continuations, three deletions, and three additions to the approved 1990 noise compatibility program; and seven noise mitigation measures, which consist of four continuations, one completion, and two additions to the 1990 noise compatibility program. Phase II of the submitted program contained two new noise abatement measures and two new noise mitigation measures. The FAA completed its review and determined that the procedural and substantive requirements of the Act and Part 150 have been satisfied. The overall program, therefore, was approved by the Administrator, effective March 30, 1998.

Of the overall 21 specific measures requiring federal action, 19 were approved without exception. Two land use measures were partially approved subject to the recommendation related to the introduction of noncompatible residential development is not meeting Part 150 criteria. The approved measures included such items as: the continuation of periodic noise monitoring, provision for monthly reports on late night (11 p.m. to 7 a.m.) runway utilization, variance from noise compatibility program assumptions to the Tower and frequent nighttime users; designation of runways 18R and 18L as the preferred for takeoffs by turbojet and large four-engine prop aircraft between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. when runway 23 or runway 5 cannot be used for reasons of wind, weather, operational necessity, or required runway length; designation of locations and procedures for engine runups; modification to current operating procedures for turbojet and large four-engine prop aircraft departing runways 36R and 36L to initiate turns at 2.5 and 2.6 DME north of the CLT VOR/DME respectively; continuation of the 1990 noise compatibility program land use planning which recommends amending local land use planning policies to reduce the development of noncompatible land uses within the airport environs; continuation of the 1990 noise compatibility program land use measure to rezone undeveloped property to airport compatible land use and limit the density of residential development permitted within noise contours; dedication of avigation easement as a condition of approval for the development of property located in the airport environs; pursuit of the establishment of an airport overlay district that corresponds to the airport environs; pursuit of an amendment of the state building code to authorize the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County to raise the minimum building standards (noise level reduction) for new residential construction in the airport overlay district; development of the full disclosure of property location within the airport environs for potential buyers; continuation of the public information program that is a part of the approval 1990 noise compatibility program; continuation of the sound insulation program for sensitive public buildings used for instruction (schools) and assembly (churches) within the 65 DNL contour; continuation of the sound insulation program of residential property within the 65 DNL contour; within the 70–75 DNL noise contour, offers of purchase assurance, sound insulation of residences, purchase of aviation easements or acquisition of noncompatibility property; acquisition of mobile homes located within the 70 DNL noise contour; exercise of the option to purchase avigation easement, sound insulate or acquire homes within the 65 DNL noise contours where sound insulation is infeasible or not cost effective; establishment of departure turn for third parallel runway 17; establishment of departure turn for the third parallel runway 35; insulation of eligible dwellings within the 2001 noise compatibility program/noise exposure map 65 DNL noise contour, and acquisition of mobile homes within the 65 DNL noise contour of the 2001 noise compatibility program/noise exposure map. These determinations are set forth in detail in the Record of Approval endorsed by the Administrator on March 30, 1998.00000

The FAA also has completed its review of the revised noise exposure maps and related descriptions submitted by the City of Charlotte. The specific maps under consideration are dated February 27, 1998, in the submission. The FAA has determined that these maps for the Charlotte/Douglas International Airport are in compliance with applicable requirements. This determination is effective April 28, 1998. FAA's determination on an airport operator's noise exposure maps is limited to a finding that the maps were developed in accordance with the procedures contained in Appendix A of FAR Part 150. Such determination does not constitute approval of the data, information or plans.

If questions arise concerning the precise relationship of specific properties to noise exposure contours depicted on a noise exposure map submitted under Section 103 of the Act, it should be noted that the FAA is not involved in any way in determining the relative locations of specific properties with regard to the depicted noise contours, or in interpreting the noise exposure maps to resolve questions concerning, for example, which properties should be covered by the provisions of Section 107 of the Act. These functions are inseparable from the ultimate land use control and planning responsibilities of local government. These local responsibilities are not changed in any way under Part 150 or through FAA's review of noise exposure maps. Therefore, the responsibility for the detailed overlaying of noise exposure contours onto the map depicting properties on the surface rests exclusively with the airport operator which submitted those maps, or with those public agencies and planning agencies with which consultation is required under Section 103 of the Act. The FAA has relied on the certification by the airport operator, under Section 150.21 of FAR Part 150, that the statutorily required consultation has been accomplished.

Copies of the noise exposure maps and of the FAA's evaluation of the maps, and copies of the record of approval and other evaluation materials and documents which comprised the submittal to the FAA are available for examination at the following locations:

Federal Aviation Administration, Atlanta Airports District Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2–260, College Park, Georgia 30337–2747.

Mr. T.J. Orr, Aviation Director, Charlotte/Douglas International Airport, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Questions on either of these FAA determinations may be directed to the individual named above under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Issued in Atlanta, Georgia on April 28, 1998.

Dell T. Jernigan,

Manager, Atlanta Airports District Office, ATL–ADO.

[FR Doc. 98–13264 Filed 5–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE–98–9]

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 exemptions (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 in 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 8, 1998.

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, DC 20591.

Comments may also be sent electronically to the following internet address: 9–NPRM–CMTS@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: Tawana Matthews (202) 267–9783 or Terry Stubblefield (202) 267–7624, 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, DC, on May 13, 1998.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: 29168.
Petitioner: Continental Airlines, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.417(c)(2)(i)(A).
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Continental and Continental Micronesia to use video-based differences training in lieu of physical hands-on training to accomplish the training and qualification of crewmembers on the automatic Type III emergency overwing exits installed on Boeing 737–600, –700, and –800 airplanes, when the crewmembers previously have been trained and qualified on Type III emergency overwing exits installed on other versions of Boeing 737 aircraft.

Docket No.: 29166.
Petitioner: Roger Aviation Company.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 142.15(d).
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Roger Aviation Company to conduct simulator training under part 142 with a Frasca 242 flight training device (FTD) without that FTD meeting the requirements of an advanced FTD as defined in § 142.3.

Dispositions of Petitions

Docket No.: 27307.
Petitioner: Comair Airlines, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.433(c)(1)(iii), 121.441(a)(1) and (b)(1) and appendix F to part 121.
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit Comair to combine recurrent flight and ground training and proficiency checks for its pilots in a single annual training and proficiency evaluation program.
Grant, April 30, 1998, Exemption No. 5734C.

Docket No.: 29173.
Petitioner: Captain Joe R. McCabe.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.383(c).
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the petitioner to act as a pilot in operations conducted under part 121 after reaching his 60th birthday.
Denial, April 20, 1998, Exemption No. 6757.

Docket No.: 28174.
Petitioner: Air Carriage.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the petitioner to operate certain aircraft under the provisions of part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed on those aircraft.
Grant, April 20, 1998, Exemption No. 6108A.

Docket No.: 28597.
Petitioner: U.S. Helicopters, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit U.S. Helicopters to operate certain aircraft under the provisions of part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed on those aircraft. In addition, in your letter, you include a revised list of aircraft to be covered by the extension.
Grant, April 20, 1998, Exemption No. 6452A.

Docket No.: 29167.
Petitioner: Captain David F. Specht.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.383(c).
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the petitioner to act as a pilot in operations conducted under part 121 after reaching his 60th birthday.
Denial, April 20, 1998, Exemption No. 6755.

Docket No.: 29171.
Petitioner: Mr. Thomas Bentley.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.383(c).
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the petitioner to act as a pilot in operations conducted under part 121 after reaching your 60th birthday.
Denial, April 20, 1998, Exemption No. 6756.

Docket No.: 25550.
Petitioner: Department of the Army.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.169(a)(2) and (c).
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the U.S. Army to file instrument flight rules flight plans in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the U.S. Army.
Grant, April 30, 1998, Exemption No. 6528A.

Docket No.: 27785.
Petitioner: Chevron U.S.A., Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit Chevron to operate without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed on its aircraft operating under the provisions of part 135.
Grant, April 30, 1998, Exemption No. 5948B.

Docket No.: 28206.
Petitioner: Silver Moon Aviation.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.143(c)(2).
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the petitioner to operate certain aircraft without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed.
Grant, April 30, 1998, Exemption No. 6122A.

Docket No.: 28307.
Petitioner: Bombardier Business Aircraft.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.337(a)(2), and (3), and (b)(2); and 135.339(b) and (c) and appendix H to part 121.
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit certain instructors employed by Bombardier and listed in a part 135 certificate holder's approved training program to act as simulator instructors for that

certificate holder under part 135 without having received ground and flight training in accordance with that certificate holder's training program approved under subpart H of part 135. That exemption also permits simulator instructors employed by Bombardier and listed in a certificate holder's approved training program to serve in advanced simulators without being employed by the certificate holder for 1 year, provided the instructors receive applicable training in accordance with the provisions of this exemption.

Grant, April 30, 1998, Exemption No. 6446A.

Docket No.: 29176.

Petitioner: Col. Marcus F. Cooper, Jr.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.383(c).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the petitioner to act as a pilot in operations conducted under part 121 after reaching his 60th birthday.

Denial, April 30, 1998, Exemption No. 6759.

Docket No.: 28499.

Petitioner: Sky Helicopters, Inc.

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

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit Sky Helicopters to operate certain aircraft under the provisions of part 135 without a TSO–C112 (Mode S) transponder installed on those aircraft

Grant, April 30, 1998, Exemption No. 6430A.

Docket No.: 26017.

Petitioner: ERA Aviation, Inc.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 43.3(a) and 135.443(b)(3).

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit ERA to allow appropriately trained and certificated pilots employer by ERA to install and remove an approved emergency rescue hoist on its Aerospatiale AS332 Super Puma helicopters.

Disposition, Date, Exemption No. 6760.

Docket No.:

Petitioner:

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR.

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit.

Disposition, Date, Exemption No.

[FR Doc. 98–13267 Filed 5–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application 98–01–C–00–MHK To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Manhattan Regional Airport, Manhattan, KS

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 impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Manhattan Regional Airport 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).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 18, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Central Region, Airports Division, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Ken Black, Airport Manager, Manhattan Regional Airport, at the following address: City of Manhattan, Kansas, Manhattan Regional Airport, 5500 Fort Riley Blvd., Suite 120, Manhattan Kansas 66502–9721.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the City of Manhattan, Manhattan Regional Airport, under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lorna Sandridge, PFC Program Manager, FAA, Central Region, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106, (816) 426–4730. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invite public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at the Manhattan Regional Airport 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).

On May 1, 1998, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the City of Manhattan, Kansas, 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 July 31, 1998.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: June, 1998.

Proposed charge expiration date: January, 2004.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $401,978.

Brief description of proposed project(s): Construction of Access Road (Phase 1); Installation of Part 139 Signage; Construct Terminal Building; Terminal Building Site Development; Construct Service Road; Update the Airport Master Plan; Rehabilitate Apron.

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 Manhattan Regional Airport. Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on May 1, 1998.

George A. Hendon,

Manager, Airports Division, Central Region.

[FR Doc. 98–13266 Filed 5–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Outagamie County Airport, Appleton, WI

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 impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Outagamie County Airport 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).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 18, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Minneapolis Airports District