

Denver, CO 80249-6361. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application (04-03-C-00-FNL) to impose and use a PFC at the Fort Collins-Loveland Municipal Airport, under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On March 3, 2004, the FAA determined that the application to impose a PFC submitted by the City of Fort Collins and the City of Loveland, Colorado, was substantially complete within the requirements of section 158.25 of Part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than June 1, 2004.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

*Level of the proposed PFC:* \$4.50.

*Proposed charge-effective date:* July 1, 2004.

*Proposed charge expiration date:* September 1, 2005.

*Total requested for use approval:* \$75,778.

*Brief description of proposed projects:* South ramp rehabilitations; Snow Removal equipment building design; Master plan.

Class or classes of air carriers that the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFC's: None.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA Regional Airports Office located at: Federal Aviation Administration, Northwest Mountain Region, Airports Division, ANM-600, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Suite 315, Renton, WA 98055-4056.

In addition, in person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice, and other documents germane to the application in person at the Fort Collins-Loveland Municipal Airport.

Issued in Renton, Washington on March 3, 2004.

**David A. Field,**

*Manager, Planning, Programming and Capacity Branch, Northwest Mountain Region.*

[FR Doc. 04-5351 Filed 3-9-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### **Notice of Intent to Rule on Application 04-09-C-00-MFR to Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, Submitted by Jackson County, Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, Medford, OR**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to rule on application.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use PFC revenue at Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before April 9, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Mr. J. Wade Bryant, Manager; Seattle Airports District Office, SEA-ADO; Federal Aviation Administration; 1601 Lind Avenue SW, Suite 250, Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Bern E. Case, Airport Director, at the following address: 3650 Biddle Road, Medford, OR 97504.

Air Carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, under § 158.23 of part 158.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Suzanne Lee-Pang, (425) 227-2654, Seattle Airports District Office, SEA-ADO; Federal Aviation Administration; 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Suite 250, Renton, Washington 98055-4056. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application 04-09-C-00-MFR to impose and use PFC revenue at Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On March 3, 2004, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Jackson County, Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport, Medford, Oregon, was substantially

complete within the requirements of § 158.25 of part 158. The FAA will approve or disapprove the application, in whole or in part, no later than June 4, 2004.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

*Level of the proposed PFC:* \$450.

*Proposed charge effective date:* September 1, 2004.

*Proposed charge expiration date:* August 1, 2005.

*Total requested for use approval:* \$27,542,553.

*Brief description of proposed projects:* Terminal Building and Area; Taxiway B, B2 and B3 Rehabilitation.

*Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFC's:* Operations by Air Taxi/Commercial Operators when enplaning revenue passengers in limited, irregular, special service air taxi/commercial operations such as air ambulance services, student instruction, non-stop sightseeing flights that begin and end at the airport and are concluded within a 25 mile radius of the airport.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** and at the FAA Regional Airports Office located at: Federal Aviation Administration, Northwest Mountain Region, Airports Division, ANM-600, 1601 Lind Avenue SW., Suite 315, Renton, WA 98055-4056.

In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport.

Issued in Renton, Washington on March 3, 2004.

**David A. Field,**

*Manager, Planning, Programming and Capacity Branch, Northwest Mountain Region.*

[FR Doc. 04-5350 Filed 3-9-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 02-13571]

#### **Motor Vehicle Safety: Reimbursement Prior to Recall**

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

**ACTION:** Request for public comment on a revision to an approved collection of information.

**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 October 16, 2002 (67 FR 63960).

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before April 9, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

George Person at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Office of Defects Investigation, NVS-215, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Room 6240, Washington, DC 20590, phone 202-366-5210.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Defect and Noncompliance Notification.

*OMB Number:* 2127-0004.

*Type of Request:* Revision of currently approved collection.

*Abstract:* On October 17, 2002, NHTSA published a Final Rule (67 FR 64049) implementing section 6(b) of the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability, and Documentation (TREAD) Act. Under this rule, motor vehicle and motor vehicle equipment manufacturers are required to include, in their programs to remedy a safety-related defect or a noncompliance with a Federal motor vehicle safety standard (safety recall), a plan for reimbursing owners for the cost of a remedy incurred within a reasonable time before the manufacturer's notification of the defect or noncompliance, and to notify owners affected by the safety recall of their eligibility for reimbursement. The rule allows manufacturers to submit general reimbursement plans that may be incorporated into defect and noncompliance information reports submitted to NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR part 573 (part 573 reports) by reference rather than providing detailed plans to NHTSA for each safety recall. Specific information regarding a particular safety recall, such as the beginning and ending dates for the reimbursement period, must be submitted for each safety recall as part of the manufacturer's part 573 report. This revision adds the burden of providing this information to the currently approved burden of 15,844 hours for providing all other information about the defect or noncompliance required by 49 CFR part 573.

*Affected Public:* All manufacturers of motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment that conduct safety recall campaigns would be required to comply with the reporting requirements. Based on recent history, we estimate that fewer than 500 safety recall campaigns will be conducted annually by no more than 170 different manufacturers.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden:* In order to provide the required information, manufacturers that conduct recalls must prepare a reimbursement plan and submit it to NHTSA. Ordinarily, we expect that this will consist of a general plan and supplemental information specific to each recall. We estimate that preparing the general plan would require 8 hours. Further, we estimate that no more than one hour would be required to include the additional information about a particular recall into individual Part 573 Reports. Since there are estimated to be 170 manufacturers that will submit 573 Reports annually and since there are estimated to be 500 recalls annually, the annual burden hours required to submit the plan would be 1,860 hours ((8x170)+(1x500)). Also, there will be additional burden associated with the third party information included in the notification letter sent to owners, since a sentence or two advising the owners of the possibility that they may be eligible for reimbursement must be added to the notification letter. We estimate that less than one hour per recall will be necessary or 500 hours (500x1) to provide this information annually. The total additional annual burden hours for this revision to the information collection is therefore 2,360 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, DC 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 March 4, 2004.

**Kenneth N. Weinstein,**

*Associate Administrator for Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 04-5352 Filed 3-9-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Research and Special Programs Administration**

[Docket No. RSPA-03-15733; Notice 2]

**Pipeline Safety: Grant of Waiver; Portland Natural Gas Transmission System**

**AGENCY:** Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA); U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice; grant of waiver.

**SUMMARY:** PNGTS Operating Co., LLC, operator of the Portland Natural Gas Transmission System (PNGTS), requested a waiver of compliance with the regulatory requirements at 49 CFR 192.611 that require natural gas pipeline operators to confirm or revise the maximum allowable operating pressure of their natural gas pipelines after changes occur in Class location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

PNGTS Operating Co., LLC, operator of the Portland Natural Gas Transmission System, submitted a request to RSPA's Office of Pipeline Safety (RSPA/OPS) seeking a waiver of compliance with the regulatory requirements at 49 CFR 192.611 to confirm or revise the maximum allowable operating pressure of its natural gas pipeline after Class location changes occurred in areas associated with two sections of the pipeline totaling 595 feet in length in West Stewartstown, New Hampshire. In lieu of complying with the § 192.611 requirements, PNGTS proposed to conduct certain alternative risk control activities on the pipeline that exceed the minimum requirements of Part 192. These activities included performing internal inspections at six-year intervals on the entire 24-inch mainline, annual close-interval cathodic protection surveys on the waiver segments, a direct current voltage gradient survey on the waiver segments, direct assessment and repair of any anomalies identified by the inspections and electrical surveys, and more frequent ground and aerial surveillance patrols and instrumented leak surveys on the pipeline.

PNGTS requested a waiver of compliance with the requirements at 49