FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jason Watt, Program manager, Detroit Airports District Office, 11677 South Wayne Road—Suite 107, Romulus, Michigan 48174, (734) 229–2906. 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 to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at MBS International Airport under the provisions of the 49 U.S.C. 40117 and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On August 26, 2003 the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by MBS International Airport Commission 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 November 25, 2003.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Proposed charge effective date: June 1, 2008.

Proposed charge expiration date: April 1, 2010.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $1,378,794.

Brief description of proposed projects: Furnish and install regional jet bridge; reimbursement of charges for PFC application preparation (PFC number 01–04–C–00–MBS); reimbursement of charges for audits performed on the PFC program at MBS International Airport; land acquisition (southwest approach, Law property); security fingerprint machine procurement (sponsor portion); airport rescue and fire fighting vehicle procurement; snow removal equipment procurement; runway friction braking vehicle procurement. Class or classes of air carriers, which the public agency has requested, not be required to collect PFCs: Part 135, air taxi/commercial operators filing FAA Form 1800–31.

Any person may inspect the application in person at the FAA office listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. In addition, any person may, upon request, inspect the application, notice and other documents germane to the application in person at the MBS International Airport Commission.

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois on September 4, 2003.

Barbara J. Jordan,

Acting Manager, Planning and Programming Branch, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 03–23872 Filed 9–17–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at Tulsa International Airport, Tulsa, OK

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 the revenue from a PFC at Tulsa International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 17, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate copies to the FAA at the following address: Mr. G. Thomas Wade, Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, Airports Division, Planning and Programming Branch, ASW–611, Fort Worth, Texas 76193–0610.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Brent A. Kitchen, Airport Director, Tulsa International Airport, at the following address: 7777 East Apache, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74115.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of the written comments previously provided to the Airport under § 158.23 of part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. G. Thomas Wade, Federal Aviation Administration, Southwest Region, Airports Division, Planning and Programming Branch, ASW–611, Fort Worth, Texas 76193–0610, (817) 222–5613.

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 to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Tulsa International Airport under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Public Law 101–508) and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On September 9, 2003, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the Airport 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 January 2, 2004.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: July 1, 2004.

Proposed charge expiration date: July 1, 2013.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $35,722,000.

PFC application number: 04–05–C–00–TUL.

Brief description of proposed project(s):

Projects To Impose and Use PFCs

1. Rehabilitate Terminal with Security Improvements
2. Acquire Snow Removal and ARFF Equipment
3. Rehabilitate Taxiways and Taxi Lanes
4. Extend Runway 8/26 and Associated Development
5. Replace Runway 18L/36R Lighting

Proposed class or classes of air carriers to be exempted from collecting PFCs: Air Taxi/Commercial Operators Filing FAA Form 1800–31.

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, Southwest Region, Airports Division, Planning and Programming Branch, ASW–610, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth, Texas 76137–4298.

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

Issued in Fort Worth, TX, on September 9, 2003.

Naomi L. Saunders,

Manager, Airports Division.

[FR Doc. 03–23770 Filed 9–17–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Docket No. FAA–2003–16171]

Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF) Mobile Live Fire Training Simulators

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of proposed policy; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FAA issues regulations and prescribes standards for the training of aircraft rescue and fire fighters (ARFF) on United States airports certificated under 14 Code of Federal Regulations part 139. One of the requirements of part 139 is for all ARFF personnel to participate in at least one live-fire drill every 12 months. As guidance for airport operators in providing this training, the FAA issued standards for different size fire training facilities based on the largest air carrier aircraft serving the airport. With the introduction of new technologies, ARFF personnel have the option to train on both mobile as well as fixed training facilities. At the larger airports, known as Index C, Index D, and Index E, FAA has found that the live fire drill requirement in part 139 can be satisfied by training on mobile facilities as often as every other year. Otherwise, the training for those size airports is conducted on the larger fixed facilities. We have been asked by the larger airports to find that training on the smaller mobile fire fighter trainers every year, rather than just every other year, would meet the requirements of part 139. To this end, we are seeking comments on the adequacy of mobile ARFF trainers for meeting the annual live fire drill requirement at index C, D, and E airports. Based on these comments, we will issue an opinion on the acceptability of mobile trainers for annual live-fire training for these airports.

DATES: Comments must be received by November 17, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Persons may mail their comments to: U.S. Department of Transportation Dockets, Docket No. FAA–XX–XXXX, 400 Seventh St., SW., Plaza Room 401, Washington, DC 20590. Comments may also be sent electronically to the Dockets Management System (DMS) at the following internet address: *http://dms.dot.gov.* at anytime. Commenters who wish to file comments electronically, should follow the instructions on the DMS web site. Comments may be filed and/or examined at the Department of Transportation Dockets, Plaza Room 401 between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. weekdays except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ken Gilliam, Senior Fire Fighting Specialist, Airport Safety and Operations Division, AAS–300, Federal Aviation Administration 800 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (407) 812–6331, ext. 34.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA invites comments on the question, ''Should the use of Mobile Aircraft Fire Trainers be considered to meet the requirements of Part 139 every year?''

The 1988 revision of 14 Code of Federal Regulations part 139, Certification and Operations: Land Airports Serving Certain Air Carriers, section 139.319(j)(3) requires ''All rescue and fire fighting personnel participate in at least one live fire drill every 12 months.'' 52 FR 44276 (Nov. 18, 1997) (effective Jan. 1, 1988). At the time this rule was promulgated, hydrocarbon fuels, such as diesel or jet-A, fueled the training facilities. In the early 1990s, Federal and State environmental protection agencies began banning such facilities because of ground contamination from the fuel. As a result, the FAA assisted in developing Liquid Propane Gas (LPG) fire facilities. The FAA funded these facilities throughout the country. The FAA refers to them as regional training facilities because mostly, they were intended to serve an area of more than one state. The aim is for a fire fighter to travel to the nearest training facility and receive both classroom and live fire training. FAA's position has been that all ARFF personnel should be exposed to live ground fuel fire fighting, either at their home airport or at a regional training facility. The size of the fire at a training facility was to be commensurate with the type of air carrier service that could be expected to service the airport of the ARFF personnel.

Part 139 requirements for aircraft rescue and fire fighting generally are based on the length of air carrier aircraft serving a particular airport. Index A airports receive air carrier aircraft less than 90 feet long. Index B airports receive air carrier aircraft 90 feet long but less than 126 feet. Index C airports receive air carrier aircraft 126 feet long to 158 feet. Index D airports receive air carrier aircraft 159 feet long to 199 feet. Index E airports receive air carrier aircraft 200 feet or longer. FAA has taken the position that fire fighters at large airports, such as Index C, D, and E, should be exposed to a larger fire than fire fighters at smaller airports. This, logically, is due to the fact that much larger air carrier aircraft operate at the larger airports, and in the event of an incident involving fire, a larger fire would likely result. The size of the Practical Critical Fire Area (PCA) specified by the FAA and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) reflects this possibility of a larger fire at airports served by larger aircraft. Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5210–6C, Aircraft fire and Rescue Facilities and Extinguishing Agents, describes the PCA and its origin. AC 150/5220–17A, Design Standards for an Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Training Facility, describes the size of the fire training facility relative to the PCA. The AC recommends the larger index C, D, and E airport fire fighters train on much larger pool fires than the mobile units provide. When flammable liquid hydrocarbons (FLH) are burned in the training facility, the size of the burn pit should be roughly 10,000 square feet for an Index C airport; roughly 14,500 square feet for Index D; and 18,000 square feet for Index E. The AC also contains procedures (Discharge Rate Method) for reducing the size of these fire pits under certain circumstances. When a training facility uses an LPG simulator, rather than FLH, FAA determined that a 12,200 square foot fire pit is suitable for training Index C through E airport fir fighters.

In the mid-1990's, industry, with the assistance of FAA, developed a mobile fire training simulator that could be transported from airport to airport on trucks. The simulations allowed for engine fires, interior fires, wheel well fires, and cargo hold fires. However, one of the drawbacks of the first models of the mobile simulator was that they did not provide for a ground fire. In the late 1990's, industry was able to develop a grid system ancillary to the simulator that provided a ground fire of limited size.

Some of the advantages and disadvantages of using Mobile Aircraft Fire Trainers for annual training by all airports are as follows.

Advantages:

- Mobile Trainers provide realistic and repeatable interior and exterior aircraft-related fire scenarios such as galley, cabin, wheel, engine, and cargo type fires.
- These scenarios can be ordered with pan fires presented in different configurations totaling up to 2,600 square feet. (These same training scenarios can also be provided by the large fixed facilities since they can install the same props.)
- Fire fighters can train with their own equipment.
- The airport fire fighters can train with local mutual air responders.
- There is more time to train with the equipment since there is no travel time to the training facility.
- Training can be done over several days without incurring added expenses of travel and per diem.

Disadvantages:

• Fixed facilities are usually able to afford better classroom training than is available at local sites.

• As more mobile units come on line providing more economical training and greater mobility, the large fixed facilities may further decline in use.

• A Mobile Aircraft Fire Trainer is limited to roughly 2600 square feet in ground fire to remain mobile. (However, some of the large fixed LPG facilities only burn ¼ of the pit at a time during a training exercise. This is not true for hydrocarbon fuel pits since once the pit is lit, the entire pit has to burn. For example, the 10,000 square foot requirement for the index C airport using propane would only use 2,500 square feet. This is considered adequate because, when the attack is made on a 10,000 square foot fire, the fire fighter will only see ¼ of the fire at any given time. The cost of fuel is another reason for this practice. Based on the above facts, a mobile unit with 2,600 square feet of fire burn area would be sufficient for a larger index airport for training each year if it were used properly.)

Recognizing the Mobile Aircraft Fire Trainer technology, FAA issued Certalert No. 96–01, Annual Live Fire Drill Qualification, dated October 23, 1996. This certalert confirmed the appropriateness, under certain limitations for large size airports, to use interior/exterior fire training simulators, either stationary or mobile, as a means of meeting part 139 training requirements. The FAA is not proposing to mandate the use of the mobile simulator, but rather to interpret the annual use of mobile simulators as meeting the requirements of part 139, if the airport operator wants to use that option. To this end, we seek comments on the advisability of such a proposal.

Issued in Washington, DC on September 12, 2003.

David L. Bennett,

Director, Office of Airport Safety and Standards.

[FR Doc. 03–23873 Filed 9–17–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Placer and Sutter Counties, CA

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public of its intent to prepare a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation, a proposed transportation corridor in western Placer and eastern Sutter Counties, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Steve Healow, Transportation Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, 980 9th St., Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814–2724. Telephone: (916) 498–5849.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded by using a computer, modem and suitable communications software from the Government Printing Office's Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202) 512–1661. Internet users may reach the Office of Federal Register's home page at *http://www.nara.gov/fedreg* and the Government Printing Office's Web page at *http://www.access.gpo.gov.nara.*

Background

The FHWA, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Sutter County, and the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority (SPRTA), will prepare a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to preserve a right-of-way corridor for a future transportation facility approximately 15 miles long that would connect State Route 65 in Placer County, north of the City of Roseville, and State Route 70/99 in Sutter County, north of the City of Sacramento. Three corridor concepts were identified in a Project Study Report prepared in 2001. One concept would consist of a 14.4 mile long, four-lane expressway/freeway connection from SR 65 at Whitney Boulevard to SR 70/99 at a point about one mile north of Sankey Road. This concept would parallel Sunset Boulevard West and Howsley Road for most of its east-west route. Another concept would consist of a 14.3 mile long, four-lane freeway connection from SR 65 at Sunset Boulevard to SR 70/99 at a point about one mile north of Riego Road. West of Fiddyment Road, this concept would travel diagonally through the agricultural area that lies between Sunset Boulevard West and Baseline Road. A third concept would be 15.6 miles long and connect SR 65 at Whitney Boulevard to SR 70/99 at a point about one-mile south of Riego Road. It would also travel through the agricultural area between Sunset Boulevard West and Baseline Road, but would parallel Baseline Road more closely. These concepts, together with other feasible alignments that may be identified during the scoping process, will be evaluated to determine the alternatives that will be analyzed in the EIS.

The Placer Parkway Corridor includes some of the fastest growing communities in the Sacramento region. The population in south Placer County will nearly double between 2000 and 2025. Employment in the SR 65 ''high-tech'' corridor is expected to grow even faster than the population. Sutter County has designated a large area on the western side of the Placer Parkway Corridor for up to 3,500 acres of industrial and commercial development. By 2025, total employment in southwest Placer County is projected to exceed total employment in downtown Sacramento. Anticipated development in the area will dramatically increase travel demand over the next 20 years and beyond. At the same time, daily traffic volumes on I–80 south of the study area are projected to increase nearly 40 percent in the already congested area south of the project area. Travel speeds will decline as well on local thoroughfares. Congestion on inter-regional roadways will adversely impact access to jobs. Free-flowing access and reliable travel times to both the Sacramento International Airport and the Lincoln Airport are important to this growing regional job center. A new controlled-access highway connection between SR 65 and SR 70/99 would benefit the regional transportation system by providing an alternative to SR 65 and I–80, thereby reducing traffic demand in these existing freeway corridors.

The proposed Parkway project is identified in the Sacramento Council of Government's (SACOG) 2025 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the 2022 Placer County Regional Transportation Plan.

Federal and state environmental laws allow ''tiered'' environmental review. Tiering is a way to focus environmental studies during the planning process at the same level of detail as the plans. The first tier document (Tier 1) allows an agency to focus on broad environmental issues and areawide air quality and land use implications, which may correlate directly to early planning decisions, such as the type, the general location, and major design features of a roadway. The Tier I EIS will also evaluate potential cumulative and indirect impacts and identify potential conceptual mitigation for impacts. This work will rely largely on existing Geographic Information System (GIS) data and limited fieldwork. The Tier I EIS will not result in any construction.