in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Frederick J. Krum, Director of Aviation of the Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority Board at the following address: Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority Board, 5400 Lauby Road, Box #9 North Canton, Ohio 44720–1598.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority Board under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Stephanie R. Swann, Program Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111 (734–487–7277). 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 Akron-Canton Regional 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 July 16, 1999, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority Board 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 5, 1999.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

PFC Application No.: 99–04–C–00–CAK.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: April 1, 2002.

Proposed charge expiration date: July 1, 2005.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $3,175,200.00.

Brief description of proposed projects:

Impose Only: Ground Run-up Enclosure; Relocate Mt. Pleasant & Frank Roads; Runway 1 Extension and Runway 19 Threshold Relocation.

Impose and Use: SRE Spreader Trucks; Ground Run-up Noise Study; Storm Water Drainage Improvements; Passenger Loading Bridge; Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan; Environmental Assessment (EA) RWY 1 Extension Phase II; Benefit Cost Analysis for Runway 1 Extension; Part 107 Security Access Control System Upgrade; Terminal Master Plan; Airport Entrance Road Signage Design; Land Acquisition-Kuhar and Daily; Airport Layout Plan Update; Airport Entrance Road Signage and Storm Water Drainage Control.

Class or classes of air carriers, which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Air Taxi/Commercial Operations.

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 Akron-Canton Regional Airport Authority Board.

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois, on August 6, 1999.

Benito De Leon,

Manager, Planning/Programming Branch, Airports Division, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 99–21182 Filed 8–13–99; 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 Detroit City Airport, Detroit, Michigan

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 Detroit City 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 September 15, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Michael G. Trout, Director, Detroit City Airport, Michigan at the following address: City of Detroit, 1110 City-County Building, Detroit, MI 48226.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the City of Detroit under section 158.23 of Part 158.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Gary J. Migut, Program Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, Detroit Airports District Office, Willow Run Airport, East, 8820 Beck Road, Belleville, Michigan 48111 (734) 487–7278. The application may be reviewed in person at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on this application to: impose and use the revenue from a PFC at Detroit City 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 August 2, 1999, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the City of Detroit 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 12, 1999.

PFC Application No.: 99–01–C–00–DET.

Level of the proposed PFC: $3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: January 1, 2000.

Proposed charge expiration date: February 28, 2004.

Total estimated PFC revenue: $3,650,000.00.

Brief description of proposed projects:

Impose and Use: Jetways, Snow Removal Equipment, Terminal Expansion Study.

Impose Only: Terminal Expansion.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: Air Taxis/Commercial Operators (ATCOs).

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 City of Detroit.

Issued in Des Plaines, Illinois, on August 6, 1999.

Benito De Leon,

Manager, Planning/Programming Branch, Airports Division, Great Lakes Region.

[FR Doc. 99–21183 Filed 8–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–99–5056; Notice 2]

Grant of Application for Determination of Inconsequential Noncompliance with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 108—Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment

General Motors Corporation (GM), determined that GM S10 Electric Trucks (S10 trucks equipped with an electric propulsion system) fail to meet the turn signal bulb outage requirements found in S5.5.6 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) 108—Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment. Pursuant to Title 49 of the United States Code, Sections 30118 and 30120, GM applied to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) for a decision that the noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. In accordance with 49 CFR 556.4(b)(6), GM also submitted a 49 CFR 573 noncompliance notification to the agency .

A notice of receipt of an application was published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 27034) on May 18, 1999. Opportunity was afforded for comments until June 17, 1999. No comments were received.

FMVSS 108 S5.5.6 requires:

S5.5.6 Each vehicle equipped with a turn signal operating unit shall also have an illuminated pilot indicator. Failure of one or more turn signal lamps to operate shall be indicated in accordance with SAE Standard J588e, Turn Signal Lamps, September 1970, except when a variable-load turn signal flasher is used on a truck, bus, or multipurpose passenger vehicle 80 or more inches in overall width, on a truck that is capable of accommodating a slide-in camper, or on any vehicle equipped to tow trailers.

The design of the S10 Electric Truck is based on the design of conventional S10 trucks powered by internal combustion engines, with modifications to accommodate the electric propulsion system. The conventional S10 trucks are capable of towing, have a variable load flasher, and, therefore, are not required by the Standard to provide bulb outage indication. The use of an S10 Electric Truck for towing is not practical and is not recommended. The impact of that fact was overlooked in the process of carrying over the design of the turn signal system from the conventional S10 to the S10 Electric and, therefore, the non complying vehicles were not equipped to indicate bulb outage and do not meet that requirement of FMVSS 108 S5.5.6. This was corrected in the 1998 model year production of the S10 Electric.

GM believed that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety for these reasons:

The S10 Electric Trucks are identical in appearance to the normal production vehicles. Except for the lack of towing capability, the subject vehicles are functionally the same as fully compliant S10 trucks.

There were only 209 vehicles produced and, therefore, the exposure is extremely small.

Most of the subject vehicles are part of commercial and government fleets (they have been purchased by electric utility companies and state and municipal government agencies). As such, they will be exposed to routine maintenance schedules that are more rigorous than the average consumer practices.

Most trucks currently produced are capable of trailer towing and, thus, are not required to detect bulb outage. As a result, individuals and fleets who are accustomed to truck operation do not necessarily have an expectation that turn signal bulb outage will be indicated. In addition, other lamps required by FMVSS 108 are not required to provide bulb outage indication. As a result, the lack of that feature on these vehicles is not likely to be noticed by the vehicle operators, and they will continue to discover turn signal bulb outage the way they would on other trucks that are capable of towing.

GM is not aware of field complaints due to the subject condition.

GM asserted that the noncomplying trucks present the same level of safety as the millions of other vehicles with variable load flashers currently on the roads and highways. GM thus argued that this noncompliance is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety. In consideration of the foregoing, GM petitioned that it be exempted from the notification and remedy provisions of the Safety Act for this specific noncompliance with FMVSS No. 108.

The agency recognizes that these electric vehicles are mainly used in fleet service and in such use do receive regular periodic maintenance where detection of the failure of a turn signal lamp and replacement thereof is more likely than in individual ownership of such a vehicle. Thus, the agency is convinced that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. The likelihood of these S10 Electric Trucks having any sustained period of outage, relative to a normal S10, or even to vehicles with turn signal failure indication is expected to be a relatively infrequent event.

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that the applicant has met its burden of persuasion that the noncompliance described above is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, its application is granted, and the applicant is exempt from providing the notification of noncompliance required by 49 U.S.C. 30118, required by 49 CFR 30120.

(49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8)

Issued on: August 10, 1999.

L. Robert Shelton,

Associate Administrator for Safety Performance Standards.

[FR Doc. 99–21184 Filed 8–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–99–6009]

W.F. Mickey Body Company, Inc., Receipt of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

W.F. Mickey Body Company, Inc. (Mickey Body), a manufacturer of trailers (beverage bodies, van bodies, and vending bodies), is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of North Carolina with its principal place of business located in High Point, North Carolina. Mickey Body has determined that its tire and rim label information, on some units, is not in full compliance with 49 CFR 571.120, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 120, ''Tire Selection and Rims for Vehicles Other Than Passenger Cars,'' and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, ''Defect and Noncompliance Reports.'' Mickey Body has also applied to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301—''Motor Vehicle Safety'' on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of an application is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other