

3. Project Sponsor and Facility: Houtzdale Municipal Authority (Beccaria Springs), Gulich Township, Clearfield County, Pa. Application for surface water withdrawal of up to 5,000 mgd (peak day).

4. Project Sponsor and Facility: WPX Energy Appalachia, LLC (Susquehanna River), Great Bend Township, Susquehanna County, Pa. Application for renewal of surface water withdrawal of up to 1,000 mgd (peak day) (Docket No. 20090303).

**Authority:** Pub. L. 91-575, 84 Stat. 1509 et seq., 18 CFR Parts 806, 807, and 808.

Dated: April 9, 2013.

**Thomas W. Beauduy,**  
Deputy Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2013-08991 Filed 4-16-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7040-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Notice of Intent To Rule on Request To Lease Airport Property for Non-Aeronautical Purpose at the Bradford Regional Airport, Lewis Run, PA

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of request to lease airport property for non-aeronautical purpose.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA proposes to rule and invite public comment on the lease of land for non-aeronautical purpose at the Bradford Regional Airport, Lewis Run, Pennsylvania under the provision 49 U.P.C. 47125(a).

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before May 17, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered to the following address:

Thomas Frungillo, Airport Director,  
Bradford Regional Airport, 212  
Airport Drive, Suite E, Lewis Run,  
Pennsylvania 16738.

and at the FAA Harrisburg Airports District Office:

Lori K. Pagnanelli, Manager, Harrisburg Airports District Office, 3905 Hartzdale Dr., Suite 508, Camp Hill, PA 17011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles Trice, Civil Engineer, Harrisburg Airports District Office, location listed above.

The request to lease property may be reviewed in person at this same location.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FAA invites public comment on the request to lease airport property for non-

aeronautical purpose at the Bradford Regional Airport under the provisions of Section 47125(a) of Title 49 U.S.C. On April 9, 2013, the FAA determined that the request to lease airport property for non-aeronautical purpose at the Bradford Regional Airport (BRF), Pennsylvania, submitted by the Bradford Regional Airport Authority (Authority), met the procedural requirements.

The following is a brief overview of the request:

The Authority requests the lease of approximately 0.50 acres of non-aeronautical airport property to the Lafayette Township Sewer Authority (Sewer Authority), Lewis Run, Pennsylvania. The land was acquired without Federal participation. The undeveloped property is located in Lafayette Township, east of Roberts Road and immediately adjacent to and north of Pennsylvania State Route 59. The Sewer Authority is proposing to use the property to construct an extension to the existing Lafayette Township underground sewer system, and connect the extension to an existing sewer line on airport property. As shown on the Airport Layout Plan, the property does not serve an aeronautical purpose and is not needed for airport development. The sewer line will also not interfere with normal airport operations. There will be no proceeds from the lease of the property, however, the airport will receive equal if not greater intangible benefits including: the allocation of two (2) tap-in connections to the sewer line; and the allowance of two (2) Equivalent Dwelling Units, each of which apportion 400 gallons of sewage flow per day into the new system.

Any person may inspect the request by appointment at the FAA office address listed above. Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed lease. All comments will be considered by the FAA to the extent practicable.

Issued in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, April 9, 2013.

**Lori K. Pagnanelli,**

Manager, Harrisburg Airports District Office.

[FR Doc. 2013-08953 Filed 4-16-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD 2013 0045]

#### Information Collection Available for Public Comments and Recommendations

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Maritime Administration's (MARAD's) intentions to request extension of approval for three years of a currently approved information collection.

**DATES:** Comments should be submitted on or before June 17, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Shashi Kumar, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, NY 11024. Telephone: 516-726-5833; FAX: 516-773-5539, or Email: [kumars@usmma.edu](mailto:kumars@usmma.edu). Copies of this collection also can be obtained from that office.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title of Collection:* United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Survey.

*Type of Request:* Extension of currently approved information collection.

*OMB Control Number:* 2133-0542.

*Form Numbers:* KP2-66-DK1, KP2-67-DK2, KP2-68-DK3, KP2-69-ENG1, KP2-70-ENG2, KP2-71-ENG3.

*Expiration Date of Approval:* Three years from date of approval by the Office of Management and Budget.

*Summary of Collection of Information:* The United States Merchant Marine Academy is an accredited federal service academy that confers BS and MS degrees. The Academy is expected to assess its educational outcomes and report those findings to its Regional Accreditation authority in order to maintain the institution's degree granting status. Periodic survey of alumni cohorts and analysis of the data gathered is a routine higher education assessment practice in the United States.

*Need and Use of the Information:* The information gathered will be analyzed and used for program management and improvement.

*Description of Respondents:* Respondents are graduates of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

*Annual Responses:* 500 responses.

*Annual Burden:* 125 hours.

*Comments:* Comments should refer to the docket number that appears at the

top of this document. Written comments may be submitted to the Docket Clerk, U.S. DOT Dockets, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. Comments also may be submitted by electronic means via the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Specifically address whether this information collection is necessary for proper performance of the functions of the agency and will have practical utility, accuracy of the burden estimates, ways to minimize this burden, and ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected. All comments received will be available for examination at the above address between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. EDT (or EST), Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays. An electronic version of this document is available on the World Wide Web at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

**Privacy Act:** Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477-78) or you may visit <http://www.regulations.gov>.

**Authority:** 49 CFR 1.93.

Dated: April 11, 2013.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

**Julie P. Agarwal,**

*Secretary, Maritime Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2013-09020 Filed 4-16-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-81-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2007-28927; Notice 2]

#### Sidump'r Trailer Company, Inc., Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Grant of petition.

**SUMMARY:** Sidump'r Trailer Company, Inc. (Sidump'r) has determined that the rear impact guards on certain trailers that it manufactured between January 10, 2006 and April 13, 2007 do not comply with paragraph S5.1 of 49 CFR 571.224, Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 224, *Rear Impact Protection*. Sidump'r has filed an

appropriate report pursuant to 49 CFR Part 573, *Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports*, dated April 20, 2007.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 30118 (d) and 30120 (h) and the rule implementing those provisions at 49 CFR Part 556, Sidump'r 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 a petition was published, with a 30-day public comment period, on August 16, 2007, in the **Federal Register** (72 FR 46127). The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) received no comments. 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-2007-28927."

For further information on this decision, contact Mr. Luis Figueroa, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA, telephone (202) 366-5298, facsimile (202) 366-1002.

**Trailers Involved:** Affected are approximately 416 model 223, 325 and 425 side dump bulk material hauling trailers manufactured by Sidump'r between January 10, 2006 and April 13, 2007.

**Summary of Sidump'r's Analysis and Arguments:** Sidump'r first became aware of the noncompliance of these trailers when Sidump'r received a customer inquiry on or about February 27, 2007 regarding the rear impact guards installed on the subject trailers. As a result of this inquiry, Sidump'r stated that it commenced a thorough engineering evaluation of the rear end of the subject trailers to determine whether they meet the requirements of FMVSS No. 224. Following this engineering evaluation and after consultation with its counsel, Sidump'r determined that the trailers do not comply with FMVSS No. 224.

Specifically, Sidump'r has determined that the location of those guards does not meet the requirements of paragraph S5.1.3 of FMVSS No. 224 because there is a "push block" located at the rear of the trailer chassis extending 23.62 inches (600 mm) to the rear of the rear impact guard. Sidump'r stated that it considered the "push blocks" to be the "rear extremities" of the subject trailers. Therefore, it concluded that the rearmost surface of the horizontal members of the rear impact guards are located 11.62 inches (295 mm) too far forward of the "rear

extremity" of the trailers to conform with the requirements of paragraph S5.1.3.

Sidump'r also examined the possibility of the "push block" itself serving as the rear impact guard. It determined that the "push block" itself does not constitute a compliant rear impact guard as originally installed because it exceeds the maximum ground clearance of 22 inches (560 mm) allowed by paragraph S5.1.2 of FMVSS No. 224 by 1.5 inches (38 mm).

Sidump'r stated that it has corrected the problem that caused the noncompliance in the trailers they produced after April 20, 2007 by modifying the design of the trailers to incorporate an additional horizontal member mounted to the underside of the "push block" assembly.

Sidump'r also stated that it believes this noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety and that no further corrective action is warranted due to the geometric characteristics of the trailers and the nature of their field usage. Specifically, Sidump'r makes the arguments that the overall level of safety of the subject trailers is equivalent to a compliant trailer because their "push block" is equipped with a guard-like structure that is comparable to a compliant rear impact guard based on dimensional considerations, and on a simulation of the guard performance<sup>1</sup> when subjected to the loads required under FMVSS No. 223. Sidump'r additionally supported its position that the overall level of safety of the noncompliant trailers is equivalent to comparable trailers by comparing them to road construction controlled horizontal discharge trailers and by citing several previous decisions where NHTSA granted temporary exemptions from compliance with FMVSS No. 224 as the result of petitions filed under 49 CFR Part 555 *Temporary Exemption From Motor Vehicle Safety and Bumper Standards* for noncompliances that it considers similar in consequence to those covered in this petition.

#### Discussion

##### Requirement Background

Paragraph S5.1.3 *Guard Rear Surface* of FMVSS No. 224 requires:

At any height 560 mm or more above the ground, the rearmost surface of the horizontal member of the guard shall be located as close as practical to a transverse vertical plane tangent to the rear extremity of the vehicle, but no more than 305 mm forward of that

<sup>1</sup> Fred P. Smith, P.E., CSP, *Under Ride Report* (Alpine Engineering and Design, Inc., 2007). Supplemental petition data as submitted on May 14, 2008 to docket number NHTSA-2007-28927.