

sites or airport terminals. The information kept is used by the FAA to prove that the facility is maintained within certain specified tolerances.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: An estimated 33,116 hours annually.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention FAA 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 estimates 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.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 2, 2002.

Judith D. Street,

FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, Standards and Information Division, APF-100.

[FR Doc. 02-25595 Filed 10-7-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

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 extension of the currently approved collection. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and the expected burden. The Federal Register Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on June 12, 2002, page 40373.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 7, 2002. A comment to OMB is most effective if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judy Street on (202) 267-9895.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

Title: Training and Qualification Requirements for Check Airmen and Flight Instructors.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

OMB Control Number: 2120-0600.

Form(s): NA.

Affected Public: A total of 3,000 airmen and flight instructors.

Abstract: This rule establishes separate requirements for check airmen who check only in flight simulators and flight instructors who instruct only in flight simulators. The collection of information allows the FAA to determine the compliance to this rule of experienced pilots who would otherwise qualify as flight instructors or check airmen but who are not medically eligible to hold the requisite medical certificates.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: An estimated 12.5 hours annually.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention FAA 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 estimates 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.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 2, 2002.

Judith D. Street,

FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, Standards and Information Division, APF-100.

[FR Doc. 02-25596 Filed 10-7-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Approvals and Disapprovals

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) DOT.

ACTION: Monthly Notice of PFC Approvals and Disapprovals. In August 2002, there were no applications approved. Twelve approved amendments to previously approved applications are listed.

SUMMARY: The FAA publishes a monthly notice, as appropriate, of PFC approvals and disapprovals under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101-508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158). This notice is published pursuant to paragraph (d) of § 158.29.

AMENDMENTS TO PFC APPROVALS

| Amendment No., city, state | Amendment approved date | Original approved net PFC revenue | Amendment approved net PFC revenue | Original estimated charge exp. date | Amended estimated charge exp. date |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| *93-01-C-05-TYS, Knoxville, TN | 02/08/02 | 4,881,882 | 4,453,055 | 02/01/97 | 02/01/97 |
| *99-01-C-01-STC, St. Cloud, MN | 04/16/02 | 1,147,578 | 1,147,578 | 10/01/19 | 01/01/14 |
| *97-04-1-01-SBP, San Luis Obispo, CA | 06/25/02 | 6,820,830 | 6,820,830 | 07/01/15 | 07/01/12 |
| 00-06-U-01-SBP, San Luis Obispo, CA | 06/25/02 | NA | NA | 07/01/15 | 07/01/12 |
| 99-03-C-01-MOB, Mobile, AL | 07/15/02 | 5,694,289 | 4,033,023 | 10/01/04 | 07/01/04 |
| 92-01-C-01-NGM, Agana, GU | 08/16/02 | 5,632,000 | 800,00 | 06/01/94 | 06/01/94 |
| *93-02-C-02-NGM, Agana, GU | 08/16/02 | 258,408,107 | 257,802,097 | 07/01/21 | 03/01/25 |
| *99-04-C-01-PNS, Pensacola, FL | 08/19/02 | 19,400,000 | 19,400,000 | 06/01/09 | 09/01/07 |
| *93-01-1-02-SHV, Shreveport, LA | 08/20/02 | 29,841,353 | 29,841,353 | 05/01/16 | 09/01/14 |
| 95-02-U-01-SHV, Shreveport, LA | 08/20/02 | NA | NA | 05/01/16 | 09/01/14 |
| *94-02-C-02-BWI, Baltimore, MD | 08/28/02 | 60,230,930 | 60,230,930 | 04/01/09 | 06/01/04 |

AMENDMENTS TO PFC APPROVALS—Continued

| Amendment No., city, state | Amendment approved date | Original approved net PFC revenue | Amendment approved net PFC revenue | Original estimated charge exp. date | Amended estimated charge exp. date |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 99-03-C-02-DRO, Durango, CO | 08/29/02 | 730,634 | 1,169,258 | 09/01/02 | 01/01/04 |

NOTE: The amendments 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 St. Cloud, MN, this change is effective on July 1, 2002. For San Luis Obispo, CA, this change is effective on September 1, 2002. For Pensacola, FL, Agana, GU, Shreveport, LA, and Baltimore, MD, this change is effective on November 1, 2002.

Issued in Washington, DC on October 2, 2002.

Barry Molar,

Manager, Airports Financial Assistance Division.

[FR Doc. 02-25593 Filed 10-7-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 02-13469]

Grant of Applications of Five Motorcycle Manufacturers for Temporary Exemption, and Requests for Extension of Temporary Exemption, From Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 123

This notice grants the applications by five motorcycle manufacturers for either a temporary exemption of two years from a requirement of S5.2.1 (Table 1) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 123 *Motorcycle Controls and Displays*, or for an extension of two years of an existing temporary exemption from such requirement. The applicants assert that "compliance with the standard would prevent the manufacturer from selling a motor vehicle with an overall level of safety at least equal to the overall safety level of nonexempt vehicles," 49 U.S.C. Sec. 30113(b)(3)(iv).

The manufacturers who have applied for a temporary exemption are CPI Motor Co. of Ta-Li City, Taiwan (CPI), for the Motorrad JT 125 (Moskito); American Suzuki Motor Corporation, Brea, California, on behalf of Suzuki Motor Corporation of Japan, for the Suzuki AN650, and Malaguti USA, Miami, Florida, on behalf of Malaguti S.p.A. of Bologna, Italy, for the Ciak 150 cc and F-18 150 cc motor scooters. The manufacturers who have applied for an extension of an existing exemption are Aprilia, U.S.A. Inc., Woodstock, Ga. for the Aprilia Scarabeo 150 (NHTSA Temporary Exemption No. 99-9, expiring October 1, 2002 (see 64 FR 44264, 65 FR 1225, and 66 FR 59519)); and American Honda Motor Company, Inc., Torrance, California, for the Honda

NSS250(NHTSA Temporary Exemption No. EX 2000-2, expiring November 1, 2002, 65 FR 69130).

Because the safety issues raised by petitions for renewal of exemptions are identical to those raised in the initial petitions by these manufacturers, and because these issues are identical to those raised by the manufacturers petitioning for an exemption for the first time, we have decided to address all the petitions in a single notice. Further, given the opportunity for public comment on these issues in the years 1998-2001 (which resulted only in comments in support of the petitions), we have concluded that a further opportunity to comment on the same issues is not likely to result in any substantive submissions, and that we may proceed to decisions on these petitions. See, e.g., most recently Aprilia and Honda (66 FR 59519) and Aprilia (65 FR 1225).

The Reason Why the Applicants Need a Temporary Exemption

The problem is one that is common to the motorcycles covered by the applications. If a motorcycle is produced with rear wheel brakes, S5.2.1 of Standard No. 123 requires that the brakes be operable through the right foot control, although the left handlebar is permissible for motor-driven cycles (Item 11, Table 1). Motor-driven cycles are motorcycles with motors that produce 5 brake horsepower or less. The five manufacturers petitioned to use the left handlebar as the control for the rear brakes of certain of their motorcycles whose engines produce more than 5 brake horsepower. The frame of each of these motorcycles has not been designed to mount a right foot operated brake pedal (i.e., these scooter-type vehicles which provide a platform for the feet and operate only through hand controls). Applying considerable stress to this sensitive pressure point of the frame could cause failure due to fatigue unless proper design and testing procedures are performed.

Absent an exemption, the manufacturers will be unable to sell the motorcycle models named above

because the vehicles would not fully comply with Standard No. 123.

Arguments Why the Overall Level of Safety of the Vehicles To Be Exempted Equals or Exceeds That of Non-Exempted Vehicles

As required by statute, the petitioners have argued that the overall level of safety of the motorcycles covered by their petitions equals or exceeds that of a non-exempted motor vehicle for the following reasons. All vehicles for which petitions have been submitted are equipped with an automatic transmission. As there is no foot-operated gear change, the operation and use of a motorcycle with an automatic transmission is similar to the operation and use of a bicycle, and the vehicles can be operated without requiring special training or practice.

CPI is manufacturing the Moskito 125 (JT125) under contract with Motorrad und Zweiradwerk GmbH of Germany, which has completed certification testing of the vehicle. CPI will affix a certification of compliance with the Federal motor vehicle safety standards as the manufacturer of the Moskito 125, and then ship the motorcycles directly to Motorrad of North America for sale in the United States.

According to CPI, the JT125 provides an equivalent overall level of safety to a complying vehicle because its operation is similar to that of a bicycle, and the use of a left-hand lever for the rear brake is highly intuitive and easy to use. The use of the left handlebar for the rear brake control on scooters is more natural and quicker for a scooter rider than the rider's foot searching for the correct position on a pedal to operate the brakes. In addition, "additional benefit is provided by the reduced probability of inadvertent wheel locking in an emergency braking situation, which comes from increased sensitivity to brake feedback with the hand lever."

American Suzuki informed us that its AN650 "can easily meet the braking performance requirements in FMVSS 122," and enclosed a test report in support. It also compared the performance of the AN650 with the somewhat lighter GSF600S motorcycle, which is equipped with rear brakes that