

1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2-260, College Park, GA 30337-2747.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Mr. Bradley S. Whited, Airport Director, of the City of Fayetteville at the following address: Mr. Bradley S. Whited, Airport Director, Fayetteville Regional Airport, P.O. Box 64218, Fayetteville, NC 28306.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lee Kyker, Manager of Airport Programs, Atlanta Airports District Office, 1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2-260, College Park, GA 20227-2747, (404) 305-7161. 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 Fayetteville 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) (Pub. L. 101-508) and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

On May 12, 2000, the FAA determined that the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC submitted by the City of Fayetteville 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 September 8, 2000.

The following is a brief overview of the application.

PFC Application No.: 00-01-C-00-FAY.

Level of the proposed PFC: \$3.00.

Proposed charge effective date: September 1, 2000.

Proposed charge expiration date: October 1, 2002.

Total estimated net PFC revenue: \$942,620.

Brief description of proposed project(s) that were omitted from May 25, 2000 Federal Register Notice:

- Construct general aviation area (design only).

- Acquire handicap lift device.

Class or classes of air carriers which the public agency has requested not be required to collect PFCs: None.

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 Federal Aviation Administration.

Issued in Atlanta, Georgia on June 27, 2000.

Scott L. Seritt,

Manager, Atlanta Airports District Office.

[FR Doc. 00-16920 Filed 7-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Draft Environmental Impact Statement; Douglas County, CO

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the FHWA, in cooperation with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), have jointly prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for proposed transportation improvements in the South I-25 Corridor and US 85 Corridor of the Denver, Colorado metropolitan area. The project is within Douglas County. The Draft EIS identifies various alternatives and the associated environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives. Interested citizens are invited to review the Draft EIS and submit comments. Copies of the Draft EIS may be obtained by telephoning or writing the contact person listed below under **ADDRESSES**. Public reading copies of the Draft EIS are available at the locations listed under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

DATES: A 45-day public review period will begin on July 5, 2000 and conclude on August 21, 2000. Written comments on the alternatives and impacts to be considered must be received by CDOT by August 21, 2000. Three public hearings to receive oral comments on the Draft EIS will be held in Castle Rock, Lone Tree, and Sedalia.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the Draft EIS should be addressed to Wes Goff, Project Manager, Colorado Department of Transportation, South I-25 and US 85 Corridor, 18500 East Colfax Avenue, Aurora, CO 80011. Requests for a copy of the Draft EIS may be addressed to Mr. Wes Goff at the address above. Please see

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section for a listing of the available documents and formats in which they may be obtained. Copies of the Draft EIS are also available for public inspection and review. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for locations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request copies of the Draft EIS or for additional information, contact: Mr. Scott Sands, FHWA, Colorado Division, 555 Zang Street, Room 250, Lakewood, CO, 80228, Telephone: (303) 969-6730 extension 362; or Mr. Wes Goff, Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 1, 18500 East Colfax Avenue, Aurora, CO 80011, Telephone: (303) 757-9647.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Hearing Dates and Locations:

Tuesday, July 25, 2000: Louviers Village Club House (5 p.m.-7 p.m.)

Wednesday, July 26, 2000: Lone Tree Civic Center (5 p.m.-7 p.m.)

Thursday, July 27, 2000: Douglas County Building (5 p.m.-7 p.m.)

Copies of the Draft EIS are available in hard copy format for public inspection at:

- CDOT Arapahoe Residency, 359 Inverness Drive South, Suite K, Englewood, CO 80112, 303-790-1020
- CDOT Office of Environmental Services, 1325 South Colorado Boulevard, Suite B400, Denver, CO 80222, 303-757-9259
- CDOT Region 1, 18500 E Colfax Avenue, Aurora, CO 80010, 303-757-9371
- Douglas County Planning Department, 100 Third Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104, 303-660-7490
- Federal Highway Administration, 555 Zang Street, Room 250, Lakewood, CO 80228, 303-969-6730
- Highlands Ranch Library, 48 West Springer Drive, Littleton, CO 80129-2314, 303-791-7703
- Lone Tree Library, 8827 Lone Tree Parkway, Lone Tree, CO 80124-8961, 303-799-4446
- Louviers Library, 7885 Louviers Boulevard, Louviers, CO 80131-9900, 303-791-7323
- Parker Library, 10851 South Crossroads Drive, Parker, CO 80134-9081, 303-841-3503
- PBS&J, 5500 Greenwood Plaza Blvd., Suite 150, Englewood, CO 80111, 303-221-7275
- Philip S. Miller Library, 961 S. Plum Creek Road, Castle Rock, CO 80104, 303-688-5157
- The document is also available on the project Website: www.southi25.com

Background

This Draft EIS provides a detailed evaluation of the South I-25 Corridor and US 85 Corridor improvement project. The project corridors both lie within Douglas County, Colorado. The I-25 Corridor extends from C-470 at approximate milepost 195 to the southern limit of Castle Rock at

approximate milepost 178 and the US 85 Corridor extends from C-470 at approximate milepost 200 to Castle Rock at approximate milepost 184. This Draft EIS includes an examination of the purpose and need, alternatives under consideration, travel demand, affected environment, environmental consequences, and mitigation measures as a result of the improvements under consideration. Three alternatives, including the No-Action Alternative, and several other I-25 improvement options are considered for improvements to the I-25 Corridor. Two alternatives, including the No-Action Alternative, and one other US 85 improvement option are considered for improvements to the US 85 Corridor. CDOT was the lead agency for the preparation of the Draft EIS.

The FHWA, the CDOT, and other local agencies invite interested individuals, organizations, and Federal, State, and local agencies to comment on the evaluated alternatives and associated social, economic, or environmental impacts related to the alternatives.

Issued on: June 23, 2000.

James Daves,

Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Lakewood, Colorado.

[FR Doc. 00-16853 Filed 7-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-99-6685; Notice 2]

General Motors Corporation, Grant of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

General Motors Corporation (GM) has determined that certain 1999 Chevrolet vehicles are not in compliance with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 120, "Tire selection and rims for motor vehicles other than passenger cars" and 49 CFR Part 567, "Certification" and has filed an appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Reports." GM 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.

Notice of receipt of the application was published, with a 30-day comment period, on January 19, 2000, in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 3004). NHTSA received no comments.

The purpose of FMVSS No. 120 according to S2 is "to provide safe operational performance of vehicles by ensuring that vehicles to which it applies are equipped with tires of adequate size and load rating, and rims of appropriate size and type designation." Paragraph S5.2 of FMVSS No. 120 requires that each rim be marked with specific information, including the rim size designation which indicates the source of the rim's published nominal dimensions, and the rim size designation. For example: "20 x 5.50," or "20 x 5.5."

Between March 1, 1999, and March 13, 1999, GM produced 5,079 Chevrolet Blazers and Chevrolet S-10 pickup trucks, some of which may be equipped with one or more than one of the 1,658 wheels that are missing the width designation in the rim marking on the back side of the wheel. In the original petition, GM stated that this missing data affected 11,522 vehicles; however, on March 6, 2000, the agency received a follow-up letter from GM stating that only 5,079 vehicles may be affected. GM's wheel supplier, Reynolds-Rualca, Venezuela, produced 3,721 wheels that had an error in the rim size designation. Instead of the correct rim size designation of "15 x 7," these wheels have a rim size designation of "15 x ." The error occurred when one of the wheel casting molds was refurbished. Of the 3,721 mis-marked wheels produced, 2,063 were located and correctly stamped with the missing rim width. The remaining 1,658 wheels were installed on the Chevrolet vehicles. The rim markings other than the rim width designation were not affected by the refurbishing error, and the remainder of the rim marking information, including rim diameter, is correct on all of the 1,658 wheels.

GM supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance by stating the following:

1. "The tire and rim of the affected wheels are properly matched, and are appropriate for the load-carrying characteristics of these vehicles. The lack of complete marking has no effect on the performance of the tire/rim combination of the subject vehicles."

2. "These vehicles have a placard on the left front door that contains the correct and complete tire and rim sizes installed on these vehicles. The placard on the subject vehicles shows rim size completely and correctly as 15x7J."

3. "The owner's manual provided with these vehicles contains a section 'Buying New Tires.' The text of this section advises the customer that they should look at the Certification/Tire Label to find out what kind and size of

tires they need. It goes on to tell them that they should get new tires with the same Tire Performance Criteria Specification (TPC Spec) that the vehicle came with, and that they can find the TPC number on each tire's sidewall. Finally it advises them that if they were to replace the tires with those not having the TPC Spec number found on the original equipment tires, they should make sure that the tires they choose are the same size, load range, speed rating and construction type as the original tires. Nowhere are customers told to look at the wheel to determine the appropriate tire."

4. "General Motors believes that very few of these wheels will ever have to be replaced over the life of the vehicle. Nevertheless, the owner's manual provided with these vehicles contains a section 'Wheel Replacement.' This section states that each new wheel should have the same load-carrying, diameter, width, offset and be mounted in the same way as the one it replaces. It also advises customers that their dealer will know the kind of wheel they need. The wheels at issue here are not marked with an incorrect width. Rather, they have no width marking. Therefore a dealer would not be misled by a width marking on the wheel, but would look at the placard if they were not aware of the exact width."

5. "If a customer needs to replace a tire or a wheel, he/she is likely to go to a tire/wheel store, or a vehicle dealer. The skilled personnel at any of these places know how to determine the correct tire or wheel size that they are replacing. For the tire replacement, it is highly probable that they will first look at the tire sidewall to determine the replacement tire size. They also know that the information exists on the placard and may look at the placard. For the wheel replacement, they may look at the tire placard or at the wheel itself to determine the replacement size. The subject wheels do not give incorrect information, however the information is incomplete. Since the information on the wheel is incomplete, the person looking at it will look elsewhere to find the missing information prior to selecting replacement wheel or tire size. For the correct tire selection, rim diameter is of primary importance, and the tire diameter must be the same as the rim diameter. The information on the subject wheels does contain the correct rim diameter, *i.e.*, 15."

The purpose for the rim marking requirements in FMVSS No. 120 is to provide the owner with permanent rim size and type designation information necessary to ensure proper selection and matching of rims and tires. Without