archives pertaining to the internal armed conflict; and
(C) The Guatemalan Air Force, Navy, and Army Corps of Engineers are cooperating with the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG) by granting access to CICIG personnel, providing evidence to CICIG, and allowing witness testimony.

This Certification shall be published in the Federal Register, and copies shall be transmitted to the appropriate committees of Congress.

[FR Doc. 2011–2523 Filed 2–3–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4710–29–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Airfield Improvement Program at Palm Beach International Airport, West Palm Beach, FL

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Location of Proposed Action: The Palm Beach International Airport (PBJA) is located in east Palm Beach County, Florida, adjacent to the City of West Palm Beach and immediately east of the Town of Haverhill.

SUMMARY: The FAA announces that the FEIS for the proposed Airfield Improvement Program (AIP) at PBJA is available for public review.

The FEIS includes the Section 106 consultation with the Florida State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places (Keeper) regarding the National Register eligibility of properties within the EIS Area of Potential Effect (APE) and the proposed action’s potential effect to historic resources eligible for, or listed-in, the National Register of Historic Places.

Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA), as amended, the proposed AIP is being evaluated in the FEIS for consistency with the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP). Comments regarding the compatibility of the No-Action Alternative, the AIP, and Alternative 2 with regard to Section 106 resources and the Florida’s Coastal Management Program are encouraged by the FAA.

The FAA is seeking comments on those sections of the FEIS that have been updated and/or contain information that has become available since the release of the DEIS. Please see the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section below for more information.

Updated information regarding the forecasts of aviation operations at PBJA became available and was published following the public availability of the September, 2008 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Also, Palm Beach County (the Airport Sponsor) submitted to the FAA a revised implementation plan and schedule for the proposed AIP after the publication of the DEIS. The FAA determined that this information should be considered by the agency and be disclosed to the public in the FEIS.

All comments on the FEIS are to be submitted to Mr. Bart Vernace of the FAA, at the address shown in the section below entitled For Further Information or to Submit Comments Contact. The FAA is providing a forty-five (45) day comment period for the public to comment on the FEIS. The comment period begins on the date of the publication of this Notice of Availability (NOA) in the Federal Register, and will close on March 21, 2011.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA, as the lead Federal agency, has prepared the EIS for the proposed AIP at PBJA. The FAA published a DEIS in September, 2008. The DEIS was prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The DEIS comparatively assessed and disclosed the potential future impacts of the No-Action Alternative (no development at PBJA besides that which has already been planned, environmentally reviewed, and/or that are needed for safety, security or maintenance reasons), and two proposed action alternatives, designated as the Airport Sponsor’s AIP (Proposed Project) and Alternative 2.

The primary capacity enhancement elements of these two proposed action alternatives consists of the following:

AIP—relocate existing Runway 10R/28L 100 feet south of its existing location and expand the runway to a length of 8,000 feet and a width of 150 feet; Alternative 2—construct new Runway 10L/28R located 800 feet north of existing Runway 10L/28R to a length of 10,000 feet and a width of 150 feet. Both the AIP and Alternative 2 include other less substantial airport-related projects that are either associated with the primary runway development components of each alternative or are stand-alone projects that could be constructed by the Airport Sponsor outside of the EIS process.

Since the publication of the DEIS, the economic recession has resulted in a decrease in aviation activity at PBJA and changes in the FAA’s forecasts of aviation activity for both PBJA and for the national system. The actual and forecast decrease in aircraft operations at PBJA have been, and are expected to continue to be, substantial enough to bring into question the initially proposed timing for implementation of the airport improvement program studied in the DEIS. As a result, the FAA made a determination that the 2006 PBJA Master Plan Update forecasts approved for use in the DEIS, and which were used as the basis for the justification for the airport capacity enhancement component of the Airport Sponsor’s AIP, were no longer appropriate for use in determining the timing for the implementation of the AIP and Alternative 2. After the publication of the DEIS, and the review of comments on the DEIS, the FAA determined that a more recent forecast of aviation activity that is representative of the changed conditions at PBJA should be used for the FEIS.

Subsequently, the FAA decided that the agency’s own 2009 Terminal Area Forecast (2009 TAF) would be the most applicable forecast of aviation activity...
Near-Term AIP Project through the relocation of Concourses and Runway 14/32, relocation of portions of the Runway 10L/28R as described above, the closure of the Near-Term AIP Projects would be constructed and operational by the year 2015. However, the FAA acknowledges that the development schedule for future GA facilities would be influenced by prevailing market conditions, the demand for additional GA facilities, and respective business decisions by the Airport Sponsor and Fixed Base Operators (FBO’s). Therefore, the build-out of the Near-Term AIP or Near-Term Alternative 2 GA facilities could occur sometime before or after the FEIS Near-Term study year of 2015.

Through the EIS process and the FAA’s subsequent ROD, the Airport Sponsor is also requesting the FAA’s “conditional” approval of the Long-Term AIP Project. The Long-Term AIP Project consists of the primary airfield capacity enhancement components of the AIP, which includes the relocation and expansion of Runway 10R/28L and connected actions, as well as other minor stand-alone airport improvement projects. The Long-Term AIP Project would be considered by the FAA for unconditional approval only when the number of aircraft operations at PBIA returns to the levels that would cause unacceptable aircraft operational delay. At such time that this occurs, the FAA will consider the appropriate level of additional NEPA processing and environmental analysis/documentation that may be needed to fully evaluate and disclose the potential environmental impacts associated with the Long-Term AIP Project and its connected actions.

Public Comment: Because of the amount of time that has elapsed since the publication of the DEIS, the consideration of revised forecasts (FAA’s 2009 TAF) in the FEIS, and the Airport Sponsor’s revised implementation plan and schedule for the proposed project, the FAA is seeking comments on its FEIS for a period of 45 days following the publication of the NOI of the proposed action.

Comments can only be accepted with the full name and address of the individual commenting. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, be advised that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask the FAA in your comment to withhold from public review your personal identifying information, the FAA cannot guarantee that it will be able to do so.

For Further Information or to Submit Comments Contact: Mr. Bart Vernace, FAA’s Assistant Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, Orlando Airports District Office, 5950 Hazeltine National Drive, Citadel International Building, Suite 400, Orlando, Florida. Contact Bart Vernace at (407) 812–6331.

The Airport Sponsor is requesting the FAA’s “conditional” approval of the Near-Term AIP Project through the FAA’s findings and determinations in its Record of Decision (ROD) on the FEIS. If “unconditional” approval is granted by the FAA in its ROD, the Airport Sponsor anticipates that the Near-Term AIP Projects would be constructed and operational by the year 2015.
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration


Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Request for public comment on an extension of a currently approved collection.

SUMMARY: Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatement of previously approved collections.

This document describes one collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 5, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Comments must refer to the docket notice numbers cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted to Docket Management, Room W12–140, Ground level, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590 by any of the following methods:


C. Hand Delivery/Courier: 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590.

D. Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590.

E. Fax: (202) 493–2251.

F. Telephone: (202) 366–0846.

Note: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number for this proposed collection of information. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://dms.dot.gov including any personal information provided.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number for this proposed collection of information. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to http://dms.dot.gov including any personal information provided. NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Complete copies of each request for collection of information may be obtained at no charge from Carlita Ballard, NHTSA 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE., Room W43–439, NVS–131, Washington, DC 20590. Ms. Ballard’s telephone number is (202) 366–0846.

Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to its OMB Control Number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before an agency submits a proposed collection of information to OMB for approval, it must first publish a document in the Federal Register providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB’s regulation (5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following:

(i.) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii.) The accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii.) How to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected and;

(iv.) How to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses.

In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks for public comments on the following proposed collections of information:

Title: Procedures for Selecting Lines to be Covered by the Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR 542)

OMB Control Number: 2127–0539

Form Number: None.

Affected Public: Motor vehicle manufacturers.

Requested Expiration Date of Approval: Three years from approval date.

Abstract: Manufacturers of light duty trucks must identify new model introductions that are likely to be high-theft lines as defined in 49 U.S.C. 33104.

Estimated Annual Burden: 315 hours.

Number of Respondents: 7.

In 1984, Congress enacted the Motor Vehicle Theft Law Enforcement Act (the 1984 Theft Act). As a means to prevent the theft of motor vehicles for their parts, the 1984 Theft Act required vehicle manufacturers to mark the major parts of “high-theft” passenger cars and the major replacement parts for those cars. The Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 (ACTA) amended the 1984 Theft Act to extend its provisions to multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPVs) and light duty trucks (LDTs).

The 1984 Theft Act, as amended by ACTA, requires NHTSA to promulgate a theft prevention standard for the designation of high-theft vehicle lines. The specific lines are to be selected by agreement between the manufacturer and the agency. If there is a disagreement of the selection, the statute states that the agency shall select such lines and parts, after notice to the manufacturer and an opportunity for written comment. NHTSA’s procedures for selecting high theft vehicle lines are contained in 49 CFR part 542.

In a final rule published on April 6, 2004, the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard was extended to include all passenger cars and multipurpose passenger vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating of 6,000 pounds or less, regardless of whether they were likely to be high or low theft, and to light duty trucks with major parts that are interchangeable with a majority of the covered major parts of multipurpose passenger vehicles. The final rule became effective September 1, 2006.

As a result of this amendment, determination of high theft status is required only for LDTs manufactured on or after that date. There are seven vehicle manufacturers who produce...