

*Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use at a \$4.50 PFC Level:*

Terminal roadway expansion and improvement.  
Terminal pedestrian access expansion and improvement.  
15R parallel taxiway and airfield ramp construction.  
Common use terminal equipment for International terminal fit out.  
Surface movement guidance control system.

*Decision Date:* September 17, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Eleanor Schifflin, Eastern Region Airports Division, (718) 553-3354.

*Public Agency:* County of Routt, Hayden, Colorado.

*Application Number:* 02-05-C-00-HDN.

*Application Type:* Impose and use a PFC.

*PFC Level:* \$4.50.

*Total PFC Revenue Approved in This Decision:* \$1,052,470.

*Earliest Charge Effective Date:*

December 1, 2002.

*Estimated Charge Expiration Date:*

August 1, 2005.

*Classes of Air Carriers Not Required To Collect PFC's:* None.

*Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use:*

Construction of taxiway B.  
Runway 10/28 rehabilitation.  
Americans with Disabilities Act improvements.

Security upgrades.

Land acquisition.

Snow removal equipment.

*Decision Date:* September 20, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Christopher Schaffer, Denver Airports District Office, (303) 342-1258.

*Public Agency:* City of Pensacola, Florida.

*Application Number:* 02-05-C-00-PNS.

*Application Type:* Impose and use a PFC.

*PFC Level:* \$4.50.

*Total PFC Revenue Approved in This Decision:* \$350,000.

*Earliest Charge Effective Date:*

September 1, 2007.

*Estimated Charge Expiration Date:*

December 1, 2007.

*Classes of Air Carriers Not Required To Collect PFC's:* Part 135 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 approved class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at Pensacola Regional Airport.

*Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use:* Heightened security costs.

*Decision Date:* September 25, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bill Farris, Orlando Airports District Office, (407) 812-6331, extension 25.

AMENDMENTS TO PFC APPROVALS

Amendment No., city, state	Amendment approved date	Original approved net PFC revenue	Amended approved net PFC revenue	Original estimated charge exp. date	Amended estimated charge exp. date
01-04-C-01-RNO, Reno, NV. ....	08/14/02	\$16,136,446	\$6,764,830	02/01/03	06/01/02
01-12-C-03-ORD, Chicago, IL. ....	08/16/02	1,315,327,790	1,340,327,790	10/01/16	12/01/16
00-02-C-01-GRI, Grand Island, NE. ....	08/23/02	578,060	545,219	04/01/08	11/01/13
98-02-C-03-FLL, Fort Lauderdale, FL. ....	09/24/02	183,627,920	181,471,378	01/01/07	09/01/05
01-03-C-01-FLL, Fort Lauderdale, FL. ....	09/24/02	27,841,586	26,202,553	05/01/08	08/01/06
01-04-C-01-FLL, Fort Lauderdale, FL. ....	09/24/02	30,702,199	44,333,391	08/01/09	03/01/08
00-03-C-01-MDT, Harrisburg, PA. ....	09/26/02	3,715,249	4,206,613	12/01/02	01/01/03
*98-04-C-03-SEA, Seattle, WA. ....	09/27/02	803,385,000	803,385,000	01/01/23	06/01/14
01-05-U-01-SEA, Seattle, WA. ....	09/27/02	NA	NA	01/01/23	06/01/14
01-06-U-01-SEA, Seattle, WA. ....	09/27/02	NA	NA	01/01/23	06/01/14

NOTE: The amendment denoted by an asterisk (\*) include a change to the PFC level charged from \$3.00 per enplaned passenger to \$4.50 per enplaned passenger. For Seattle, WA, this change is effective on January 1, 2003.

Issued in Washington, DC on November 5, 2002.

**Barry Molar,**

*Manager, Airports Financial Assistance Division.*

[FR Doc. 02-28825 Filed 11-12-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

**Reports, Forms and Recordkeeping Requirements; Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review**

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), this notice

announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collections and their expected burden. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period was published on August 9, 2002 [67 FR 51924-51925].

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before December 13, 2002.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mrs. Marcia Tabet at NHTSA, Evaluation Division (NPO-321) of the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Budget, 202-366-2570, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Room 5208, Washington, DC 20590.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

*Title:* Heavy Vehicle Antilock Brake System (ABS) and Underride Guard Fleet Maintenance Study.

*OMB Number:* 2127-NEW.

*Type of Request:* New information collection.

*Abstract:* As required by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 and Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735), NHTSA reviews existing regulations to determine if they are achieving policy goals. Safety Standard 105 (49 CFR 571.105) requires Antilock Brake Systems (ABS) on hydraulic-braked vehicles with a Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR) greater than 10,000 pounds built on or after March 1, 1999. Safety Standard 121 (49 CFR 571.121) requires ABS on air-braked truck-tractors built on or after March 1, 1997 and on air-braked trailers and single-unit trucks manufactured on or after March 1, 1998. Safety Standard 223 (49 CFR 571.223) requires all trailers and semi-trailers built on or after January 24, 1998 with a Gross Vehicle Weight Rating of 10,000 pounds to have an underride guard. NHTSA's Office of

Evaluation and Regulatory Analysis is planning a data collection effort that will provide adequate information to perform an evaluation on the effect of ABS and underride guards on the maintenance of heavy vehicles in trucking fleets. This study will determine fleet maintenance policies and procedures related to ABS and underride guards, examine factors that motivate fleets to maintain antilock brakes and underride guards, and document fleet experience in maintaining ABS and underride guards since the implementation of the new safety standards.

*Affected Public:* Private trucking fleets nationwide.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* 420 hours.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments, within 30 days, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725-17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20503, Attention NHTSA Desk Officer.

*Comments are invited on:* Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. A Comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 11, 2002.

**James F. Simons,**

*Acting Associate Administrator for Planning, Evaluation, and Budget.*

[FR Doc. 02-28834 Filed 11-12-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2002-11846; Notice 2]

#### Decision That Nonconforming 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (R230 Body) Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of decision by NHTSA that nonconforming 2001-2002

Mercedes Benz SL (R230 Body) passenger cars are eligible for importation.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the decision by NHTSA that 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (R230 Body) passenger cars not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because they have safety features that comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

**DATE:** This decision is effective as of the date of its publication in the **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Luke Loy, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-5308).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards ("FMVSS") shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable FMVSS.

Where there is no substantially similar U.S.-certified motor vehicle, 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) permits a nonconforming motor vehicle to be admitted into the United States if its safety features comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable FMVSS based on destructive test data or such other evidence as NHTSA decides to be adequate.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

J.K. Technologies, LLC, of Baltimore, MD, ("J.K.") (Registered Importer 90-006) petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (R230 Body) passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. NHTSA published notice of the petition on May 1, 2002 (67 FR 21797), to afford an opportunity for public comment. The reader is referred to that notice for a thorough description of the petition.

One comment was received in response to the notice of the petition, from U.S. Conformance of Jupiter, Florida, another registered importer (Registered Importer 00-214). This comment addressed issues that U.S. Conformance believed J.K. overlooked in describing alterations necessary to conform non-U.S. certified 2001-2002 Mercedes Benz SL (R230 Body) passenger cars to Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard Nos. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment* and 301 *Fuel System Integrity*, and with the Federal Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR part 581. The agency accorded J.K. an opportunity to respond to the issues raised in this comment. The statements in the petition regarding these standards, U.S. Conformance's comments, and J.K.'s responses are set forth below.

##### Standard No. 108

The petition stated that the vehicles are capable of being readily altered to meet this standard by: (a) Installation of U.S.-model headlamps and front sidemarker lamps, and (b) installation of U.S.-model taillamp assemblies that incorporate rear sidemarker lamps.

U.S. Conformance stated that it determined, upon physical inspection of one of the vehicles in question, that the rear taillamp assemblies are capable of being modified to meet the standard. The comment noted that the required reflective materials for red side marker lamps are in all taillamp assemblies manufactured for these vehicles. The comment further noted that one additional light source can be added to the appropriate spot in each taillamp assembly to bring the assembly into compliance with the standard, eliminating the need for replacement of the assembly.

In its response, J.K. stood by the statement in its petition. J.K. stated that it had no idea whether the modifications proposed by U.S. Conformance would in fact conform the vehicles to the standard. J.K. noted, however, that those modifications would activate several warning systems if the wiring is not correct.