

to withhold from public review your personal identifying information, FAA cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 16, 2026.

Stacey Molinich Zee,

Manager, Operations Support Branch.

[FR Doc. 2026–19178 Filed 9–17–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Docket No. FAA–2025–1218]

Notice of Availability of Revision E to FAA Order 8000.95, Regarding Individual Designee Management Policy

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: Revision E to FAA Order 8000.95, Individual Designee Management Policy, incorporates new FAA policy to address transition from the Designee Registration System to the Designee Management System (DMS) and aligns the Order with the DMS tool workflows. The revision updates several procedural descriptions to better match DMS workflows, including updates to automation for registering, enrolling, tracking, and recording designee training completions. The revision also changes the algorithm for the frequency of direct observation oversight intervals required of Flight Standards Service (FS) managing specialists, and updates email addresses and website links.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Scott Geddie, Policy and Oversight Integration Section, AVS–64, AVS ODA Office, Federal Aviation Administration, by telephone at 405–954–6897 or by email at Scott.Geddie@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

A proposed version of FAA Order 8000.95D, Change 1 published in the **Federal Register** and was available for public comment from November 24, 2025 through January 23, 2026 (90 FR 53045, November 24, 2025). The FAA received 234 public comments. The comments were from various stakeholders, including educational institutions, industry associations, air carriers and commercial operators, and individuals. Organizations submitting comments included Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Angel City Flyers/Aero City Flyers, Aviation Services LLC,

Aviation Suppliers Association, Beech Training, Chickasha Wings Inc., Experimental Aircraft Association, Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation, Magnolia Aviation, Minnesota Pilots Association, National Association of Flight Instructors, National Flight Training Alliance, Palouse Pilot Training LLC, Society of Aviation & Flight Educators Inc., SoCo Flight Ops, T/Two Inc., Texas Turbine Conversions Inc., The Boeing Company, Three Rivers Aero, United Airlines, Utah State University, and Vapor Global Aviation LLC. Though FAA submitted a proposed version of FAA Order 8000.95D, Change 1, for public comment, the agency subsequently determined that the number and scope of changes required a comprehensive revision of the Order.

The proposed changes to FAA Order 8000.95D attracted a significant number of public comments. The comments addressed multiple key topics, including requirements for designee qualifications, examiner fee policies, oversight procedures, and the operational realities of flight training and certification. FAA has considered each comment and provides the following summary and responses in accordance with the rulemaking process.

Supportive Comments. While most comments included suggestions or critiques, stakeholders such as Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association and National Association of Flight Instructors expressed support for the FAA's general intent to update, clarify, and improve designee management policy, even as they recommended focused revisions or voiced concerns regarding specific proposed changes.

Five-Hour Pilot-in-Command (PIC) Make and Model Requirement for Designated Pilot Examiners (DPE). Multiple commenters, including flight instructor and examiner associations, flight schools, and individual DPEs, expressed concern regarding the proposed requirement that DPEs log at least five hours of PIC flight time in each make and model prior to administering practical tests in Airplane Single Engine Land (ASEL) or Airplane Single Engine Sea (ASES). Examiner associations that commented include Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Experimental Aircraft Association, Minnesota Pilots Association, National Association of Flight Instructors, National Flight Training Alliance, Utah State University. Flight schools that commented include Angel City Flyers/Aero City Flyers, Beech Training, Chickasha Wings Inc, Magnolia Aviation, Palouse Pilot Training, LLC, SoCo Flight Ops, Three Rivers Aero, and

Vapor Global Aviation. Commenters stated the requirement is operationally burdensome, would further constrain examiner availability, and exacerbate checkride delays, particularly for experimental and less common aircraft types. Some commenters pointed out existing regulatory framework already ensures examiner proficiency through category and class experience requirements, recent flight experience, and FAA oversight. Commenters reasoned that no safety data was presented to justify the necessity of a five-hour make and model requirement, and such a threshold is not a standard measure of proficiency elsewhere in FAA policy.

FAA partially accepted these recommendations. The final language has been revised as follows: prior to administering a practical test in a single-engine airplane that is turbine-powered or having Simplified Flight Controls, the designee must have logged at least five hours of PIC flight time in that single-engine make and model. This make-and-model requirement thus applies only to these higher-complexity aircraft. Broader make-and-model requirements for all single-engine airplanes were not adopted.

Fee Collection and “Reasonable Fee” Definition. Stakeholders, including Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association and National Association of Flight Instructors, commented on proposed fee collection provisions, expressing concern over the prohibition on collecting any fee prior to determination of applicant eligibility, which could leave examiners uncompensated for preparation or travel should the applicant be found ineligible. In addition, they commented that the lack of a clear definition for “reasonable fee,” could lead to inconsistent application, complaints, and possible examiner termination for subjective determinations of unreasonableness.

FAA partially accepted these concerns. The restriction on collecting fees prior to eligibility determination is removed from FAA Order 8000.95E.¹ The policy regarding fee collection is addressed in FAA Order 8900.1, Flight Standards Information Management System, Volume 5, Chapter 2, Section 1, paragraph 5–222, which remains in effect. Regarding the definition of “reasonable fee,” FAA has determined that providing a specific definition is outside the scope of this policy revision.

¹ The original language regarding fee collection can be found in draft FAA Order 8000.95D, Change 1, Volume 3, Chapter 5, paragraph f.(8).

FAA acknowledges this as an area for future consideration and discussion.

Limitation on Initial Certified Flight Instructor (CFI) Practical Tests Per Day. Several commenters objected to limits restricting examiners to accepting only one initial CFI application per day, to include retests or continuations of previously discontinued or unsuccessful exams. Commenters contended retests and continuations often require less time and effort than standard initial CFI exams. Also, the commenters stated that the limitation would further reduce examiner availability and increase certification delays.

FAA accepts the recommendation to limit only complete initial CFI practical tests to one per day. FAA removed the restriction on conducting retests or continuations on the same day as a full exam.

Authority and Oversight of Ministerial Functions. Aviation Suppliers Association commented that FAA should streamline oversight by allowing automatic pre-approval for ministerial designee functions such as the issuance of FAA Form 8130-3, Authorized Release Certificate, Airworthiness Approval Tag. The commenter stated that these functions posed a lower risk and required less oversight.

FAA rejected this proposal. The policy intentionally provides Managing Specialists (MS) discretion to evaluate designees and individual situations based on risk. This risk-based approach supports safety and compliance, and remains unchanged.

Elimination of the Designee System. A single commenter advocated for the elimination of designated representatives for flight testing, arguing this function should be inherently governmental.

FAA rejected this proposal. Designated Engineering Representatives (DERs) and other designees are a critical component of the FAA's certification system, enabling efficiency and maintaining high safety standards. There are no plans to discontinue the use of DERs or other designees.

Editorial changes. The FAA evaluated and incorporated multiple suggestions where commenters requested editorial changes and corrections, such as typographical errors and inaccurate references to other paragraphs, regulations, and other FAA policy.

This Order is available to the public at http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/orders_notices, on the Dynamic

Regulatory System website at <https://drs.faa.gov>, and in the docket.

Scott A. Geddie,

Manager, AVS-64, Policy and Oversight Integration Section, AVS ODA Office.

[FR Doc. 2026-19106 Filed 9-17-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Notice of Final Federal Agency Actions on Proposed Highway in Georgia

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of limitation on claims for judicial review of actions by FHWA.

SUMMARY: This notice announces actions taken by FHWA that are final. The actions relate to a proposed highway project, Interstate 75 (I-75), from I-475 to State Route (SR) 155 in Butts, Henry, Lamar, Monroe, and Spalding Counties in Georgia, and includes auxiliary lanes from SR 155 up to the I-75/SR 20 interchange in Butts, Henry, Lamar, Monroe, and Spalding Counties, Georgia, for a total project length of approximately 41 miles. Those actions grant licenses, permits, and approvals for the project. The FHWA's Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) provides details on the Selected Alternative for the proposed improvements.

DATES: By this notice, FHWA is advising the public of the final agency actions subject to 23 U.S.C. 139(j)(1). A claim seeking judicial review of the Federal agency actions on the listed highway project will be barred unless the claim is filed on or before February 16, 2027. If the Federal law that authorizes judicial review of a claim provides a time period of less than 150 days for filing such claim, then that shorter time period still applies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For FHWA: Ms. Sabrina David, Division Administrator, FHWA, Georgia Division Office; 75 Ted Turner Drive, Suite 1000, Atlanta, Georgia 30303; (404) 562-3630; Sabrina.David@dot.gov. The FHWA Georgia Division's normal business hours are 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (eastern time) Monday through Friday. For the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT): Mr. Russell McMurry, Commissioner, GDOT; 600 West Peachtree Street, 22nd Floor, Atlanta, Georgia 30308; (404) 631-1990; RMcMurry@dot.ga.gov. The GDOT normal business hours are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (eastern time) Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that FHWA has taken final agency actions subject to 23 U.S.C. 139(j)(1) by issuing licenses, permits, and approvals for the following highway project in the State of Georgia: I-75 Commercial Vehicle Lanes Project, Project Identification Number 0014203. GDOT is proposing improvements to approximately 41 miles of I-75 between I-475 and SR 155 in Butts, Henry, Lamar, Monroe, and Spalding Counties, Georgia. The project will construct two barrier-separated northbound CVLs beginning at the I-75/I-475 interchange in Monroe County and extend northward on the east side of the I-75 northbound corridor for approximately 38 miles, which then transitions to a single auxiliary lane for an additional two miles up to the I-75/SR 155 interchange. A single auxiliary lane will also be added to the I-75 general purpose lanes to accommodate merging trucks beginning at SR 155 and extending up to the I-75/SR 20 interchange. The purpose of the proposed project is to improve travel time reliability, reduce the above average crash rate, and improve freight movement on the I-75 northbound corridor.

The FHWA's actions and the laws under which such actions were taken, are described in the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the project, approved on March 31, 2026, and the FONSI issued on September 15, 2026, and in other documents in the project file. The EA, FONSI, and other project records are available by contacting FHWA or GDOT at the addresses provided above. The EA and FONSI can be viewed and downloaded from the project website at: <https://0014203-gdot.hub.arcgis.com/>.

This notice applies to all Federal agency decisions that are final as of the issuance date of this notice and all laws under which such actions were taken, including but not limited to:

1. *General:* National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) [42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*]; Federal-Aid Highway Act (FAHA) [23 U.S.C. 109, 139, and 128].
2. *Air:* Clean Air Act (CAA) [42 U.S.C. 7401-7671(q)].
3. *Noise:* Noise Control Act of 1972 [42 U.S.C. 4901-4918]; 23 CFR part 772.
4. *Land:* Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. 303 and 23 U.S.C. 138].
5. *Wildlife:* Endangered Species Act (ESA) [16 U.S.C. 1531-1544 and Section 1536]; Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act [16 U.S.C. 661-667(d)]; Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) [16 U.S.C. 703-712].