15000 Aviation Blvd., Room 3024, Lawndale, 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 at the following address, Los Angeles World Airports, 1 World Way, Los Angeles, CA 90045–5803.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John Milligan, Supervisor, Standards Section, Airports Division, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Blvd., Room 3024, Lawndale, CA 90261, telephone (310) 725–3621. The request may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the request to amend the application to impose and 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).

On June 3, 1998, the FAA received the request to amend the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the Los Angeles World Airports within the requirements of section 158.37(b) of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the amendment no later than October 2, 1998.

The following is a brief overview of the request.

PFC amendment number: PFC No. 97–04–C–01–LAX.

Proposed increase in the total estimated PFC revenue: From $150,000,000 to $440,000,000.

Proposed change in estimated charge expiration date: From March 31, 2000 to January 31, 2004.

Proposed altered description of approved project: The Noise Mitigation project is modified to decrease residential soundproofing in the city of Los Angeles by approximately 2,557 units and to increase the amount of land to be acquired for noise mitigation purposes by 90 acres or 563 parcels.

Any person may inspect the request in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Hawthorne, CA on July 6, 1998.

Herman C. Bliss,

Manager, Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 98–20344 Filed 7–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent to Rule on Application to use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Monterey Peninsula Airport, Monterey, 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 Monterey Peninsula 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 August 31, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, 15000 Aviation Blvd., Lawndale, CA 90261 or San Francisco Airports District Office, 831 Mitten Road, Room 210, Burlingame, CA 94010–1303.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Ms. Susan Kovalenko, Manager, Support Services of the Monterey Peninsula Airport District, at the following address: 200 Fred Kane Drive, Suite 200, Monterey, CA 93940.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Monterey Peninsula Airport District under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marlys Vandervelde, Airports Program Specialist, Airports District Office, 831 Mitten Road, Room 210, Burlingame, CA 94010–1303, Telephone: (650) 876–2806. 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 the Monterey Peninsula 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). On July 13, 1998, the FAA determined that the application to use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the Monterey Peninsula Airport District was substantially complete within the requirements of § 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than October 13, 1998. The following is a brief overview of the use application No. 96–03–U–00–MRY:

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: January 1, 1994.

Proposed charge expiration date: June 1, 2002.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $396,006.

Brief description of proposed projects: Westside Access Connection to Garden Road (Sky Park Way Connection to Garden Road); Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for ''New Northside'' Ground Access Road (Environmental Assessment (EA)/EIR for Airport Road Extension); ''New Northside'' Ground Access Road (Airport Road Extension); and ''Old Northside'' Road Relocation (Airport Road Realignment).

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: unscheduled/intermittent Part 135 air taxis.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA Regional Airports office located at: Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, 15000 Aviation Blvd., Lawndale, CA 90261.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Monterey Peninsula Airport District.

Issued in Hawthorne, California, on July 14, 1998.

Herman C. Bliss,

Manager, Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 98–20343 Filed 7–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Los Angeles County, California

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Amended notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this amended notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will not be prepared for a proposed highway project in Los Angeles County, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: C. Glenn Clinton, Chief, District Operations—South, Federal Highway Administration, 980—9th Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814–2724; Telephone: (916) 498–5037.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: No federal funding is proposed to be used by the City of Santa Clarita to construct the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway (State Route 126) from west of San Fernando Road to Via Princessa (2.5 miles) and to construct the extension of Via Princessa from Magic Mountain Parkway to Rainbow Glen Drive (1.7 miles). Since there is no federal action for the proposed project, the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 will not be needed. Thus this amended notice is to rescind the earlier notice which was published in the **Federal Register** on February 24, 1998 (63 FR 9293).

Per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Notice of Preparation on an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project was published on February 12, 1997 and a 45-day public comment period followed from February 12, 1997 to March 31, 1997, including a Public Scoping Meeting held on March 5, 1997. In addition to the comment period and scoping meeting, three public meetings were conducted by the City of Santa Clarita in November 1996. The public and review agencies have had the opportunity to comment on the scope and content of the project.

Issued on: July 9, 1998.

C. Glenn Clinton,

Chief, District Operations—South, Sacramento, California.

[FR Doc. 98–20317 Filed 7–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–97–3129; Notice 2]

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

Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan, has estimated that approximately 853,000 of its 1995–1997 Ford Explorer and 1997 Mercury Mountaineer multipurpose passenger vehicles with console armrests fail to comply with 49 CFR 571.302, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 302, ''Flammability of Interior Materials,'' and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.'' On September 11, 1997, Ford applied to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) 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.

On November 25, 1997, NHTSA published a notice of receipt of the application in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 62798) and requested comments on it. The agency received no comments.

FMVSS No. 302, Paragraphs S4.2 and S4.3, specify that any portion of a single or composite material which is within ½ inch of the occupant compartment air space, when tested in accordance with paragraph S5, shall not burn, nor transmit a flame across its surface, at a rate of more than 4 inches per minute. Composite is defined as a material that adheres to other material(s) at every point of contact. FMVSS No. 302's burn rate testing requires a 4-inch wide by 14-inch long sample, wherever possible (S5.2).

The Ford Explorer and Mercury Mountaineer armrests have multi-layer cover materials: a 1.5mm thick exterior cover, a 2mm thick second layer Ethylene Vinyl Acetate/Polyethylene (EVA/PE), referred to in the application as ''plus pad,'' a 13mm thick third layer foam bun pad, and a 3mm polycarbonate substratum. The subject of Ford's application is the 2mm thick ''plus pad'' layer.

Ford acknowledged that the ''plus pad'' material does not adhere to its 1.5mm exterior cover material or the 13mm foam bun under it at every point of contact. Therefore, as specified in FMVSS No. 302, the ''plus pad'' material cannot be tested with other materials as a composite material and has to be tested separately. Ford reported that when the ''plus pad'' material was tested separately, it showed a burn rate range from 8 to 10 inches per minute—a noncompliance with FMVSS No. 302. Ford stated that all other affected materials in the armrest satisfy the 4-inch per minute maximum burn rate. Ford explained that the supplier of the ''plus pad'' material only ''certified'' the raw material for FMVSS No. 302 by testing 11mm thick samples, not the designed 2mm thickness.

Ford supported its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following:

A. Ford stated that the FMVSS No. 302 burn rate testing requirement of cutting a sample from the ''normal configuration and packaging in the vehicle'' is conservative in regard to the actual fire spreading potential of the tested material.

B. The 2mm ''plus pad'' failed the FMVSS No. 302 test requirements when tested as a single material. However, a series of further testing demonstrates that the noncompliance does not adversely affect occupant safety because it does not increase the burn rates of the assembly or the adjacent materials in the assembly to levels higher than specified by FMVSS No. 302.

C. The ''plus pad'' accounts for less than 10 percent of the armrest material and is an insignificant percentage of the vehicle's remaining materials. All other flammable interior materials of the subject vehicles complied with FMVSS No. 302. Therefore, the noncompliance of the ''plus pad'' offers an insignificant portion of interior materials that could potentially support an interior fire.

Ford attached the following summary results of several alternative tests, including a ''worst case scenario'' test:

1. FMVSS No. 302 type tests (cover, plus pad, and foam)—treated the assembly materials as a composite material.

2. FMVSS No. 302 type tests (cover, plus pad, and foam)—added simulations of cut and torn of the materials:

a. Cut the cover layer longitudinally,

b. Cut a hole in the cover layer, and

c. Cut through the cover layer and the ''plus pad'' longitudinally.

3. FMVSS No. 302 type tests (plus pad and foam)—with the cover layer completely removed to simulate a worst case scenario.

4. Cut a complete armrest assembly in half along the lateral-vertical plane:

a. Exposed the opposite of the cut end to the flame, and

b. Exposed the cut cross-section to the flame.

All test results were less than FMVSS No. 302's maximum permissible 4-inch per minute burn rate, thereby meeting the standard.

In conclusion, Ford requested NHTSA to grant the inconsequentiality petition since the ''plus pad'' complied with FMVSS No. 302's requirements in every other test except that when tested by itself. Ford's request was based on the fact that the ''plus pad'' represents an insignificant adverse effect on interior material burn rate and the potential for