BAHAMAS, THE

(In North America, CANADA DOES NOT QUALIFY for this year's Diversity Program.)

Applicants must meet ALL eligibility requirements under the U.S. law in order to be issued visas. Processing of applications and issuance of diversity visas to successful applicants and their eligible family members MUST occur by September 30, 2000. Family members may not obtain diversity visas to follow to join the applicant in the U.S. after this date.

IMPORTANT NOTICE: There is NO initial fee, other than postage required to enter the DV–2000 program. The use of an outside intermediary or assistance to prepare a DV–2000 entry is entirely at the applicant's discretion. Qualified entries received directly from applicants or through intermediaries have equal chances of being selected by computer. There is no advantage to mailing early, or mailing from any particular locale. Every application received during the mail-in period will have an equal random chance of being selected within its region. However, more than one application per person will disqualify the person from registration.

Selection of Winners

The selection of winners is made at random and no outside service can legitimately improve an applicant's chances of being chosen or guarantee that an entry will win. Any service that claims it can improve an applicant's odds is promising something it cannot lawfully deliver.

Persons who think they have been cheated by a U.S. company or consultant in connection with the Diversity Visa Lottery may wish to contact their local consumer affairs office or the National Fraud Information Center at 1–800–876–7060 or 1–202–835–0159 from 9:00 am to 5:30 p.m. (EST), Monday through Friday or 1–202–835–0159; Internet address: http://www/fraud.org. The U.S. Department of State does not investigate consumer complaints against businesses in the United States.

Notifying Winners

Only successful entrants will be notified. They will be notified by mail between April and July of 1999 at the address listed on their entry. Winners will also be sent instructions on how to apply for an immigrant visa, including information on the fee for immigrant visas and a separate visa lottery surcharge. Successful entrants must complete the immigrant visa application process and meet all eligibility requirements under U.S. law to be issued a visa.

Being selected as a winner in the DV Lottery does not automatically guarantee being issued a visa even if the applicant is qualified, because the number of entries selected and registered is greater than the number of immigrant visas available. Those selected will, therefore, need to complete and file their immigrant visa applications quickly. Once all 50,000 visas have been issued or on September 30, 1999, whichever is sooner, the DV Program for Fiscal Year 2000 will end.

Obtaining Instructions on Entering the DV Lottery

The above information on entering the DV–2000 Program is also available 24 hours a day to persons within the United States by calling the Department of State's Visa Lottery Information Center at 1–900–884–8840 at a flat rate of $5.10 per call. Callers will first hear some basic information about the DV Lottery and will be requested to provide their name and address so that printed instructions can be mailed to them. Applicants overseas may continue to contact the nearest U.S. Embassy or Consulate for instructions on the DV Lottery.

Dated: July 29, 1998.

Mary A. Ryan,

Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs.

[FR Doc. 98–20637 Filed 7–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE–98–15]

Petitions for Exemption; Summary of Petitions Received; Disposition 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 partitions 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 August 24, 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, D.C. 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, D.C. 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, D.C., on July 27, 1998.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: 28672
Petitioner: Alaska Airlines, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.709(b)(3)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Alaska Airlines' certificated mechanics to train flight operations instructors who would then train flight crewmembers in the installation and removal procedures for medevac stretchers in Alaska Airlines' aircraft

Docket No.: 29210
Petitioner: Simulator Training, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 63.37(b)(1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) and paragraphs (a)(3)(i), (iv)(a) and (v) of appendix C to part 63
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Simulator Training, Inc., to allow an applicant for the initial Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight engineer (FE) certificate, who does not

hold an FAA commercial pilot certificate with an instrument rating, to satisfy the FE certificate in-flight aeronautical experience requirement by completing a structured FAA-approved line-oriented observation program (LOOP) in lieu of the flight instruction time required in an airplane. The LOOP would be conducted only following an FE applicant's successful completion of flight simulator, flight training device, and line-oriented flight training

Docket No.: 29250
Petitioner: True North, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.299(a)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit True North, Inc., pilots to accomplish a line operational evaluation in a Level C or Level D flight simulator in lieu of a line check in an aircraft

Docket No.: 29274
Petitioner: Airborne Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.299(a)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Airborne, Inc., pilots to accomplish a line operational evaluation in a Level C or Level D flight simulator in lieu of a line check in an aircraft

Docket No.: 29233
Petitioner: Elite Aviation, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.299(a)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Elite Aviation Inc., pilots to accomplish a line operational evaluation in a Level C or Level D flight simulator in lieu of a line check in an aircraft

Docket No.: 29276
Petitioner: Excelaire Services, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.299(a)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Excelaire Services, Inc., pilots to accomplish a line operational evaluation in a Level C or Level D flight simulator in lieu of a line check in an aircraft

Docket No.: 29251
Petitioner: Alamo Jet, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.299(a)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Alamo Jet, Inc., pilots to accomplish a line operational evaluation in a Level C or Level D flight simulator in lieu of a line check in an aircraft

Docket No.: 29273
Petitioner: Air Response, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.299(a)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Air Response, Inc., pilots to accomplish a line operational evaluation in a Level C or Level D flight simulator in lieu of a line check in an aircraft

Docket No.: 22690
Petitioner: The Boeing Company
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.57(c)(3)(ii) and (d)(2)(ii)
Description of Relief Sought: To permit Boeing and pilots employed as crewmenbers for Boeing to continue to use any type of Boeing airplane or a Level B, C, or D simulator to meet the takeoff and landing regency of experience requirements of § 61.57

Dispositions of Petitions

Docket No.: 581
Petitioner: Department of the Air Force
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.159
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the Air Force to conduct hurricane reconnaissance flights without maintaining the appropriate cruising altitudes as prescribed by the Federal Aviation Regulations governing operations for flights conducted under visual flight rules. *GRANT, July 13, 1998, Exemption No. 131H*

Docket No.: 29237
Petitioner: Mr. Ernest Maresca
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.383
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, July 9, 19998, Exemption No. 6797*

Docket No.: 29182
Petitioner: Continental Express
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.434 (c)(1)(ii)
Description of Relief Sought/ Dispositions: To permit Continental Express to substitute a qualified and authorized check airman in place of an FAA inspector to observe a qualifying PIC while the PIC is performing prescribed duties during at least one flight that includes a takeoff and a landing when completing initial or upgrade training as specified in § 121.424, subject to certain conditions and limitations. *GRANT, July 16, 1998, Exemption No. 6798*

Docket No.: 29172
Petitioner: Heli-Jet Corporation
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 135.152(a)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit Heli-Jet to operate its five Bell 212 helicopters under part 135 without each of those helicopters being equipped with an approved DFDR installed, subject to certain conditions and limitations. *GRANT, July 2, 1998, Exemption No. 6796*

Docket No.: 28975
Petitioner: AOG, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 145.37 (b)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit AOG, Inc., to perform maintenance on flexible and integral fuel cells at its customer's facilities and maintenance on flexible fuel cells at the petitioner's facility without providing suitable permanent housing for at least one of the heaviest aircraft for which it is rated. *DENIAL June 11, 1998, Exemption No. 6795*

Docket No.: 29211
Petitioner: United Parcel Service
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.157 and 61.158
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit UPS and persons who contract for services from UPS to use FAA-approved flight simulators to meet certain flight experience requirements of part 61 without UPS holding a 14 CFR part 142 certificate. *GRANT, July 10, 1998, Exemption No. 6794*

Docket No.: 26582
Petitioner: Air Transport Association of America
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.3(a) and (c), 63.3(a), and 121.383(a)(2)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit an air carrier to issue written confirmation of an FAA-issued crewmember certificate to a flight crewmember employed by that air carrier based on information in the air carrier's approved record system. *GRANT, July 10, 1998, Exemption No. 5487C*

Docket No.: 27354
Petitioner: Mr. August J. Blake, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 137.53(c)(2)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the petitioner to conduct aerial application of insecticide materials from a Piper PA–23–250 aircraft not equipped with a device capable of jettisoning within 45 seconds at least one-half of the aircraft's maximum authorized load of agricultural materials when operating over a congested area. *GRANT, July 17, 1998, Exemption No. 5676C*

Docket No.: 29263
Petitioner: Mr. Edward E. Moon
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, July 22, 1998, Exemption No. 6799*

Docket No.: 144CE

Petitioner: Sino Swearingen Aircraft Company

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 23.25; 23.29; 23.235; 23.471; 23.473; 23.477; 23.479; 23.481; 23.483; 23.485; 23.493; 23.499; 23.723; 23.725; 23.726; 23.727; 23.959; 23.1583(c) (1) and (2), Appendix C23.1, Appendix D23.1, through Amendment 23–52

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To allow type certification of the Sino Swearingen SJ30–2 390 airplane without an exact showing of compliance 14 CFR part 23 requirements, subject to certain conditions and limitations. *GRANT, June 29, 1998, Exemption No. 6791*

Docket No.: 29041

Petitioner: Estumkeda, Ltd

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 47.65

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the petitioner to obtain a Dealer's Aircraft Registration Certificate without meeting the United States citizenship requirements. *DENIAL, June 23, 1998, Exemption No. 6793*

[FR Doc. 98–20632 Filed 7–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

RTCA, Inc., Government/Industry Free Flight Steering Committee

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 Government/Industry Free Flight Steering Committee meeting to be held August 19, 1998, starting at 1:00 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, 20591, in the Bessie Coleman Conference Center, Room 2AB.

The agenda will include: (1) Welcome and Opening Remarks; (2) Review Summary of the Previous Meeting; (3) Report and Recommendations from the Free Flight Select Committee on a Restructured Flight 2000 Program; (4) Report on the status and plans for the GPS/WAAS Sole Means Risk Assessment; (5) Other Business; (6) Date and Location of Next Meeting; (7) Closing Remarks.

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), or dclarke@rtca.org (e-mail). Members of the public may present a written statement at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 27, 1998.

Janice L. Peters,

Designated Official.

[FR Doc. 98–20631 Filed 7–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 98–4075]

General Motors; Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

General Motors Corporation (GM) of Warren, Michigan, determined that some of its 1997 model Chevrolet Corvettes failed to meet the requirements of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 124, ''Accelerator Control Systems,'' and filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, ''Defects and Noncompliance Reports.'' GM also applied 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.

Notice of receipt of the application was published on September 16, 1997, and an opportunity afforded for comment (Docket No. 97–58, Notice 1; 62 FR 48708).

Paragraph S5.2 of FMVSS No. 124 requires the throttle to return to idle position within the time limits specified in S5.3, whenever any component of the accelerator control system is disconnected or severed at a single point. S5.3 requires return to idle within 3 seconds for any vehicle exposed to temperatures of 0 degrees to −40 degrees F (−18 degrees to −40 degrees C). During the 1997 model year, GM produced 9,500 Chevrolet Corvettes, which will not comply with FMVSS No. 124 because, when tested with one return spring removed at temperatures below −26 degrees F, their accelerator pedal module assembly does not move quickly enough to cause the throttle to return to the idle position within 3 seconds.

GM described the noncompliance and supported its application with the following arguments:

The Chevrolet Corvette employs an electronic throttle control which adjusts the throttle position based on input from the accelerator pedal position. The accelerator pedal is equipped with three springs, any two of which are capable of returning the pedal to rest position. Once this occurs, the throttle returns to idle position approximately 0.2 seconds later. A test run in early May, however, raised a question about the ability of the pedal assembly to return at low temperatures.

GM believes that the failure of the pedal assembly to meet the throttle closing time requirements of FMVSS No. 124 at extremely low temperatures is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons.

1. *Vehicle Controllability*—In the unlikely event that all of the prerequisites necessary for the noncompliance occurred—that is, a return spring was disconnected or severed on a pedal assembly with residual oil, and the vehicle soaked at ambient temperatures below −32 degrees C—the vehicle would continue to be controllable both by the service brakes and as a result of the Brake Torque Management System.

2. *Reliability of the Accelerator Springs*—The condition which is the subject of GM's noncompliance decision can only occur if one of the return springs is severed or disconnected. The springs in the Corvette pedal assembly, however, have extremely high reliability and are not likely to fail in the real world.

3. *Condition Requires Extreme Temperatures; Pedal Assembly Warms Quickly*—As mentioned above, the root cause of the noncompliance condition is the residual oil on the pedal assemblies congealing below −32 degrees C. Testing at temperatures above that level resulted in full compliance with the FMVSS No. 124 time limits for all pedal assemblies tested. Therefore, the ambient temperatures required for the possibility of this noncompliance to exist are severe. Even if a vehicle with a disconnected return spring soaked under the necessary harsh conditions for a sufficient time to congeal the residual oil, the potential for the noncompliance to occur would exist for only a short time, because the pedal assembly would warm up quickly with activation of the vehicle heating system.

4. *Condition is Self-correcting*—Durability testing indicates that the condition improves with wear. Bench testing was conducted on five production pedal assemblies with poor