

staff and FAA Air Traffic Control representatives.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval signed by the FAA Associate Administrator for Airports on December 2, 2005. The Record of Approval, as well as other evaluation materials and the documents comprising the submittal, are available for review at the FAA office listed above and at the administrative offices of the Northwest Arkansas Regional Airport Authority. The Record of Approval also will be available on-line at <http://www.faa.gov/arp/environmental/14cfr150/index14.cfm>.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, December 23, 2005.

Kelvin L. Solco,

Manager, Airports Division.

[FR Doc. 05-24698 Filed 12-30-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Availability of Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) and Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f) Determination for the Final Environmental Assessment, Erie International Airport, Erie, PA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is issuing this notice to advise the public that it has issued a Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD), effective December 8, 2005, for the Final Environmental Assessment that evaluated the proposed extension of Runway 6-24 at Erie International Airport (ERI), Tom Ridge Field, Erie, Pennsylvania.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FAA has completed and issued its Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision (FONSI/ROD) for the proposed extension of Runway 6-24 at Erie International Airport, Tom Ridge Field, Erie, Pennsylvania. The FONSI/ROD sets out the FAA's consideration of environmental and other factors and is based on the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Extension of Runway 6-24 at Erie International Airport, Tom Ridge Field, Erie, Pennsylvania dated October 2005 and the Erie International Airport, Tom Ridge Field, Section 4(f) Report dated July 2005. Mitigation measures intended to minimize potential environmental

impacts are identified in the FONSI/ROD and would become part of this Runway Extension Project. There are no environmental impacts associated with the preferred alternative that cannot be mitigated below FAA established significance thresholds.

The project considers the proposed extension of Runway 6-24 at Erie International Airport. The runway extension is needed to accommodate existing and future aviation demand as demonstrated in the recently completed airport master plan.

The Final EA presented the purpose and need for the project, a comprehensive analysis of the alternatives to the proposed project, including No-Action Alternative and potential impacts associated with the proposed development of the Runway 6-24 extension at ERI. The Final EA also identified the FAA's Preferred Alternative (Build Alternative 3) and described the proposed Mitigation Program for the Preferred Alternative that will be implemented by the Erie Municipal Airport Authority to off-set unavoidable environmental impacts.

Copies of the FONSI/ROD are available for review by appointment only at the following locations.

Please call to make arrangements for viewing:

Federal Aviation Administration
Harrisburg Airports District Office, 3905 Hartzdale Drive, Suite 508, Camp Hill, PA 17011, (717) 730-2830 and Erie Municipal Airport Authority, 4411 W. 12th Street, Erie, PA 16505-3091, (814) 833-4258.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward S. Gabsewics, CEP, Environmental Protection Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Harrisburg Airports District Office, 3905 Hartzdale Drive, Suite 508, Camp Hill, PA 17011, Telephone 717-730-2832. Documents reflecting this FAA action may be reviewed at these same locations.

Issued in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, December 14, 2005.

Wayne T. Heibeck,

Manager, Harrisburg Airports District Office.

[FR Doc. 05-24700 Filed 12-30-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

RTCA Special Committee 202: Portable Electronic Devices

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of RTCA Special Committee 202 Meeting: Portable Electronic Devices.

SUMMARY: The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of RTCA Special Committee 202: Portable Electronic Devices.

DATES: The meeting will be held on January 30-31, February 1-3, 2006, from 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at Conference Rooms, 1828 L Street, NW., Suite 805, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: RTCA Secretariat, 1828 L Street, NW., Suite 805, Washington, DC, 20036-5133; telephone (202) 833-9339; fax (202) 833-9434; Web site <http://www.rtca.org>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub.L. 92-463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for a Special Committee 202 Portable Electronic Devices meeting. The agenda will include:

- January 30:
 - Working Groups (WG) 1 through 4 meet.
 - WG-1, PED Characterization, Garmin Room
 - WG-2, Aircraft Path Loss and Test, with WG-3, Aircraft Susceptibility, MacIntosh-NBAA-Hilton/ATA Room
 - WG-4, Risk Assessment, Mitigation, and Process, Colson Board Room
- January 31 and February 2:
 - Opening Plenary Session (Welcome and Introductory Remarks, Review Agenda, Review/Approve previous Common Plenary Summary, Review Open Action Items)
 - Update from Regulatory Agencies (FAA, UK-CAA, Canadian TSB, FCC or other)
 - Update from CEA PEDs Working Group by Doug Johnson of CEA
 - Update on CTIA Task Force on cell phones on airborne aircraft by Paul Guckian of QUALCOMM
 - Report on updates to GPS Sensitivity data of Table 6 by Robert Erlandson of OST Global
 - Report on cell phone demonstration on the 777-200LR Worldliner flight by Peter Tuggey of Aeromobile
 - Considerations to develop recommendation on Guidance for Airplane Design and Certification in support of Phase 2 TOR requirements by Dave Walen FAA CSTA EMI and Grey Dunn FAA ANM-111
 - Overview of comments received to proposed changes for Interim DO-294 update

- Plenary consensus on process to complete interim DO-294 document update, Working Groups comment disposition validation, action items to Working Groups, etc.
- Break-out sessions for Working Groups:
- Working Groups (WG) 1 through 5 meet.
- WG-1, PED Characterization, Garmin Room
- WG-2, Aircraft Path Loss and Test, with WG-3, Aircraft Susceptibility, MacIntosh-NBAA Hilton/ATA Room
- WG-4, Risk Assessment, Mitigation, and Process, Colson Board Room
- WG-5, Airplane Design and Certification Guidance, ARINC Conference Room
- Chairmen's strategy session with Work Group Leaders, MacIntosh-NBAA and Hilton-ATA Rooms
- Process check and readiness review for DO-294 document update
- February 2:
- Opening Remarks and Process Check
- Working Groups Report out on (Disposition of FRAC comments to DO-294 Interim document update; Issues identified, with recommendation to Plenary for consensus on closure of issues; Recommendations for Plenary consensus on document update final version; Schedule and TOR compliance assessment; Phase 2 work remaining; work plan and schedule)
- WG-1 (PEDs characterization, test and evaluation)
- WG-2 (Aircraft test and analysis)
- WG-3 (Aircraft systems susceptibility)
- Proposal for assessing aircraft systems susceptibility to Phase 2 technologies.
- WG-4 (Risk Assessment, Practical application, and final documentation)
- Collaboration with EUROCAE WG58
- WG-5 (Recommended Guidance for Airplane Design and Certification)
- Plenary consensus on Interim DO-294 update document recommendation to publish
- Updates to Phase 2 work statement, committee structure, work plan and schedule, including: Plan for access to material and organization of data in appendix CD for Phase 2 document Working Groups' teleconference and meeting schedule, plan for Phase 2 work completion
- Closing Session (Other Business,

Date and Place of Next Meeting (April 4-6, 2006, Fourteenth Plenary at RTCA; July 10-14, 2006, Fifteenth Plenary at RTCA; October 16-20, 2006, Sixteenth and final Plenary at RTCA, Closing Remarks, Adjourn)

- Working Groups to complete action items and complete interim update DO-294 for recommendation to PMC to publish

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairmen, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on December 23, 2005.

Natalie Ogletree,

FAA General Engineer, RTCA Advisory Committee

[FR Doc. 05-24699 Filed 12-30-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

Denial of Motor Vehicle Defect Petition

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

ACTION: Denial of a petition for a defect investigation.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a petition (Defect Petition 05-002) submitted by Mr. Jordan Ziprin to NHTSA's Office of Defects Investigation (ODI), by letter dated July 8, 2005, under 49 U.S.C. 30162, requesting that the agency commence a proceeding to determine the existence of a defect related to motor vehicle safety within the electronic throttle control (ETC) system in model year (MY) 2002 to 2005 Toyota and Lexus vehicles, or to reopen Preliminary Evaluation (PE) 04-021 whose subject was the ETC system on MY 2002 to 2003 Toyota Camry, Solara and Lexus ES models. In a letter dated August 18, 2005, Mr. Ziprin amended the petition to include additional allegations of interrelated brake and acceleration problems that allegedly result in inappropriate and uncontrollable vehicle accelerations in ETC equipped MY 2002 to 2005 Toyota and Lexus vehicles.

After reviewing the material cited by the petitioner and other information, NHTSA has concluded that further expenditure of the agency's investigative resources on the issues raised by the petition is not warranted. The agency accordingly has denied the petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Scott Yon, Vehicle Control Division, Office of Defects Investigation, NHTSA, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202-366-0139.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The petitioner owns a 2002 Toyota Camry with V6 engine that he purchased new in March 2002. On July 5, 2005, at approximately 8:45 p.m., the petitioner parked his vehicle in the driveway of a home near his residence in Phoenix, Arizona and exited the vehicle. Upon determining that he was at the wrong address, he re-entered the vehicle, started the engine, placed his foot on the brake pedal and shifted the gear selector to reverse. The petitioner states that he was steering clockwise as the vehicle drifted backwards from the driveway under its own power. He alleges that without application of the throttle the vehicle suddenly accelerated backwards at a high rate causing a loss of vehicle control. The vehicle appears to have moved in a circular path and came to rest with the driver's door abutted to a utility box situated on a concrete pad in front of the home adjacent to where the vehicle had been parked. According to the petitioner, he does not recall if he applied, or attempted to apply, the brake pedal during this incident. He stated, however, that he is sure he would not have applied the throttle since no application was necessary for vehicle movement. Although the exact distance and path the vehicle traveled during the incident is unknown, the vehicle damage¹ and incident site evidence suggests the vehicle yawed (rotated about a vertical axis) through a significant angle to reach its final rest position; this is consistent with the petitioner's statement that the vehicle accelerated at a high rate and is an indication that a significant throttle opening occurred. Additionally, the petitioner describes another incident² that happened in April 2002, within the first few weeks of his ownership, stating that he did not report the incident at that time because he felt that his unfamiliarity with the vehicle may have caused an error that lead to the incident.

¹ Repair damage for the petitioner's vehicle from this incident was estimated at \$3,000.

² The incident occurred while the petitioner was reversing the vehicle at a gas station local to his residence.