

photograph, such as a driver's license. If an individual does not have identification documents sufficient to establish his/her identity, the individual must certify in writing that he/she is the person claimed to be and that he/she understands that knowing and willful request for, or acquisition of, a record pertaining to another individual under false pretenses is a criminal offense.

If notification is requested by telephone, an individual must verify his/her identity by providing identifying information that parallels the record to which notification is being requested. If it is determined the identifying information provided by telephone is insufficient, the individual will be required to submit a request in writing or in person. If an individual is requesting information by telephone on behalf of another individual, the subject individual must be connected with SSA and the requesting individual in the same phone call. SSA will establish the subject individual's identity (his/her name, SSN, address, date of birth and place of birth, along with one other piece of information such as mother's maiden name), and ask for his/her consent in providing information to the requesting individual.

If a request for notification is submitted by mail, an individual must include a notarized statement to SSA to verify his/her identity or must certify in the request that he/she is the person claimed to be and that he/she understands that the knowing and willful request for, or acquisition of, a record pertaining to another individual under false pretenses is a criminal offense. These procedures are in accordance with SSA Regulations (20 CFR 401.40).

#### RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURE(S):

Same as "Notification" procedure(s). Requesters also should reasonably specify the record contents they are seeking. These procedures are in accordance with SSA Regulations (20 CFR 401.50).

#### CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURE(S):

Same as "Notification" procedures. Requesters also should reasonably identify the record, specify the information they are contesting, and state the corrective action sought, and the reasons for the correction, with supporting justification showing how the record is untimely, incomplete, inaccurate or irrelevant. These procedures are in accordance with SSA Regulations (20 CFR 401.65).

#### RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Information in this system of records is obtained from information collected

from individuals interviewed in person in SSA FOs, from existing systems of records, such as the Claims Folders System, (60-0089), Master Beneficiary Record, (60-0090), Supplemental Security Income Record and Special Veterans Benefits, (60-0103), and from information generated by SSA, such as computer date/time stamps at various points in the interview process.

#### SYSTEMS EXEMPTED FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE PRIVACY ACT:

None.

[FR Doc. 05-20503 Filed 10-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

### [Public Notice 5204]

#### Notice of Meeting; United States International Telecommunication Advisory Committee Information Meeting on the World Summit on the Information Society

The Department of State announces a meeting of the U.S. International Telecommunication Advisory Committee (ITAC). The purpose of the Committee is to advise the Department on matters related to telecommunication and information policy matters in preparation for international meetings pertaining to telecommunication and information issues.

The ITAC will meet to discuss the matters related to the second phase of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), in preparation for the WSIS Summit in mid-November. The meeting will take place on Tuesday, October 25, 2005 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. in the auditorium of the Historic National Academy of Science Building. The National Academy of Sciences is located at 2100 C St. NW., Washington, DC.

Members of the public are welcome to participate and may join in the discussions, subject to the discretion of the Chair. Persons planning to attend this meeting should send the following data by fax to (202) 647-5957 or e-mail to [jillsonad@state.gov](mailto:jillsonad@state.gov) not later than 24 hours before the meeting: (1) Name of the meeting, (2) your name, and (3) organizational affiliation. A valid photo ID must be presented to gain entrance to the National Academy of Sciences Building. Directions to the meeting location may be obtained by calling the ITAC Secretariat at (202) 647-5205.

Dated: October 6, 2005.

Anne Jillson,

Foreign Affairs Officer, International Communications and Information Policy, Department of State.

[FR Doc. 05-20550 Filed 10-12-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-07-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

[Docket No. FAA-2004-16944]

#### Operating Limitations at Chicago O'Hare International Airport

**ACTION:** Notice of order.

**SUMMARY:** On July 18, 2005, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued an order to show cause, which solicited written views on extending for a second time the FAA's August 18, 2004, order limiting scheduled operations at O'Hare International Airport (O'Hare). The August 2004 order made effective a series of schedule adjustments that the air carriers individually agreed to during a scheduling reduction meeting. These agreements, in general, resulted in a voluntary peak-hour arrival rate at O'Hare of eighty-eight scheduled flights, with the exception of the 8 p.m. hour—the final peak hour of the day—when the rate would not exceed ninety-eight scheduled arrivals.

The FAA previously extended the effectiveness of the August 2004 order through October 29, 2005. This notice announces that the FAA Administrator has signed an order that further extends the August 2004 order through April 1, 2006. The text of the extension order is published below as supplementary information to this notice.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Gerry Shakley, System Operations, Air Traffic Organization: telephone (202) 267-9424; facsimile (202) 267-7277; e-mail [gerry.shakley@faa.gov](mailto:gerry.shakley@faa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Second Order Extending the August 2004 Limitation of Scheduled Operations at O'Hare International Airport

On July 18, 2005, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued an order to show cause, soliciting written views on extending through April 1, 2006, the August 2004 order limiting scheduled operations at O'Hare International Airport (O'Hare).<sup>1</sup> The August 2004 order made effective a series of schedule adjustments that air carriers

<sup>1</sup> 70 FR 42135 (July 21, 2005).

individually agreed to during a scheduling reduction meeting convened under 49 U.S.C. § 41722. The FAA previously extended the order through October 29, 2005. After careful reflection on the written views submitted, the FAA is now extending the August 2004 order through April 1, 2006.

The FAA is taking this action to ensure that congestion and delay at O'Hare remain at manageable levels through the upcoming winter scheduling season while the agency considers the need for additional measures. The FAA has separately issued a notice of proposed rulemaking that would limit scheduled arrivals at O'Hare and establish allocation, transfer, and other procedures not included in the August 2004 order.<sup>2</sup> The comment period for the proposed rule closed on May 24, and the FAA and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation are evaluating the comments filed in that proceeding. The FAA intends to make a final decision in that proceeding as promptly as possible. The FAA expects that this extension of the August 2004 order will permit the order's expiration to coincide with the effective date of a final rule, if a rule is adopted.

The FAA's authority to extend the August 2004 order is the same authority cited in that order. The FAA proposed to extend the August 2004 order under the agency's broad authority in 49 U.S.C. § 40103(b) to regulate the use of the navigable airspace of the United States. This provision authorizes the FAA to develop plans and policy for the use of navigable airspace and, by order or rule, to regulate the use of the airspace as necessary to ensure its efficient use. In addition, 49 U.S.C. § 41722 authorizes the FAA to conduct scheduling reduction meetings. The FAA's authority under section 41722 would be unenforceable if the FAA lacked the related authority to capture voluntary schedule reductions in FAA orders.

*Discussion of the Written Submissions:* A total of six respondents filed written views on the FAA's proposed extension of the August 2004 order. The respondents included four air carriers (American Airlines, Independence Air, Northwest Airlines, and United Airlines), one air carrier organization (the Air Carrier Association of America), and the City of Chicago (City). None of the respondents representing air carrier interests opposed the extension of the August 2004 order through April 1, 2006.

As the operator of O'Hare, the City registers a concern that the restrictions contained in the August 2004 order will be effective indefinitely. We reiterate that the agreements reached during the August 2004 scheduling reduction meeting are temporary. In the August 2004 order, the FAA emphasized that capacity increases—not negotiated schedule reductions or other restrictions on demand—are the preferred means of curtailing delays like those the O'Hare experienced prior to the order. In addition, as the July 18 Order to Show Cause reflects, the FAA has issued a notice of proposed rulemaking on the subject of flight limitations at O'Hare, and the FAA and Office of the Secretary of Transportation are evaluating the comments received in that matter. Our decision to extend the August 2004 order through April 1, 2006, will permit adequate time to consider the comments on the proposed rulemaking and, if a rule is adopted, to implement a final rule. Again, we continue to anticipate that the August 2004 order will endure for the shortest practical duration.

The City asks the FAA to let the order expire to determine whether over scheduling at O'Hare will recur. The City reasons that a capacity constraint can be imposed again if it proves necessary. In the August 2004 order, the FAA recounted in detail the impact of over scheduling at O'Hare. The nationwide and debilitating nature of the resulting delays caused the FAA to convene the scheduling reduction meeting. The recent and expected air traffic procedural improvements and equipment upgrades that the City identifies will not increase O'Hare's capacity so significantly that intolerable delay will not recur if the August 2004 order were to expire as now scheduled. The FAA's overall approach seeks to avoid the instability that successive expiration and reinstatement of voluntary schedule reductions at O'Hare would inflict on air carriers and the public. Moreover, while the FAA recognizes the City's view that the O'Hare Modernization Program, if approved and implemented, could significantly increase the airport capacity, the program could not be completed before the August 2004 order is currently scheduled to expire.

The City also asserts that the hourly scheduled arrival rate of eighty-eight during most peak hours, as set forth in the August 2004 order, is too low. The City would prefer an hourly scheduled arrival rate of ninety-two. In addition, the City repeats that, in its view, the FAA should amend the August 2004 order to exempt all international operations from the order's limitations.

The City previously raised identical concerns over the FAA's first extension of the August 2004 order, and the FAA therefore addressed the City's views in detail when it extended the order in March 2005.<sup>3</sup> In the context of extending the voluntary scheduling limits, the FAA's prior assessment of the City's views has not materially changed. In addition, the City has filed similar comments in the public docket for the related rulemaking proceeding. The FAA and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation are affording the City's comments most careful consideration in that proceeding. Because the only matter at issue in this order is the contemplated short-term extension of the August 2004 order through April 1, 2006, it is unwise to address here issues that are now the subject of an open rulemaking before the agency. The FAA will address the merit of these comments in the rulemaking process.

Finally, we reject the City's suggestion that the agency lacks the authority to limit arrivals at O'Hare by extending the August 2004 order. As an initial matter, the August 2004 order was the product of voluntary schedule limitations negotiated during a scheduling reduction meeting that Congress specifically authorized in 49 U.S.C. 41722. An FAA-issued order is the only practical means by which we can enforce the voluntary agreements that a scheduling reduction meeting produces. Accordingly, in authorizing the FAA to conduct such meetings, Congress presumably perceived that the FAA would issue and maintain orders, like the August 2004 order, as extended, that comport with the air carriers' agreements.

Furthermore, in phasing out the High Density Rule at O'Hare in July 2002, Congress simultaneously emphasized that it did not disturb the FAA's authority over safety and the movement of air traffic. 49 U.S.C. 41715(b). Our continuing authority in these areas is more than adequate to permit the extension of the August 2004 order that we specify here.

*Conclusion:* The FAA proposed to extend the August 2004 order through April 1, 2006, on the basis of its tentative finding that such an extension is necessary to prevent a recurrence of overscheduling at O'Hare. After considering the responses, the FAA has determined to make this finding final and to extend the order through April 1, 2006.

Accordingly, with respect to scheduled flight operations at O'Hare, it is ordered that:

<sup>2</sup> 70 FR 15520 (Mar. 25, 2005).

<sup>3</sup> Mar. 21, 2005, Order at 5–10.

1. Ordering paragraph seven of the FAA's August 18, 2004, order limiting scheduled operations at O'Hare International Airport is amended to state that the order shall expire at 9 p.m. on April 1, 2006.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 5, 2005.

**Rebecca MacPherson,**

*Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 05-20464 Filed 10-12-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Artisan Liens on Aircraft; Recordability

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice

**SUMMARY:** Consistent with Agency practice, this notice is issued to advise interested parties of the addition of the States of Idaho and Utah to the list of those thirty-three states from which the Aircraft Registration Branch (FAA Aircraft Registry), Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, will accept artisan liens for recordation. Since December 17, 1981, the Aeronautical Center Counsel has issued these notices in the Federal Register.

**DATE:** This notice is effective October 13, 2005.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Joseph R. Standell, Aeronautical Center Counsel, Aeronautical Center (AMC-7), Federal Aviation Administration, 6500 S. MacArthur, Oklahoma City, OK 73169. Telephone (405) 954-3296.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In 46 FR 61528, December 17, 1981, the Federal Aviation Administration published its legal opinion on the recordability of artisan liens, with the identification of those states from which artisan liens would be accepted. Subsequently, we advised that Florida, Nevada, and New Jersey had passed legislation that, in our opinion, allows the FAA Aircraft Registry to accept artisan liens from those states (49 FR 17112, April 23, 1984).

The Agency continued this practice when we advised that the following states had passed legislation that either required or allowed recording of notice of lien thereby allowing the FAA Aircraft Registry to accept and record artisan liens claimed under those states' law:

Minnesota and New Mexico (51 FR 21046, June 10, 1986)

Missouri (53 FR 23716, June 23, 1988)  
Texas, (54 FR 38584, September 19, 1989)  
North Dakota, (54 FR 51965, October 17, 1989)  
Michigan and Tennessee, (55 FR 31938, August 6, 1990)  
Arizona, (56 FR 27989, June 18, 1991)  
Iowa, (56 FR 36189-36190, July 31, 1991)  
California (General Aviation only), Connecticut, Ohio, and Virginia (58 FR 50387, September 27, 1993)  
Louisiana, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island (67 FR 68902, November 13, 2002)

This notice is to advise interested parties that the states of Idaho and Utah are now identified as additional states from which artisan liens will be accepted.

With the addition of Idaho and Utah, the complete list of thirty-five states from which artisan liens on aircraft will be accepted as of this date is: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California (General Aviation Only), Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virgin Islands, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming.

Issued in Oklahoma City on September 28, 2005.

**Joseph R. Standell,**

*Aeronautical Center Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 05-20467 Filed 10-12-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and To Conduct Scoping Meetings for the Proposed Relocation of Runway 11R/29L and Associated Development at the Tucson International Airport in Tucson, AZ

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and to conduct scoping meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared to assess the potential impacts of the proposed relocation of Runway 11R/29L and associated development at Tucson International

Airport. To ensure that all significant issues related to the proposed action are identified, one (1) public scoping meeting and one (1) governmental agency scoping meeting will be held.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Michelle Simmons, Environmental Protection Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Western-Pacific Region, Airports Division, P.O. Box 92007, Los Angeles, California 90009-2007. Telephone: (310) 725-3614. Any scoping comments and suggestions regarding the EIS must be submitted to the address above and must be received no later than 5 p.m. Pacific Standard Time, December 15, 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for addressing specific improvements at Tucson International Airport. The (EIS) will be prepared in accordance with the procedures described in FAA Order 5050.4A, *Airport Environmental Handbook*, and FAA Order 1050.1E, *Environment Impacts: Policies and Procedures*. The Tucson Airport Authority, the owner of Tucson International Airport proposes the following development as identified in the 2004 Tucson International Airport Master Plan: Relocate Runway 11R/29L, 450 feet to the southwest, creating a centerline to centerline separation of 1,156 feet between the existing Runway 11L29R and the relocated Runway 11R/29L. The length of the relocated Runway 11R/29L will be 11,000 feet long by 150 feet wide. The development will also include the extension of existing Taxiways A-6 and A-17, and provisions for acute angled "high speed" exits at Taxiways A-11, A-13, and A-15; addition of new Taxiways A-16 and A-18; extension of Taxiway B, (which is currently marked as 11R/29L); relocation of the airport service road to accommodate the proposed runway relocation; and installation of an Instrument Landing System (ILS) in conjunction with the relocated runway, including a Medium Intensity Approach Lighting System with Runway Alignment Indicator Lights (MALSR) in both directions. The Airport Master Plan Update identified the need to provide additional airfield capacity at the Airport to meet the projected levels of operational and passenger demand. Within the EIS, FAA proposed to consider a range of alternatives that could potentially meet the need for additional airport capacity in the Tucson metropolitan area including, but not limited to, the following: