that would be rendered by the proposed computational methodology.

In summary, the proposed rule amendments would enable the Exchange, for margin purposes, to accommodate the many types of spread strategies utilized in the industry today in a fair and efficient manner.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) [20] of the Act and the rules and regulations under the Act, in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5).[21] Because this rule filing proposes a single, universal definition of a spread and one spread margin requirement that consists of a universal margin requirement computation methodology, it promotes just and equitable principles of trade and fosters cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities. By adding clarity and consistency to margin requirements, it also removes impediments to and perfects the mechanisms of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

CBOE does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received from Members, Participants, or Others

The Exchange neither solicited nor received comments on the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or within such longer period (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the self-regulatory organization consents, the Commission will:

(A) By order approve or disapprove such proposed rule change, or

(B) Institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

[20] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[21] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml);* or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov*. Please include File Number SR–CBOE–2012–043 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Elizabeth M. Murphy, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–CBOE-*2012–043.* This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml).* Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549 on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of such filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–CBOE–2012–043 and should be submitted on or before June 28, 2012.

[22] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[22]

Kevin M. O'Neill,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012–13763 Filed 6–6–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

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 May 2012, there were three applications approved. This notice also includes information on one application, approved in April 2012, inadvertently left off the April 2012 notice. Additionally, four 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.

PFC Applications Approved

PUBLIC AGENCY: Tri State Airport Authority, Huntington, West Virginia.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 12–07–C–00–HTS.

APPLICATION TYPE: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC LEVEL: $4.50.

TOTAL PFC REVENUE APPROVED IN THIS DECISION: $2,369,532.

EARLIEST CHARGE EFFECTIVE DATE: July 1, 2012.

ESTIMATED CHARGE EXPIRATION DATE: October 1, 2017.

CLASS OF AIR CARRIERS NOT REQUIRED TO COLLECT PFC'S: None.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use

Terminal center—phase I.

PFC application.

Improve airport drainage.

Acquire snow removal equipment.

Install perimeter fencing.

Rehabilitate terminal building.

Rehabilitate taxiway A (west).

Access road repair.

Rehabilitate taxiways g, E, C, F, and A (ramp edge).

Terminal center—phase II.

Environmental assessment—airfield development.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection

Relocate taxiway A (east).

Install airport beacon.

Security enhancements.

Access road and parking lot.

Terminal center—phase III.

Acquire runway protection zone land.

Rehabilitate terminal building—phase IV.

Reconfigure airside terminal.

Replace airfield generators.

Seal coat runway.

DECISION DATE: April 30, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew DiGiulian, Beckley Airports Field Office, (304) 252–6217.

PUBLIC AGENCY: Tulsa Airports Improvement Trust, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 12–08–C–00–TUL.

APPLICATION TYPE: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC LEVEL: $4.50.

TOTAL PFC REVENUE APPROVED IN THIS DECISION: $3,430,000.

EARLIEST CHARGE EFFECTIVE DATE: June 1, 2020.

ESTIMATED CHARGE EXPIRATION DATE: December 1, 2020.

CLASS OF AIR CARRIERS NOT REQUIRED TO COLLECT PFC'S: Air taxi/commercial operators filing FAA Form 1800–31.

DETERMINATION: Approved. Based on information contained in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the proposed class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at Tulsa International Airport.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use

Design and enabling projects for concourse A rehabilitation and improvement.

Passenger loading bridges.

Security exit lane equipment.

PFC consulting fees.

Brief Description of Disapproved Project

Electrical generators.

DETERMINATION: Disapproved. This project did not meet the requirements of § 158.15(b).

DECISION DATE: May 8, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Don Harris, Arkansas/Oklahoma Airports Development Office, (817) 222–5634.

PUBLIC AGENCY: Port of Port Angeles, Port Angeles, Washington.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 12–08–C–00–CLM.

APPLICATION TYPE: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC LEVEL: $3.00.

TOTAL PFC REVENUE APPROVED IN THIS DECISION: $161,209.

EARLIEST CHARGE EFFECTIVE DATE: July 1, 2012.

ESTIMATED CHARGE EXPIRATION DATE: April 1, 2014.

CLASS OF AIR CARRIERS NOT REQUIRED TO COLLECT PFC'S: None.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use

Terminal entrance road construction.

Taxilanes construction, phase II.

Terminal apron reconstruction.

Runway 8/26 lighting rehabilitation.

Taxilanes construction, phase III.

PFC administration.

DECISION DATE: May 8, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Trang Tran, Seattle Airports District Office, (425) 227–1662.

PUBLIC AGENCY: Yuma County Airport Authority, Yuma, Arizona.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 12–04–C–00–NYL.

APPLICATION TYPE: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC LEVEL: $4.50.

TOTAL PFC REVENUE APPROVED IN THIS DECISION: $250,000.

EARLIEST CHARGE EFFECTIVE DATE: July 1, 2018.

ESTIMATED CHARGE EXPIRATION DATE: October 1, 2021.

CLASS OF AIR CARRIERS NOT REQUIRED TO COLLECT PFC'S: Nonscheduled/on-demand air carriers filing FAA Form 1800–31.

DETERMINATION: Approved. Based on information contained in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the proposed class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at Yuma Marine Corps Air Station/Yuma International Airport.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Collection and Use

Widen parallel taxiway Z.

DECISION DATE: May 18, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Darlene Williams, Los Angeles Airports District Office, (310) 725–3625.

AMENDMENT TO PFC APPROVALS

Amendment No. city, state	Amendment approved date	Original approved net PFC revenue	Amended estimated net PFC revenue	Original estimated charge expiration date	Amended estimated charge expiration date
05–05–C–07–EWR Newark, NJ	04/06/12	$556,442,435	$566,136,035	07/1/11	09/1/11
10–08–C–01–SAV Savannah, GA	05/03/12	4,066,265	6,669,248	04/1/16	12/1/16
11–17–C–02–BNA Nashville, TN	05/04/12	2,512,500	2,797,105	03/1/17	06/1/17
08–07–C–01–DTW Detroit, MI	05/18/12	257,020,320	227,653,568	08/1/34	02/1/34

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 31, 2012.

Joe Hebert,

Manager, Financial Analysis and Passenger Facility Charge Branch.

[FR Doc. 2012–13690 Filed 6–6–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2012–0045; Notice 1]

Hyundai Motor Company, Receipt of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Receipt of petition.

SUMMARY: Hyundai America Technical Center, Inc., on behalf of Hyundai Motor Company (collectively referred to as ''Hyundai'') [1] has determined that certain model year 2012 Hyundai Veracruz multipurpose passenger vehicles (MPV) manufactured August 9, 2011, through January 8, 2012, that were equipped with 7J x 18 wheel rims, do not fully comply with paragraph S4.3.3 of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 110, *Tire Selection and Rims and Motor Home/Recreation Vehicle Trailer Load Carrying Capacity Information for Motor Vehicles with a GVWR of 4,536 Kilograms (10,000 pounds) or less.* Hyundai has filed an appropriate report dated February 9, 2012, pursuant to 49 CFR part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports.*

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) (see implementing rule at 49 CFR part 556), Hyundai submitted a petition for an exemption from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. chapter 301 on the basis that this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

This notice of receipt of Hyundai's petition is published under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120 and does not represent any agency decision or other exercise of judgment concerning the merits of the petition.

Vehicles involved: Affected are approximately 2,764 model year 2012 Hyundai Veracruz vehicles produced beginning on August 9, 2011, through January 8, 2012, that were equipped with 7J x 18 wheel rims at the assembly plant.

NHTSA notes that the statutory provisions (49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h)) that permit manufacturers to file petitions for a determination of inconsequentiality allow NHTSA to exempt manufacturers only from the duties found in sections 30118 and 30120, respectively, to notify owners, purchasers, and dealers of a defect or noncompliance and to remedy the defect or noncompliance. Therefore, these provisions only apply to the subject 2,764 [2] vehicles that Hyundai no longer controlled at the time it determined that the noncompliance existed.

Noncompliance: Hyundai explains that the noncompliance is that the rim size information required by paragraph S4.3.3 of FMVSS No. 110 was omitted from the certification labels that it installed on the affected vehicles.

Rule text: Paragraph S4.3.3 of FMVSS No. 110 requires:

S4.3.3 Additional labeling information for vehicles other than passenger cars. Each vehicle shall show the size designation and, if applicable, the type designation of rims (not necessarily those on the vehicle) appropriate for the tire appropriate for use on that vehicle, including the tire installed as original equipment on the vehicle by the vehicle manufacturer, after each GAWR listed on the certification label required by § 567.4 or § 567.5 of this chapter. This information shall be in the English language, lettered in block capitals and numerals not less than 2.4 millimeters high and in the following format

Truck Example—Suitable Tire-Rim Choice
GVWR: 2,441 kilograms (5381 pounds).
GAWR: Front—1,299 kilograms (2,864 pounds) with P265/70R16 tires, 16 x 8.0 rims at 248 kPa (36 psi) cold single.
GAWR: Rear—1,299 kilograms (2,864 pounds) with P265/70R16 tires, 16 x 8.00 rims, at 248 kPa (36 psi) cold single.

Summary of Hyundai's Analysis and Arguments

Hyundai believes that the missing rim size information on the certification label is inconsequential as it relates to motor vehicle safety, because this information is readily available to the vehicle owner through other sources that are required to be furnished with the vehicle. The rim size is marked on the rims and is included in the Owner's Manual, which is referenced as an information source by the tire placard which is positioned adjacent to the certification label on the ''B'' pillar. FMVSS No. 110 paragraph 4.4.2(b) [3] requires that each rim be marked with the rim size designation. The affected vehicles are equipped with rims that are marked with the rim size and meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 110 paragraph 4.4.2.

Additionally, the tire placard required by FMVSS No. 110 paragraph 4.3(d) requires that the tire size designation be provided for the tires installed at the time of the first purchase and FMVSS No. 110 paragraph S4.3(f) requires that the placard state ''See Owner's Manual for Additional Information''. The affected vehicles are equipped with placards that meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 110 paragraph 4.3.

Hyundai also stated that they are not aware of any notices, bulletins, or other communications that relate directly to the noncompliance sent to more than one manufacturer, distributor, dealer, or purchaser.

Hyundai has additionally informed NHTSA that it has corrected the noncompliance so that all future production vehicles will comply with FMVSS No. 110.

In summation, Hyundai believes that the described noncompliance of its vehicles is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety, and that its petition, to exempt from providing recall notification of noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30118 and remedying the recall noncompliance as required by 49 U.S.C. 30120 should be granted.

Comments: Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments on this petition. Comments must refer to the docket and notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted by any of the following methods:

a. *By mail addressed to:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

b. *By hand delivery to:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. The Docket Section is open on weekdays from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. except Federal Holidays.

c. *Electronically:* By logging onto the Federal Docket Management System

[1] Hyundai America Technical Center, Inc., is a corporation registered under the laws of the state of Michigan.

[2] Hyundai's petition, which was filed under 49 CFR part 556, requests an agency decision to exempt Hyundai as a motor vehicle manufacturer from the notification and recall responsibilities of 49 CFR part 573 for the 2,764 affected vehicles. However, a decision on this petition will not relieve vehicle distributors and dealers of the prohibitions on the sale, offer for sale, introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of the noncompliant vehicles under their control after Hyundai notified them that the subject noncompliance existed.

[3] The citation that Hyundai referenced for rim size designation marking requirements in its petition, paragraph S4.2.2, is incorrect. The correct citation is paragraph S4.4.2.