

considers IAPs for cancellation, the FAA will publish a list of potential IAPs in the **Federal Register** for notice and comment. Submitted comments will be reviewed and addressed in the final list of subject IAPs published in the **Federal Register**. The criteria proposed in this notice does not affect any NAS navigational back-up plans and is not a part of the FAA's VOR minimum operating network (MON) initiative.

Proposed Policy

The NDB and VOR IAPs recommended for cancellation would be selected at airports using the following criteria. It must be noted that all airports that have existing RNAV and ground-based IAPs would maintain at least one RNAV and one ground-based IAP.

Airports that would be considered for NDB or VOR IAP cancellation:

- All airports with an NDB IAP.
- All airports with a VOR/DME RNAV IAP, unless it is the only IAP at the airport.
- All airports with two or more ground-based IAPs and an RNAV IAP.
- All airports with multiple, redundant ground-based IAPs (e.g., three VOR procedures).

Additional consideration would be given to the following factors in determining the list of potential candidates for cancellation:

- Prevailing wind runways.
- Prevailing runway alignment during adverse weather operations.
- If an airport has a published ILS IAP and additional ground-based IAPs, cancel the procedure to the same runway as the ILS.
- For airports with multiple VOR and NDB IAP's, retain the IAP with the lowest minimums (if minimums are within 20 feet of each other retain the procedure that allows optimum use by all customers (i.e. VOR and VOR/DME retain VOR because there are no equipment limitations).

Airports that would not be considered for NDB or VOR IAP cancellations:

- Airport with only RNAV/RNPs IAPs published.
- Airport with only one ground-based procedure.
- Airports will not be considered if cancellation would result in removing all IAPs from the airport.

Lastly, the FAA is not considering the following types of procedures for cancellation:

- PBN Procedures (RNAV or RNP).
- ILS procedures.
- Localizer procedures.
- TACAN procedures.
- Standard Instrument Arrivals (STARs).

Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs).

Comments Invited

The FAA invites interested parties to submit written comments, data, or views. The agency also invites comments relating to the economic, environmental, energy, or federalism impacts that might result from adopting the proposals in this document. The most helpful comments reference a specific portion of the proposal, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data. To ensure the docket does not contain duplicate comments, commenters should send only one copy of written comments or, if comments are filed electronically, commenters should submit only one time.

The FAA will file in the docket all comments it receives. Before acting on this proposal, the FAA will consider all comments it receives on or before the closing date for comments. The FAA will consider comments filed after the comment period has closed if it is possible to do so without incurring expense or delay. The agency may change this proposal in light of the comments it receives.

Proprietary or Confidential Business Information: Commenters should not file proprietary or confidential business information in the docket. Such information must be sent or delivered directly to the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document, and marked as proprietary or confidential. If submitting information on a disk or CD-ROM, mark the outside of the disk or CD-ROM, and identify electronically within the disk or CD-ROM the specific information that is proprietary or confidential.

Under 14 CFR 11.35(b), the FAA is aware of proprietary information filed with a comment, the agency does not place it in the docket. It is held in a separate file to which the public does not have access and the FAA places a note in the docket that it has received it. If the FAA receives a request to examine or copy this information, it treats it as any other request under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). The FAA processes such a request under Department of Transportation procedures found in 49 CFR part 7.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 19, 2013.

Abigail Smith,

Aeronautical Navigation Products, Director.

[FR Doc. 2013-17940 Filed 8-1-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS)

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration.

ACTION: Notice of availability of Final EIS.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Part 1500-1508), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is issuing this notice to advise the public that a Final EIS for proposed improvements to Runway Safety Areas at the Kodiak Airport has been prepared and is available for public review.

Included in the Final EIS are a Subsistence Evaluation consistent with Section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act and a final evaluation pursuant to Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (recodified as 49 U.S.C. 303(c)).

ADDRESSES: Copies of the Final EIS may be viewed online or during regular business hours at the following locations:

1. Online at www.kodiakairporteis.com.
2. Federal Aviation Administration, Airports Division, 222 W. 7th Avenue #14, Anchorage, AK 99513-7587. (907) 271-5453.
3. Holmes Johnson Memorial Library, 319 Lower Mill Bay Road, Kodiak, AK 99615. (907) 486-8680.
4. Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, 4111 Aviation Avenue, Anchorage, AK 99502.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leslie Grey, Environmental Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Alaskan Region, Airports Division, address 222 W. 7th Avenue Box #14, Anchorage, AK 99513. Ms. Grey may be contacted during business hours at (907) 271-5453 (telephone) and (907) 271-2851 (fax), or by email at Leslie.Grey@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Final EIS discusses proposed improvements to the Runway Safety Areas for Runway 07/25 and Runway 18/36, which have the potential to result in significant adverse environmental impacts. The FAA has identified the following preferred alternatives to meet the need for improved Runway Safety Areas:

- Improvements to the Runway Safety Area for Runway 07/25: Alternative 2,

involving placement of fill off Runway end 25 and installation of an Engineered Material Arresting System (EMAS) bed on the newly constructed landmass.

- Improvements to the Runway Safety Area for Runway 18/36: Alternative 7, involving a landmass extension to the south beyond Runway end 36, shifting the runway to the south, and placing an EMAS bed to the north beyond Runway end 18.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*, 40 CFR Part 1500–1508

Issued in Anchorage, Alaska, on July 23, 2013.

Byron K. Huffman,

Manager, Airports Division, Alaskan Region.

[FR Doc. 2013–18537 Filed 8–1–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Research, Engineering and Development Advisory Committee

Pursuant to section 10(A) (2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92–463; 5 U.S.C. App. 2), notice is hereby given of a meeting of the FAA Research, Engineering and Development (R,E&D) Advisory Committee.

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

Name: Research, Engineering & Development Advisory Committee.

Time and Date: September 18—8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Place: Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW.—Round Room (10th Floor), Washington, DC 20591.

Purpose: The meeting agenda will include receiving from the Committee guidance for FAA's research and development investments in the areas of air traffic services, airports, aircraft safety, human factors and environment and energy. Attendance is open to the interested public but seating is limited. Persons wishing to attend the meeting or obtain information should contact Gloria Dunderman at (202) 267–8937 or gloria.dunderman@faa.gov. Members of the public may present a written statement to the Committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 25, 2013.

Gloria Dunderman,

Management & Program Analyst.

[FR Doc. 2013–18704 Filed 8–1–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2012–0108; Notice 2]

Bridgestone Americas Tire Operations, LLC, Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Grant of petition.

SUMMARY: Bridgestone Americas Tire Operations, LLC (Bridgestone),¹ has determined that certain Bridgestone brand replacement tires manufactured between June 19, 2011 and March 17, 2012, do not fully comply with paragraph § 5.5(f) of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 139, *New Pneumatic Radial Tires for Light Vehicles*. Bridgestone has filed an appropriate report dated July 19, 2012, pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118(d) and 30120(h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR Part 556, Bridgestone has petitioned 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. Notice of receipt of the petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on December 3, 2012 in the **Federal Register** (77 FR 71679). No comments were received. To view the petition and all supporting documents log onto the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) Web site at: <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Then follow the online search instructions to locate docket number “NHTSA–2012–0108.”

CONTACT INFORMATION: For further information on this decision contact Mr. Abraham Diaz, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), telephone (202) 366–5310, facsimile (202) 366–7002.

Equipment Involved: Affected are approximately 1,102 Firestone Firehawk Wide Oval AS size 245/40R19 and 245/35R20 brand tires manufactured between June 19, 2011, and March 17, 2012. Only 97 of the affected tires are no longer under the control of the petitioner. Therefore, only those 97 tires are the subject of this petition.

¹ Bridgestone Americas Tire Operations, LLC is a manufacturer of replacement equipment and is registered under the laws of the state of Delaware.

Rule Text: Section S5.5 of FMVSS No. 139 specifically states:

S5.5 Tire markings. Except as specified in paragraphs (a) through (i) of S5.5, each tire must be marked on each sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(a) through (d) and on one sidewall with the information specified in S5.5(e) through (i) according to the phase-in schedule specified in S7 of this standard. The markings must be placed between the maximum section width and the bead on at least one sidewall, unless the maximum section width of the tire is located in an area that is not more than one-fourth of the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire. If the maximum section width that falls within that area, those markings must appear between the bead and a point one-half the distance from the bead to the shoulder of the tire, on at least one sidewall. The markings must be in letters and numerals not less than 0.078 inches high and raised above or sunk below the tire surface not less than 0.015 inches . . .

(f) The actual number of plies in the sidewall, and the actual number of plies in the tread area, if different . . .

Summary of Bridgestone's Analyses: Bridgestone explains that the noncompliance is that due to a mold labeling error the sidewall marking on the reference side of the tires incorrectly describes the actual number of plies in the tread area of the tires and therefore does not comply with paragraph § 5.5(f) of FMVSS No. 139. Specifically, the tires in question were inadvertently manufactured with “TREAD 1 POLYESTER 2 STEEL 1 NYLON.” The labeling should have been “TREAD 1 POLYESTER 2 STEEL 2 NYLON.”

Bridgestone stated its belief that the subject noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety because the subject tires meet or exceed all performance requirements as required in part by FMVSS No. 139 and that the noncompliant labeling has no impact on the operational performance or safety of vehicles on which these tires are mounted.

Bridgestone points out that NHTSA has previously granted similar petitions for non-compliances in sidewall markings.

Bridgestone has also informed NHTSA that it has corrected future production and will re-label the 1,005 contained tires to reflect correct construction.

In summation, Bridgestone believes that the described noncompliance of the subject tires 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.