

BEFORE THE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Application of
WESTERN PACIFIC AIRLINES, INC.
for an exemption from 14 C.F.R.
Part 93, Subparts K and S, pur-
suant to Section 206(c)(1) of
the Federal Aviation Administra-
tion Authorization Act of 1994.

Docket OST-95-277

Application of
RENO AIR, INC.
to amend exemption (Reno-
Chicago O'Hare Service)

Docket OST-97-2771

ANSWER OF
WESTERN PACIFIC AIRLINES, INC.

Communications with respect to
this document should be sent to:

John E. Gillick, Esq.
WINTHROP, STIMSON, PUTNAM
& ROBERTS
1133 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 775-9800

Counsel for Western Pacific
Airlines, Inc.

September 2, 1997

BEFORE THE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Application of :
: :
WESTERN PACIFIC AIRLINES, INC. :
: :
for an exemption from 14 C.F.R. : Docket OST-95-277
Part 93, Subparts K and S, pur- :
suant to Section 206(c)(1) of :
the Federal Aviation Administra- :
tion Authorization Act of 1994. :
:

Application of :
: :
RENO AIR, INC. : Docket OST-97-2771
: :
to amend exemption (Reno- :
Chicago O'Hare Service) :
:

ANSWER OF
WESTERN PACIFIC AIRLINES, INC.

On August 22, 1997, United Airlines, Inc. (United) filed a "Motion For Leave To File and Consolidated Response" to the applications of Western Pacific Airlines, Inc. (Western Pacific) and Reno Air, Inc. (Reno). Western Pacific hereby answers United's motion for leave to file insofar as it relates to Western Pacific, and urges, for the reasons set forth herein, that United's motion be denied.

On May 29, 1997, Western Pacific filed a Third Supplemental Response in support of its May 10, 1995, Petition for Reconsideration of Order 95-4-33. On June 9, 1997, United filed an answer

to Western Pacific's Third Supplemental Response, and Western Pacific filed a response to the United answer at that time addressing the issues which they have raised again in this consolidated response. Since United has already filed an answer in accordance with the Department's regulations and has not given any, much less a persuasive, reason why it should be permitted to file a second answer to Western Pacific's supplemental response, Western Pacific urges that the Department not permit United to file yet another answer to a pleading to which United has already responded.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Western Pacific Airlines Inc. respectfully requests that the Department deny United's Motion For Leave To File insofar as it relates to Western Pacific.

Respectfully submitted,



John E. Gillick

Counsel for Western Pacific
Airlines, Inc.

WINTHROP, STIMSON, PUTNAM &
ROBERTS
1133 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 775-9800

September 2, 1997