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

Office, 6020 28th Avenue South, Room 102, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55450.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Debra Giuffre, Airport Manager of the Outagamie County Airport at the following address: W6390 Challenger Drive, Suite 201, Appleton, WI 54915.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the County of Outagamie under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sandra E. DePottey, Program Manager, Minneapolis Airports District Office, 6020 28th Avenue South, Room 102, Minneapolis, MN 55450, 612 713–4363. 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 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).

On April 16, 1998 the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by County of Outagamie 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 18, 1998.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

PFC application number: 98–03–C–00–ATW.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: January 1, 1999.

Proposed charge expiration date: April 1, 2004.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $3,909,000,00.

Brief description of proposed projects: Electrical vault expansion, Emergency generator, Airport rescue and firefighting vehicle (ARFF), Access road construction, Runway end blast pads, Taxiway A reconstruction, Acquire snow removal equipment: rotary blower, front end loader with plow, truck with plow, truck with plow dump box and spreader, Construct taxiway J connector.

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 Outagamie County Airport, W6390 Challenger Drive, Suite 201, Appleton, WI 54915.

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on May 12, 1998.

Benito De Leon,

Manager, Planning and Programming Branch, Airports Division, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 98–13265 Filed 5–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–98–3851]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision that Nonconforming 1995 Mercedes-Benz C280 Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1995 Mercedes-Benz C280 passenger cars are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that a 1995 Mercedes-Benz C280 that was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is eligible for importation into the United States because (1) it is substantially similar to a vehicle that was originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that was certified by its manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) it is capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is June 18, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 10 am to 5 pm].

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5306).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR Part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

Wallace Environmental Testing Laboratories, Inc. of Houston, Texas (''Wallace'') (Registered Importer 90–005) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1995 Mercedes-Benz C280 passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which Wallace believes is substantially similar is the 1995 Mercedes-Benz C280 that was manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by its manufacturer, Daimler Benz, A.G., as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1995 Mercedes-Benz C280 to its U.S. certified counterpart, and found the two vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Wallace submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the non-U.S. certified 1995 Mercedes-Benz C280, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as its U.S. certified counterpart, or is capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that the non-U.S. certified 1995 Mercedes-Benz C280 is identical to its U.S. certified counterpart with respect to compliance with Standards Nos. 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence* * * *, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems,* 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems,* 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems,* 106 *Brake Hoses,* 109