

action. A request for Federal action or approval to implement specific noise compatibility measures may be required, and an FAA decision on the request may require an environmental assessment of the proposed action. Approval does not constitute a commitment by the FAA to financially assist in the implementation of the program nor a determination that all measures covered by the program are eligible for grant-in-aid funding from the FAA. Where Federal funding is sought, requests for project grants must be submitted to the FAA Regional Office in Kansas City, Missouri.

In May 1996, the STLAA submitted to the FAA the Noise Exposure Maps, descriptions, and other documentation produced during the Noise Compatibility Planning study. The Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Noise Exposure Maps were determined by FAA to be in compliance with applicable requirements on July 15, 1996. Notice of this determination was published in the Federal Register on July 31, 1996.

The Lambert-St. Louis International Airport study contains a proposed update to its Noise Compatibility Program comprised of actions designed for phased implementation by airport management from the date of study completion to beyond the year 2002. It was requested that the FAA evaluate and approve this material as a noise compatibility program as described in Section 104(b) of the Act. The FAA began its review of the program on July 15, 1996, and was required by a provision in the Act to approve or disapprove the program within 180 days. Failure to approve or disapprove such program within the 180-day period shall be deemed to be an approval of such program.

The submitted program contained numerous proposed actions for noise abatement and mitigation on and off the airport, which were contained in the technical report entitled "FAR Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program Update." The FAA completed its review and determined that the procedural and substantive requirements of the Act and FAR part 150 have been satisfied. The overall program, therefore, was approved by the Associate Administrator effective January 10, 1997.

Outright approval was granted for all measures in the NCP, with the exception of a portion of one measure related to height hazard zoning, which is not within the purview of part 150, and another measure which is a flight procedure that does not have to be acted on within the 180-day formal review

period. An FAA determination on this flight procedure is anticipated within about 30 days.

Some of the approved noise abatement measures include: continued informal noise abatement procedures and implementation of additional enhanced noise control procedures; completion of ongoing acquisition of homes in Kinloch, East Kinloch, Southeast and Southwest Berkley, Ramona Hills, Bridgeton, Bridgeton Terrace, McNulty Manor, and Robertson; development of a sound insulation and sales (transaction) assistance program; and an automated aircraft monitoring system to assist the Airport in tracking the progress of the noise control procedures.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval endorsed by the Associate Administrator on January 10, 1997. The Record of Approval, as well as other evaluation materials and the documents comprising the submittal, are available for review at the FAA office listed above and at the Lambert-St Louis Airport Planning and Development Office, 4610 N. Lindbergh, Bridgeton, Missouri. Questions may be directed to the individual named above under the heading, **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on February 5, 1997.

George A. Hendon,  
Manager, Airports Division.

[FR Doc. 97-4066 Filed 2-18-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

#### [Summary Notice No. PE-97-9]

#### **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 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 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 document number involved and must be received on or before March 11, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to 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: [nprmcmts@mail.hq.faa.gov](mailto:nprmcmts@mail.hq.faa.gov).

The petition, any comments received, and a copy of any final disposition are filed with 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:** Fred Haynes (202) 267-3939 or Angela Anderson (202) 267-9681 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 February 12, 1997.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

#### **Petitions for Exemption**

**Docket No.:** 010NM

**Petitioner:** Boeing Commercial Airplane Group

**Sections of the FAR Affected:** 14 CFR 25.809(f)

**Description of Relief Sought:** To provide an increased level of safety by permitting the use of an inertia reel for each of the seven crew-member occupants in addition to an escape rope at the crew entry door of the 757-200PF airplanes. A separate inertia reel and harness will be provided for each of the seven crew-member occupants.

**Docket No.:** 137CE

**Petitioner:** Air Tractor, Inc.

**Sections of the FAR Affected:** 14 CFR 23.3

**Description of Relief Sought:** To permit the AT-10, a freight carrying aircraft, to exceed the 12,500 pound limitation for a normal category aircraft.

**Docket No.:** 28774

**Petitioner:** Mid-East Jet, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 61.67(c)(2)(iii)(B)(4)(ii) and (d)(2)(i)(B), 61.68(d)(2)(ii)(C)(2) and (e)(2)(i)(B), and 61.158(d)(1)

*Description of Relief Sought:* To allow Mid East Jet, Inc. to use Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-approved Boeing Company (Boeing) simulators for 100 percent of its pilot training, testing, and checking while using Boeing's approved 14 CFR part 121 flight training program.

#### Dispositions of Petitions

*Docket No.:* 20583

*Petitioner:* Tenneco, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 61.57 (c)(3) and (d)(2), and 61.58(e)

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To permit pilots employed by Tenneco, Inc. to complete their entire 24-month pilot-in-command (PIC) check in an FAA-approved flight simulator.

*Grant, January 28, 1997, Exemption No. 6572*

*Docket No.:* 25052

*Petitioner:* Taquan Air Service, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 135.203(a)(1)

*Description of Relief Sought Disposition:* To permit Ketchikan Air Service, Inc., TEMSCO Helicopters, Inc./TEMSCO Airlines, Taquan Air Service, Inc., and Misty Fjords Air and Outfitting, conducting operations under part 135, to operate seaplanes inside the Ketchikan, Alaska, Class E airspace under Special Visual flight Rules (SVFR) below 500 feet above the surface.

*Grant, January 24, 1997, Exemption No. 4760E*

*Docket No.:* 25731

*Petitioner:* Experimental Aircraft Association

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 45.25 and 45.29

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To allow members of the Experimental Aircraft Association and members of the Confederate Air Force to operate their historic military aircraft with 2-inch high nationality and registration marks located beneath the aircraft's horizontal stabilizer.

*Grant, December 11, 1996, Exemption No. 5019D*

*Docket No.:* 26340

*Petitioner:* Delta Air Lines, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 121.433(c)(1)(iii), 121.440(a), and 121.441(a)(1) and (b)(1); appendix F to part 121; and Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) No. 58, paragraph 6(b)(3)(ii)(A)

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To allow Delta Air Lines,

Inc. to combine recurrent flight and ground training and proficiency checks for its crewmembers in a single annual training and proficiency evaluation session, and to meet the line check requirements through an alternative line check program.

*Grant, January 27, 1997, Exemption No. 5271E*

*Docket No.:* 26559

*Petitioner:* Helicopter Association International

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 43.3(a)

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To permit properly trained pilots employed by member operators of Helicopter Association International and the Association of Air Medical Services to remove and reinstall liquid oxygen containers in their aircraft after receiving appropriate training by a properly certified airframe mechanic.

*Grant, December 26, 1996, Exemption No. 6002A*

*Docket No.:* 26732

*Petitioner:* Air Transport Association of America

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 121.652 (a) and (c)

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To allow Air Transport Association of America (ATA)—member airlines and other similarly situated part 121 operators to permit a pilot-in-command (PIC) conducting operations under part 121 to perform an instrument approach procedure to the weather minima prescribed by this exemption during the first 100 hours of service as a PIC, in the type airplane he or she is operating, using an alternative means approved by the Administrator to satisfy the requirements.

*Grant, January 27, 1997, Exemption No. 5549C*

*Docket No.:* 27852

*Petitioner:* Higher Power Aviation, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 61.55(b)(3); 61.56(h) (1), (2), and (3); 61.57(c)(3) and (d)(2), 61.58(e); 61.64(e)(3); 61.65 (e)(2), and (g) (1) and (3); 61.67 (c)(4) and (d)(2); 61.158(d)(1); 61.191(d); and 61.197(e)

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To permit the petitioner to use Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)—approved simulators to meet certain flight experience requirements.

*Grant, January 29, 1997, Exemption No. 5986A*

*Docket No.:* 27867

*Petitioner:* Department of the Navy

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 91.209 (a) and (b)

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To permit the Navy, specifically the United States Marine Corps, to conduct helicopter night-vision flight device training operations without lighted aircraft position lights.

*Grant, January 24, 1997, Exemption No. 5978B*

*Docket No.:* 27933

*Petitioner:* Emery Worldwide Airlines

*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 allow the petitioner to combine recurrent flight and ground training and proficiency checks for its flight crewmembers in a single annual training and proficiency evaluation program.

*Grant, January 31, 1997, Exemption No. 6000A*

*Docket No.:* 28599

*Petitioner:* James C. Fisher

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

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To allow the petitioner to act as pilot in command under 14 CFR part 121 after his 60th birthday.

*Denial, January 27, 1997, Exemption No. 6574*

*Docket No.:* 28723

*Petitioner:* Ryan International Airlines, Inc.

*Sections of the FAR Affected:* 14 CFR 91.203 (a) and (b)

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To permit the petitioner to operate temporarily its U.S.-registered aircraft following the incidental loss or mutilation of that aircraft's airworthiness certificate or registration certificate, or both.

*Grant, January 24, 1997, Exemption No. 6571*

*Docket No.:* 28749

*Petitioner:* GTA Air, Inc.

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

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To allow the petitioner to operate aircraft under part 135 without a TSO-C112 (Mode S) transponder installed.

*Grant, January 27, 1997, Exemption No. 6573*

*Docket No.:* 27885

*Petitioner:* Trans World 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 14 CFR part 121

*Description of Relief Sought/*

*Disposition:* To allow the petitioner to combine recurrent flight and ground training and proficiency checks for its

flight crewmembers in a single annual training and proficiency evaluation program.

*Grant, January 31, 1997, Exemption No. 6012A*

[FR Doc. 97-4064 Filed 2-18-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

## Maritime Administration

[Docket No. M-028]

### Application of Foreign Underwriters to Write Marine Hull Insurance

The Maritime Administration (MARAD) has received an application under 46 CFR part 249 from HIH Casualty and General Insurance Limited, an Australia based underwriter, to write marine hull insurance on subsidized and Title XI program vessels.

In accordance with 46 CFR 249.7(b), interested persons are hereby afforded an opportunity to bring to MARAD's attention any discriminatory laws or practices relating to the placement of marine hull insurance which may exist in the applicant's country of domicile.

Responses to this notice must be sent to the Secretary, Maritime Administration, Room 7300, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20509, and must be received by close of business on Wednesday, March 5, 1997.

Dated: February 13, 1997.

Joel C. Richard,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-4062 Filed 2-18-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

## National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 96-133, Notice 01]

### Development of Improved Driver Interview Procedures for Police Use at Checkpoints

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice and Request for Comments on Data Collection.

**SUMMARY:** The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) plays a key role in the national effort to reduce alcohol related traffic injuries and deaths. One way the enforcement community has tried to combat this problem is by conducting sobriety checkpoints; however, there is evidence that many of the impaired drivers passing through these checkpoints are not detected by police. One component

of this study is the observation by researchers of customary police interviewing practices at sobriety checkpoints. Behaviors and cues of interviewed drivers will be linked to their breath alcohol levels to develop more effective screening procedures. Breath samples will be obtained only from drivers who volunteer to participate in this study. Current data on the best ways to improve driver interviews by police at checkpoints do not exist. NHTSA invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment the proposed data collection as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

**DATE:** Written comments must be submitted on or before April 21, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments to NHTSA, Docket Section, Room 5111, Docket #96-133, Notice 01, 400 7th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marvin M. Levy, Ph.D., Contracting Officer's Technical Representative, Office of Research and Traffic Records (NTS-31), Washington, DC 20590, Phone Number (202) 366-5597.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Abstract

Alcohol related traffic fatalities rose to 17,274 in 1995, 41 percent of all traffic fatalities for the year. NHTSA is committed to the development of effective programs to reduce the number of deaths and injuries related to alcohol-impaired driving. Among the law enforcement activities aimed at reducing drunk driving, sobriety checkpoints can act both as a specific deterrent, by apprehending impaired drivers passing through the checkpoint, and a general deterrent, by encouraging motorists not to drive after drinking. The success of sobriety checkpoints as a deterrent depends to a large extent on the perception of drivers that they will be caught if they have been drinking. However, past research suggests that many impaired drivers are not being detected by police at checkpoints. If drivers conclude that they may not be detected, then the effectiveness of this enforcement approach may decline. There is some evidence that police interview procedures can be improved, for impaired drivers who are stopped and still seated in their vehicle, when police use a procedure employing eye gaze nystagmus. Other cues or combination of cues may also result in improved detection rates.

The objective of this study is to develop and test an improved set of checkpoint interview procedures that

police may use to detect more effectively drivers who are at illegal blood alcohol concentrations [BACs].

##### II. Method of Data Collection

Data will be collected voluntarily at two separate sites in cooperating police jurisdictions during regularly scheduled checkpoint operations. To examine the effectiveness of cues and procedures that officers can use to detect drivers at illegal BACs, researchers will accompany officers while they are conducting routine driver interviews. Researchers will observe what the police do, by listening to the kinds of questions they ask and what motorists say in response to police inquiries, and how the drivers behave. Also, drivers will be observed for visual and other cues or signs indicative of alcohol consumption. For those drivers who have been permitted to proceed, a researcher, located downstream of the interviewing officer, will ask the driver to consent to blow into a device that measures the driver's breath alcohol. Each motorist will be assured of confidentiality. No identifiers, such as names, addresses, or license plate numbers, will be obtained regardless of whether or not the motorist agrees to cooperate. Also, no information about the results from breath alcohol testing will be provided to the police. No survey questions will be asked of drivers. The researchers will be using portable non-evidentiary quality "screening devices" to measure BAC. In the event that a driver who may be at an illegal BAC is identified, he or she will be informed of the BAC findings and provided with suggested remedies such as having a sober passenger drive, or taking a cab provided by the researchers.

##### III. Use of the Findings

The findings from researcher observations of checkpoint operations will help determine whether further development of an improved battery of police interview procedures is warranted. If the results are positive, a field test will be conducted as part of this study to determine whether the new procedures are an improvement over those customarily used by police to detect drivers at illegal BACs. Should the findings from the field test be successful, a police training package, containing the improved procedures, will be developed and disseminated to police agencies.

Improved interview procedures will help police officers at checkpoints make more accurate decisions regarding which drivers should or should not be detained for further sobriety testing.