cothen, Jr.,**

*Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development.*

[FR Doc. 97-20514 Filed 8-4-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Railroad Administration**

**Notice of Application for Approval of Discontinuance or Modification of a Railroad Signal System or Relief From the Requirements of Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 236**

Pursuant to Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 235 and 49 U.S.C. App. 26, the following railroads have petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval for the discontinuance or modification of the signal system or relief from the requirements of 49 CFR part 236 as detailed below.

**Block Signal Application (BS-AP)-No. 3432**

*Applicant:* CSX Transportation, Incorporated, Mr. R. M. Kadlick, Chief Engineer Train Control, 500 Water Street (S/C J-350), Jacksonville, Florida 32202.

CSX Transportation, Incorporated seeks approval of the proposed modification of the traffic control system, on the single main track, at Haines City, Florida, milepost A-828.38, Sanford Subdivision, Jacksonville Service Lane, consisting of the discontinuance and removal of controlled signals 106RA and 106LA.

The reason given for the proposed changes is to eliminate facilities no longer needed in present day operation,