

Dated: December 31, 2002.

**J.B. Penn,**

*Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign  
Agricultural Services.*

Dated: January 3, 2003.

**Thomas C. Dorr,**

*Under Secretary for Rural Development.*

[FR Doc. 03-394 Filed 1-8-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-05-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Office of the Secretary

#### 14 CFR Parts 255 and 399

[Docket Nos. OST-97-2881, OST-97-3014,  
OST-98-4775, and OST-99-5888]

RIN 2105-AC65

#### Computer Reservations System (CRS) Regulations; Statements of General Policy

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary,  
Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; notice of petition  
response date.

**SUMMARY:** The Department has issued a notice of proposed rulemaking that proposes to readopt and amend its existing rules governing airline computer reservations systems (CRSs) and to clarify the requirements of its Statements of General Policy on travel agency disclosure of any agency service fees. Sabre, one of the CRSs, has filed a petition asking for a fact hearing. The Department is now establishing January 13, 2003, as the due date for responses to Sabre's petition.

**DATES:** Responses to Sabre's petition are due January 13, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Thomas Ray, Office of the General Counsel, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590, (202) 366-4731.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

The Department has begun a rulemaking to reexamine whether it should maintain its existing rules governing CRS operations. We issued a notice of proposed rulemaking that set forth our tentative proposals regarding the existing rules and our tentative belief that we should not extend the rules to cover the sale of airline tickets through the Internet. 67 FR 69366 (November 15, 2002). We stated our intent to follow the notice-and-comment procedures established by the Administrative Procedure Act for informal rulemakings. 67 FR 69369. Comments and reply comments on our notice of proposed rulemaking are now due March 16 and May 15, 2003. 67 FR 72869 (December 9, 2002).

On December 23 Sabre filed a petition asking us to hold a "Fact Hearing." Sabre asserts that our notice did not provide an adequate factual basis for our tentative decision that we should maintain the existing rules with some changes. The hearing sought by Sabre would include, among other things, testimony from a Department official on the factual basis underlying these decisions.

Delta Airlines, assuming that answers to Sabre's petition would normally be due January 3, has filed a motion asking that answers be due January 13. Sabre filed its 33-page petition on December 23. Delta contends that it did not receive a copy of the petition until December 30, since Sabre had served it by mail, that Delta would have only two business days to prepare its response if it were required to respond by January 3, and that a 10-day extension would be reasonable. Delta notes that the petition seeks extraordinary relief and raises a number of controversial legal issues.

We believe that Delta's request is reasonable and that responses by other parties would assist our consideration of Sabre's petition. Given the holidays and the unusual nature of Sabre's petition, establishing January 13 as the due date for answers would give the parties an adequate time to respond without delaying the rulemaking. We therefore invite interested persons to file answers by January 13.

Issued in Washington, DC on January 2, 2003.

**Kirk K. Van Tine,**

*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 03-355 Filed 1-8-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-63-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Customs Service

#### 19 CFR Part 101

#### Expansion of the Port Limits of Portland, MA

**AGENCY:** Customs Service, Department  
of the Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes to amend the Customs regulations pertaining to the field organization of Customs by extending the geographical limits of the port of entry of Portland, Maine, to include the City of Auburn, Maine. This proposed change is being made to provide better service to carriers, importers, and the general public.

**DATE:** Comments must be received on or before March 10, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments must be submitted to the U. S. Customs Service, Office of Regulations and Rulings, Attention: Regulations Branch, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20229. Submitted comments may be inspected at the U.S. Customs Service, 799 9th Street, NW., Washington, DC, during regular business hours. Arrangements to inspect submitted comments should be made in advance by calling Mr. Joseph Clark at 202-572-8768.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Keith Fleming, Office of Field Operations, at 202-927-1049.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Background

To provide better service to carriers, importers, and the general public, Customs proposes to amend § 101.3(b)(1), Customs regulations (19 CFR 101.3(b)(1)), by extending the geographical limits of the port of entry of Portland, Maine.

#### Current Port Limits of Portland, Maine

The current port limits of Portland, Maine, as extended by Executive Order (E. O.) 9297 of February 1, 1943 (8 FR 1479), include Portland, Maine, and the territory embracing the municipalities of South Portland, Falmouth, and Cape Elizabeth, in the State of Maine, and Peak, Long, Cliff, Cushing, and Diamond Islands, in the State of Maine.

#### Proposed Expansion of Port

It is proposed to expand the port limits of the port of entry of Portland, Maine, to include the City of Auburn, Maine.

Customs proposes to include the City of Auburn within the port limits to facilitate the clearance of international cargo at the Auburn Intermodal Facility ("AIF"). AIF is a rail/truck intermodal facility with a high cube, doublestack intermodal terminal worldwide.

If the proposed extension of the Portland, Maine, port of entry limits to include the City of Auburn, Maine, is adopted, the limits of port column adjacent to the listing of Portland, Maine, in the list of Customs ports of entry in § 101.3(b)(1) will be amended accordingly.

#### Authority

This change is proposed under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 301 and 19 U.S.C. 2, 66 and 1624.

#### Comments

Before adopting this proposal, consideration will be given to any