issuing the final AC. The proposed AC and comments received may be inspected at the Standards Office (ACE—110), 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri, between the hours of 8:30 and 4 p.m. weekdays, except Federal holidays by making an appointment in advance with the person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

Background: In the early 1980s, a move to reduce the crew size of the new generation of commercial jet transport airplanes from three to two caused the FAA to develop additional criteria and guidance for minimum crew determination for part 25 airplanes. AC 25.1523 was developed to provide manufacturers and certification personnel a means of demonstrating compliance to 14 CFR, part 25, § 25.1523. Most part 23 airplanes are single pilot, none require a crew of three, and only a few require a crew of two; therefore, there was no desire to address crew complement in these airplanes and no parallel effort was initiated at that time for part 23 airplanes. For many years, part 23 airplane cockpits were relatively simple in design and utilized instruments and systems that were also quite similar in operation. This made it relatively easy for pilots to safely transition from one part 23 airplane to another. However, in recent years due to the growth of modern technology and the reduced cost of electronic components, novel and more complex integrated avionic systems are increasingly being installed in part 23 airplanes. These new systems have changed the appearance, operation, and usability of the pilotvehicle interface. There is also much variation between manufacturers in terms of the design and operational characteristics of these systems. Consequently, there is a concern that pilot(s) familiar and proficient with one system may not be able to sufficiently understand and operate another system. Although many of these systems can greatly improve pilot situational awareness and safety, poorly designed systems can increase pilot workload, and increase the potential for pilot error.

Additionally, the lack of standardization in the design and operation of these systems can negatively affect pilot training and impact performance and safety. Accordingly, there is a need to more closely examine pilot workload and error potential in these highly complex, integrated cockpits.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri on June 16, 2004.

# William J. Timberlake,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Office.

[FR Doc. 04–15038 Filed 7–1–04; 8:45 am]

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Federal Aviation Administration**

Acceptance of Noise Exposure Maps for Santa Barbara Airport, Santa Barbara, CA

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its determination that the noise exposure maps submitted by City of Santa Barbara, California for Santa Barbara Airport under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 47501 *et. seq.* (Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act) and 14 CFR part 150 are in compliance with applicable requirements.

**DATES:** *Effective:* The effective date of the FAA's determination on the noise exposure maps is June 28, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jennifer Mendelsohn, Environmental Protection Specialist, AWP–621.6, Southern California Standards Section, Federal Aviation Administration, Western-Pacific Region, P.O. Box 92007, Los Angeles, California 90009–2007, Telephone: 310/725–3637.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This** notice announces that the FAA finds that the noise exposure maps submitted for Santa Barbara Airport are in compliance with applicable requirements of Part 150, effective June 28, 2004. Under 49 U.S.C. 47503 of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), an airport operator may submit to the FAA noise exposure maps which meet applicable regulations and which depict non-compatible land uses as of the date of submission of such maps, a description of projected aircraft operations, and the ways in which such operations will affect such maps. The Act requires such maps to be developed in consultation with interested and affected parties in the local community, government agencies, and persons using the airport. An airport operator who has submitted noise exposure maps that are found by FAA to be in compliance with the requirements of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150, promulgated pursuant to the Act, may

submit a noise compatibility program for FAA approval which sets forth the measures the operator has taken or proposes to take to reduce existing noncompatible uses and prevent the introduction of additional noncompatible uses.

The FAA has completed its review of the noise exposure maps and accompanying documentation submitted by City of Santa Barbara, California. The documentation that constitutes the "Noise Exposure Maps" as defined in section 150.7 of Part 150 includes: Exhibit 3M "2003 Noise Exposure Map," and Exhibit 3P "2008 Noise Exposure Map." The Noise Exposure Maps contain current and forecast information including the depiction of the airport and its boundaries, the runway configurations, land uses such as residential, open space, commercial/office, community facilities, libraries, churches, open space, infrastructure, vacant and warehouse and those areas within the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) 60, 65, 70 and 75 noise contours. Estimates for the number of people within these contours for the year 2003 are shown in Table 4D. Estimates of the future residential population within the 2008 noise contours are shown in Table 4G. Exhibit 3A displays the location of noise monitoring sites. Flight tracks for the existing and the five-year forecast Noise Exposure Maps are found in Exhibits 3E, 3F, 3G, 3H, 3J, and 3K. The type and frequency of aircraft operations (including nighttime operations) are found in Tables 3D and 3E. The FAA has determined that these noise exposure maps and accompanying documentation are in compliance with applicable requirements. This determination is effective on June 28, 2004.

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 47503 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 47506 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 detailed overlaying of noise exposure contours onto the map depicting properties on the surface rests exclusively with the airport operator that submitted those maps, or with those public agencies and planning agencies with which consultation is required under section 47503 of the Act. The FAA has relied on the certification by the airport operator, under section 150.21 of FAR Part 150, that the statutorily required consultation has been accomplished.

Copies of the full noise exposure map documentation and of the FAA's evaluation of the maps are available for examination at the following locations: Federal Aviation Administration, Community and Environmental Needs Division, APP-600, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591. Federal Aviation Administration, Western-Pacific Region, Airports Division, Room 3012, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Hawthorne, California 90261. Karen Ramsdell, Airport Director, Santa Barbara Airport, 601 Firestone Road, Goleta, California 93117.

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

Issued in Hawthorne, California, on June 28, 2004.

# Mark A. McClardy,

Manager, Airports Division, AWP–600, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 04–15044 Filed 7–1–04; 8:45 am]

### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

# **Federal Aviation Administration**

Revision to the Date and Location of the Scoping Meetings for the Notice of Intent To Prepare a Joint Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report for Ontario International Airport, Ontario,

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Revision to Notice to hold one (1) public scoping meeting and one (1)

governmental and public agency scoping meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is issuing this revised notice to advise the public of a change in the date and location of governmental and public scoping meetings. A joint Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report will be prepared for development recommended by the Master Plan for Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California. To ensure that all significant issues related to the proposed action are identified, one (1) public scoping meeting and one (1) governmental and public agency scoping meeting will be held.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jennifer Mendelsohn, Environmental Protection Specialist, AWP–621.6, Southern California Standards Section, Federal Aviation Administration, Western-Pacific Region, P.O. Box 92007, Los Angeles, California 90009–2007, Telephone: 310/725–3637. Comments on the scope of the EIS/EIR should be submitted to the address above and must be received no later than 5 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time, on Monday, September 13, 2004.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) published this Notice of Intent on June 9, 2004. This revised notice is to advise the public of a change in the date and location of the governmental and public scoping meetings. The FAA in cooperation with the city of Los Angeles, California, will prepare a joint Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report for future development recommended by the Master Plan for Ontario International Airport (ONT). The need to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is based on the procedures described in FAA Order 5050.4A, Airport Environmental Handbook.

ONT is a commercial service airport located within a standard metropolitan statistical area and the proposed airside development includes relocation of the runways, separation of the runways, extension of a runway and construction and/or relocation of taxiway(s). The proposed landside improvements include additional terminals, additional gates, construction and/or expansion of parking lots, construction and/or expansion of access roads, construction, expansion and/or relocation of the existing surface transportation center, construction, expansion and/or relocation of the general aviation facilities, construction, expansion and/ or relocation of airport maintenance area, construction, expansion and/or

relocation of an airport administration facility, construction, expansion and/or relocation of aircraft safety facility (aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) facility). The proposed project also may include an airport people mover (APM). The area around the airport contains non-compatible land uses in terms of aircraft noise; and the proposed development is likely to be controversial.

Significant growth in the demand for air travel through 2030 is expected in the ONT service area. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) predicts a doubling of regional passenger demand by 2030 and predicts that air cargo demand will more than triple. The RTP proposes to accommodate this growth at outlying airports rather than expansion of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). The proposed LAX Master Plan supports this concept and plans to modernize facilities but to maintain the airport capacity at about 78 Million Annual Passengers (MAP). Other airports in the region also are constrained from growth, generally by either the limitations of their facilities or by court settlements that restrict growth to control environmental impacts to surrounding residents. The RTP relies on the Ontario International Airport to accommodate a larger share of the total regional passenger and air cargo demand in the future than it currently accommodates (6 to 6.5 million passengers used ONT in 2003) to serve this growing regional demand. The ONT Master Plan development alternatives, therefore, propose airport improvements that can accommodate passenger growth to 30 Million Annual Passengers or the estimated capacity of the two existing dependent runways.

The city of Los Angeles, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) also will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed development. In an effort to eliminate unnecessary duplication and reduce delay, the document to be prepared, will be a joint EIS/EIR in accordance with the President's Council on Environmental Quality Regulations described in 40 Code of Federal Regulations sections 1500.5 and 1506.2.

The Joint Lead Agencies for the preparation of the EIS/EIR will be the Federal Aviation Administration and the city of Los Angeles, California.

The following master planning development alternatives and the No Action/No Project Alternative are proposed to be evaluated in the EIS/EIR as described below: