has been implemented. The public agency did not submit any information showing the project has been implemented.

Decision Date: April 30, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David P. Gabbert, Helena Airports District Office, (406) 449–5271.

Public Agency: Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport Authority, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Application Number: 99–12–C–00–CHO

*Application Type:* Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total PFC Revenue Approved ion This Decision: \$160,000.

Earliest Charge Effective Date: December 1, 2004.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: April 1, 2005.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required To Collect PFC's: Air taxi/commercial operators filing FAA Form 1800–31.

Determination: Approved. Based on information contained in the public

agency's application, the FAA has determined that the proposed class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Collection and Use: Terminal building rehabilitation

Decision Date: April 30, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Art Winder, Washington Airports District Office, (703) 661–1363.

## AMENDMENTS TO PFC APPROVALS

Amendment No. city, state	Amendment approved date	Original ap- proved net PFC revenue	Amended ap- proved net PFC revenue	Original esti- mated charge exp. date	Amended esti- mated charge exp. date
96-01-C-02-MDT, Middletown, PA	03/26/99 04/05/99 04/07/99 04/12/99 04/14/99 04/14/99 04/14/99	\$4,700,000 211,299 4,397,107 1,657,146 133,574 65,350 28,157 8,999,000	\$4,765,166 218,988 11,285,444 1,724,197 124,127 56,752 28,953 10,348,850	06/01/99 09/01/01 06/01/03 06/01/99 09/01/02 09/01/02 09/01/02 07/01/99	07/01/99 12/01/01 12/01/27 09/01/99 09/01/02 09/01/02 09/01/02 10/01/99
94–03–C-01–OAK, Oakland, CA 95–04–U-01–OAK, Oakland, CA 96–06–C-01–OAK, Oakland, CA	04/15/99 04/15/99 04/15/99	15,827,091 8,671,000 4,063,541	17,127,741 9,971,650 4,673,072	07/01/99 07/01/99 07/01/99	10/01/99 10/01/99 10/01/99

Issued in Washington, DC on May 18, 1999.

# Eric Gabler,

Manager, Passenger Facility Charge Branch. [FR Doc. 99–13436 Filed 5–26–99; 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 Houghton County Memorial Airport, Hancock, MI

**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 Houghton County Memorial 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 June 28, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road Belleville, MI 48111.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Ms. Sandra D. LaMothe, Airport Manager of the Houghton County Airport Committee at the following address: Route 1, Box 94, Calumet, MI 49913.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jon Gilbert, Program Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111 (734–487–7281). 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 Houghton County Memorial 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 May 4, 1999, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Houghton County Airport Committee 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 August 10, 1999.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

*PFC Application No.:* 99–07–C–00–CMX.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00. Proposed charge effective date: July 1, 1999.

Proposed charge expiration date; May 1, 2001.

Total estimated PFC revenue: \$113,389.00.

Brief description of proposed projects: PFC audit reimbursement; PFC preparation reimbursement; sanitary sewer upgrade gravity sewer, Phase II; sanitary sewer upgrade forcemain, Phase III; mobile manual wheelchair lift; Cost Benefit Analysis Runway 13/31; construct and light Taxiway "C" to Runway "13". Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFC's: None.

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 Houghton County Airport Committee.

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois, on May 19, 1999.

#### Philip Smithmeyer,

Acting Manager, Planning/Programming Branch, Airports Division, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 99–13437 Filed 5–26–99; 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 Rochester International Airport, Rochester, MN

**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 Rochester 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). DATES: Comments must be received on or before June 28, 1999.

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 Steven W. Leqve, Airport Manager of the City of Rochester, Rochester, MN at the following address: Helgerson Drive Southwest, Rochester, MN 55902.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the City of Rochester under section 158.23 of Part

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sandra E. DePottey, Program Manager Airports District Office, 6020 28th Avenue South, Room 102, Minneapolis, MN 55450, 612–713–4350. 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 Rochester 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 April 30, 1999 the FAA determined that the application to use the revenue from a PFC submitted by City of Rochester 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 30, 1999.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

*PFC Application No.:* 99–03–U–00– RST

Level of the PFC: \$3.00.

Actual charge effective date: May 1, 1996.

Estimated charge expiration date: April 1, 1999.

Total approved net PFC revenue: \$1,160,582.00.

*Brief description of proposed project:* Acquire land for extension of runway 2/20.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Non-scheduled Part 135 air taxis/commercial operators.

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 City of Rochester.

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on May 10, 1999.

# Philip Smithmeyer,

Acting Manager, Planning/Programming Branch, Airports Division, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 99–13438 Filed 5–26–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

## **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-98-4008; Notice 2]

Grant of Application for A Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance With Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 108—Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment

General Motors Corporation (GM) determined that certain 1998 GMC Sonoma pickup trucks, GMC Jimmy and Oldsmobile Bravada sport utility vehicles are equipped with daytime running lights (DRLs) that fail to meet the spacing requirements of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108-Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment. Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120, GM applied to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) for a decision that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. GM submitted a 49 CFR Part 573 noncompliance notification to the agency in accordance with 49 CFR 556.4(b)(6).

A notice of receipt of application was published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 40781) on July 20, 1998. Opportunity was afforded for comments until September 21, 1998. One comment was received, from JCW Consulting (JCW). The comment opposed granting the petition.

GM stated that DRLs on the subject vehicles utilize the upper beam headlamps operating at reduced intensity, with a maximum intensity of approximately 6,700 candela per lamp. FMVSS No. 108 requires these DRLs to be located so that the distance from their lighted edge to the optical center of the nearest turn signal lamp is not less than 100 mm, with four exceptions that do not apply to these GM vehicles. However, one of the exceptions permitted vehicles manufactured before October 1, 1995 that used an upper beam headlamp as a DRL to have a spacing of less than 100 mm from the turn signal lamp if the turn signal were sufficiently bright that it could have been spaced less than 100 mm from a lower beam headlamp.

GM stated that 122,455 vehicles involved provide less than 100 mm clearance between the DRL and the turn signal and that as a result, they fail to meet FMVSS No. 108 requirements. GM believes that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for the following reasons:

1. The subject vehicles meet the requirements of CMVSS No. 108 (the