certificates, the criteria for cross-country flight would include landing at a point other than the point of departure and use of dead reckoning, pilotage, or navigation aids to navigate. No minimum distance would be specified. However, for persons applying for a private or commercial pilot certificate or for an instrument rating, the point of landing would be required to be more than 50 nautical miles from the point of departure. For a military pilot who holds or is qualified for a private or commercial pilot certificate under §61.73, cross-country time would be flight over a distance of more than 50 nautical miles. However, the FAA recognizes that military flight operations may require pilots to navigate and fly considerable distances without landing at a point other than the point of departure. Therefore, proposed §61.1a would not require that a landing occur at any point other than the departure point.

Proposed §61.51 would eliminate reference to "solo" time as a type of pilot experience or training equivalent to PIC time. The proposal would permit student pilot certificate holders to log PIC time when they: are the sole occupant of the aircraft; have a supervised PIC flight endorsement; and are undergoing a course of training for a pilot certificate or rating or are logging PIC time toward a certificate or rating. The description of solo flight time in current §61.51 would be eliminated under the proposal.

The proposal would specify that, except when a flight instructor gives flight training, only one person at a time may log PIC flight time. This provision is intended to eliminate current confusion, particularly regarding the current provision that permits any pilot to log PIC time when acting as PIC of an aircraft on which more than one pilot is required under the regulations under which the flight is conducted.

Instead, the proposal would state that the holder of a pilot certificate may log PIC time only when that pilot: (1) Has the final authority and responsibility for the operation and safety of the flight; (2) holds the appropriate ratings; (3) has been designated PIC before the flight; and (4) the PIC time occurred in actual flight conditions and in an aircraft.

Although the current regulation also specifies that a flight instructor may log as PIC time all flight time during which the person acts as a flight instructor, the proposed rule would provide more detail regarding the conditions under which this occurs. For example, the flight instructor would have to be authorized to conduct the training; hold at least a third-class medical certificate; and occupy a pilot station with functioning flight controls. To log PIC time the certificated pilot receiving flight training would have to be qualified to conduct the flight in accordance with the FAR; manipulate the controls of the aircraft; and be undergoing a course of training for the issuance of a certificate or rating or obtaining recency of experience requirements. In addition, the aircraft would have to have dual functioning flight controls and engine controls that could be reached from either pilot station.

The proposal would not significantly alter the current requirements regarding logging of instrument time. However, the proposal would state that if a safety pilot is required, the name and pilot certificate number of the safety pilot must be recorded and the location and kind of each completed instrument approach. The current rule does not require the safety pilot's certificate number.

The proposal would specify the information that should be recorded regarding flight training toward a certificate, rating, or flight review. This would include a description of the training given, the length of the lesson, the instructor's signature, certificate number, and certificate expiration date.

The proposal would modify the current provision of §61.51 that applies to the requirement for presentation of the person's logbook. The proposal would list the other records a person must present, in addition to the logbook, upon the request of an authorized official. The other documents include the pilot certificate, medical certificate, or any other record required under part 61. Both the current rule and proposed rule refer to officials representing the Administrator and the NTSB. However, the current rule also refers to a State or local law enforcement officer; the proposal would expand this to include any law enforcement officer.

18. Recency of Experience Requirements

The FAA proposes to modify a number of the recency of experience requirements in § 61.57.

The current requirement for three takeoffs and three landings within the preceding 90 days would be modified to allow night takeoffs and landings to also count for daytime currency. However, the takeoffs and landings would have to be to a complete stop, whether accomplished during day or night or in an airplane with tailwheel landing gear or tricycle landing gear. In retaining the current requirements, night operations will involve knowledge, skill, and ability that are sufficient for currency for daytime operations. However, safety will be better served if the regulation requires full-stop landings, at least for the purpose of meeting the requirements of proposed § 61.57, rather than encouraging "touch-and-go" operations. A landing is not completed until the airplane is stopped and off the runway. As an example, crosswinds may cause a wing to lift suddenly, or mistakes can be made during a hasty effort to "clean up" the airplane (i.e., retract flaps, turn off carburetor heat, etc.).

Additional language is proposed that would require each takeoff and landing to involve a flight in the traffic pattern at the recommended traffic pattern altitude for the airport. This language is intended for pilots of helicopters and powered-lift aircraft, which could takeoff and land in virtually one spot. However, the intent of the rule is that pilots perform a complete takeoff and landing operation, including operating in the airport traffic pattern.

19. Instrument Currency

In addition, the FAA proposes to revise the requirements for instrument currency. Currently, §61.57 sets the minimum requirements for recent instrument flight experience. For aircraft other than gliders, a pilot must have logged at least 6 hours of instrument time under actual or simulated IFR conditions, at least 3 of which were in flight in the category of aircraft involved, within the past 6 calendar months. The pilot must also have conducted at least six instrument approaches in that time. A pilot who does not meet the requirement of 6 hours and six approaches during the prescribed time or 6 months thereafter must pass an instrument proficiency test.

The revision in instrument currency requirements proposed here for aircraft other than gliders is based on a petition for rulemaking from Newton W. Miller, who advocates changing the requirements to emphasize instrument approaches and reduce the number of hours flown under simulated or actual instrument conditions to meet recency of experience requirements. The petition, summarized in the Federal Register on October 25, 1984 (49 FR 42943; Docket No. 24247), advocates decreasing the required flight hours to 2 or 3 hours (including at least 1 hour in the category of aircraft involved) and increasing the number of required approaches to 10 or 12. The petitioner argues that the 6 hours of simulated instrument flight may be flown largely in straight and level flight, which probably is relatively unchallenging to most instrument-rated pilots and does