prevention of the introduction of additional noncompatible uses.

The Rickenbacker Port Authority submitted to the FAA on April 17, 1998, noise exposure maps, descriptions and other documentation which were produced during the FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study dated February, 1998. It was requested that the FAA review this material as the noise exposure maps, as described in section 103(a)(1) of the Act, and that the noise mitigation measures, to be implemented jointly by the airport and surrounding communities, be approved as a noise compatibility program under section 104(b) of the Act.

The FAA has completed its review of the noise exposure maps and related descriptions submitted by the Rickenbacker Port Authority. The specific maps under consideration are Exhibits 1–1 (existing conditions) and 1–3 (future conditions) on pages 1–4 and 1–22, respectively, in the submission. The FAA has determined that these maps for Rickenbacker International Airport are in compliance with applicable requirements. This determination is effective on January 22, 1999. 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 applicant's data, information or plans, or a commitment to approve a noise compatibility program or to fund the implementation of that program.

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 detail 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 statutory required consultation has been accomplished.

The FAA has formally received the noise compatibility program for Rickenbacker International Airport, also effective on January 22, 1999. Preliminary review of the submitted material indicates that it conforms to the requirements for the submittal of noise compatibility programs, but that further review will be necessary prior to approval or disapproval of the program. The formal review period, limited by law to a maximum of 180 days, will be completed on or before July 21, 1999.

The FAA's detailed evaluation will be conducted under the provisions of 14 CFR Part 150, section 150.33. The primary considerations in the evaluation process are whether the proposed measures may reduce the level of aviation safety, create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, or be reasonably consistent with obtaining the goal of reducing existing noncompatible land uses and preventing the introduction of additional noncompatible land uses.

Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed program with specific reference to these factors. All comments, other than those properly addressed to local land use authorities, will be considered by the FAA to the extent practicable. Copies of the noise exposure maps, the FAA's evaluation of the maps, and the proposed noise compatibility program are available for examination at the following locations:

Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111

Rickenbacker Port Authority, Rickenbacker International Airport, 7400 Alum Creek Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43217–1232

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

Issued in Belleville, Michigan, on January 22, 1999.

Dean C. Nitz,

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

[FR Doc. 99–4525 Filed 2–19–99; 1:55 p.m.]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–99–5116; Notice 1]

Johnston Sweeper Company; Application for Temporary Exemption From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 105

We are asking for public comment on the application by Johnston Sweeper Company of Chino, California (''JSC''), for an exemption until March 1, 2002, from requirements of Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 105, *Hyraulic and Electric Brake Systems,* that are effective March 1, 1999. JSC has applied on the basis that ''compliance would cause substantial economic hardship to a manufacturer that has tried in good faith to comply with the standard.'' 49 CFR 555.6(a).

We are publishing this notice of receipt of the application in accordance with our regulations on temporary exemptions. This action does not represent any judgment by us about the merits of the application. The discussion that follows is based on information contained in JSC's application.

Why JSC Needs a Temporary Exemption

On and after March 1, 1999, S5.5 of Standard No. 105 requires any motor vehicle with a GVWR greater than 10,000 pounds, except for a vehicle that has a speed attainable in 2 miles of 30 mph or less, to be equipped with an antilock brake system (''ABS''), as specified in S5.5.1 of the standard. JSC manufactures street sweepers. One of these, the Model M4000, is a ''truck'' as defined by our regulations. The M4000 is hydrostatically driven, and has two braking systems: hydrostatic braking and hydraulically-braked front and rear axles. Both axles are specifically manufactured for JSC by proprietary axle manufacturers who produce customized versions of existing conventional vehicle axles, in order to make them economically viable. As far as JCS can ascertain, it is unique in producing a hydrostatically-driven vehicle that can achieve highway speeds of up to 60 mph. A supplier had promised axles by August 1998 that would be compatible with ABS control systems leading JSC to expect that it could conform with the new requirements of Standard No. 105 effective March 1, 1999. However, for the reasons discussed below, the supplier is unable to fulfill its commitment to JCS in a timely manner.

Why Compliance Would Cause JSC Substantial Economic Hardship

JSC produced 303 sweepers in 1998. Its net losses over the past three fiscal years have averaged $1,690,815 annually. It estimates that ''the loss of sales by not being granted an exemption would result in 20% less turnover.'' JSC stated that it employs 170 persons and contributes more than $30,000,000 to the American economy, and, if its application is denied, this would have a measurable effect on its employment force and the company's economic contributions.

JCS stated that it believes it will need 18 to 24 months to complete compliance work after receipt of prototype axles, in order to assure the reliability and endurance of its vehicles when the system is put into production.

How JSC Has Tried To Comply With the Standard in Good Faith

During 1997, JSC concluded a long search to find a manufacturer prepared to design and manufacture economically-viable front and rear axle and brake assemblies compatible with ABS control systems. Its supplier promised to provide axles by August 1998. According to JSC, ''the supplier subsequently acquired another axle manufacturer and instigated a rationalization review of the resulting combined product ranges.'' As a result, the supplier has decided not to produce the original axle design. JCS does not expect suitable prototypes to be available until mid to late 1999. The company has approached other axle manufacturers but has not yet located a better alternative. After it receives prototype axles, significant testing will be required to integrate the ABS with hydrostatic braking and to ensure the reliability and durability of the axles and braking system.

Why Exempting JSC Would Be Consistent With the Public Interest and Objectives of Motor Vehicle Safety

JCS said that it is a leading provider of road sweepers to municipalities, airports, and the like, which benefits the public by helping to reduce health hazards (''air borne, on the ground and in run-off water''). The company believes that the fact that its sweepers are reliable, durable, and cost effective is also in the public interest.

The sweepers operate at average speeds of from 2 to 8 mph for approximately 80 to 90 percent of the time, ''well below the limit requiring ABS brakes.'' JSC stated that its sweepers ''have inherently safe braking (hydrostatic) since the retardation force applied is proportional to the tractive effort being applied, at the time.''

How To Comment on JSC's Application

If you would like to comment on JSC's application, send two copies of your comments, in writing, to: Docket Management, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590, in care of the docket and notice number shown at the top of this document.

We shall consider all comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date stated below. To the extent possible, we shall also consider comments filed after the closing date. You may examine the docket in Room PL–401, both before and after that date, between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m.

When we have reached a decision, we shall publish it in the **Federal Register**.

Comment closing date: March 16, 1999.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30113; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.4.

Issued on: February 18, 1999.

L. Robert Shelton,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 99–4521 Filed 2–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

[T.D. 99–17]

Extension of Customs Approval of Oil Inspections USA, Incorporated, as a Commercial Gauger

AGENCY: U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of extension of approval of Oil Inspections USA, Inc., Aston, Pennsylvania, as a commercial gauger.

SUMMARY: Oil Inspections USA, Inc., of Wallington, New Jersey, an approved Customs gauger, has applied to U.S. Customs to extend its approval to gauge petroleum and petroleum products under Part 151.13 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 151.13) to their Aston, Pennsylvania facility. Customs has determined that this office meets all of the requirements for approval as a commercial gauger. Therefore, in accordance with Part 151.13(f) of the Customs Regulations, Oil Inspections USA, Inc., of Aston, Pennsylvania is approved to gauge the products named above in all Customs ports.

LOCATION: Oil Inspections USA, Inc. approved site is located at: 4009A Market Street, Aston, Pennsylvania 19014.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 9, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ira S. Reese, Chief Science Officer, Laboratories and Scientific Services, U.S. Customs Service, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room 5.5–B, Washington, D.C. 20229 at (202) 927–1060.

Dated: February 17, 1999.

George D. Heavey,

Director, Laboratories and Scientific Service.

[FR Doc. 99–4535 Filed 2–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

[T.D. 99–18]

Extension of Customs Approval of Accutest Services Incorporated as a Commercial Gauger

AGENCY: U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Approval of Accutest Services, Inc., Corpus Christi, Texas, as a Commercial Gauger.

SUMMARY: Accutest Services, Inc., of Corpus Christi, Texas, an approved Customs gauger, has applied to U.S. Customs to extend its approval to gauge petroleum and petroleum products under Part 151.13 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 151.13) to their Houston, Texas facility. Customs has determined that this office meets all of the requirements for approval as a commercial gauger. Therefore, in accordance with Part 151.13(f) of the Customs Regulations, Accutest Services Inc., Houston, Texas, is approved to gauge the products named above in all Customs ports.

LOCATION: Accutest Services, Inc. approved site is located at: 411 Allen-Genoa Road, Houston, Texas.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 9, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ira S. Reese, Chief Science Officer, Laboratories and Scientific Services, U.S. Customs Service, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room 5.5–B, Washington, D.C. 20229, at (202) 927–1060.

Dated: February 17, 1999.

George D. Heavey,

Director, Laboratories and Scientific Service.

[FR Doc. 99–4536 Filed 2–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820–02–P