

withhold as little as a portion of one page to multiple boxes of documents. NHTSA estimates that it will take on average approximately eight (8) hours for an entity to prepare a submission requesting confidential treatment. This estimate will vary based on the size of the submission, with smaller and voluntary submissions taking considerably less time to prepare. The agency based this estimate on the volume of requests received over the past three years.

NHTSA estimates that it will receive approximately 450 requests for confidential treatment annually. This figure is based on the average number of requests received over the past three years. We selected this period because it provides an estimate based on incoming requests for the most recent three years. The agency estimates that the total burden for this information collection will be approximately 3,600 hours, which is based on the number of requests (450) multiplied by the estimated number of hours to prepare each submission (8 hours).

Since nothing in the rule requires those persons who request confidential treatment pursuant to Part 512 to keep copies of any records or requests submitted to us, recordkeeping costs imposed would be zero hours and zero costs.

**Authority:** 44 U.S.C. 3506; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

Issued on: October 4, 2010.

**O. Kevin Vincent,**  
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2010-25485 Filed 10-8-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Notice of Cancellation of Preparation of Environmental Impact Statement for the Tucson International Airport, Tucson, Pima County, AZ

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of cancellation of preparation of environmental impact statement.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces that it has decided to discontinue preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed relocation of Runway 11R/29L and associated development at Tucson International Airport. The FAA's decision to discontinue preparation of the EIS is based upon the results from a planning

effort completed by the Tucson Airport Authority (TAA), the owner and operator of the airport. This planning effort revealed the project purpose and need has changed significantly. As a result, FAA has determined the new runway proposal at Tucson International Airport is not ripe for decision at this time.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Roxana Hernandez, Environmental Protection Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Western-Pacific Region, Los Angeles Airports District Office, P.O. Box 92007, Los Angeles, CA 90009-2007, Telephone: (310) 725-3614.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On October 13, 2005, the FAA, published in the **Federal Register** a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and hold a Public Scoping Meeting at Tucson International Airport (Volume 70, Number 197, FR 59800-59801). The EIS and Public Scoping Meeting were to address the proposed relocation of Runway 11R/29L and associated development at airport.

In 2005, the FAA based its decision to prepare the EIS on the procedures described in FAA Order 5050.4A, *Airport Environmental Handbook*, and FAA Order 1050.1E, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*. FAA also based its decision to prepare a federal EIS primarily on TAA's proposal to relocate Runway 11R/29L, 450 feet to the southwest, creating a centerline to centerline separation of 1,156 feet between the existing Runway 11L/29R. The length of the relocated Runway 11R/29L would have been 11,000 feet long by 150 feet wide.

Recently, the TAA completed a planning effort that revealed that the project's purpose and need changed significantly. Therefore, when the TAA submits a new Airport Layout Plan with a revised project depicted on it, the FAA will determine the appropriate National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation necessary to assess the environmental effects of those improvements pursuant to FAA Order 5050.4B, *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*, and FAA Order 1050.1E, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*.

Issued in Hawthorne, California on September 30, 2010.

**Debbie Roth,**

Acting Manager, Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region, AWP-600.

[FR Doc. 2010-25483 Filed 10-8-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

#### Environmental Impact Statement; Davis County, UT

**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent.

**SUMMARY:** FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared for proposed transportation improvements in Davis County, Utah.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Edward Woolford, Environmental Program Manager, Federal Highway Administration, 2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A, Salt Lake City, Utah 84118, Telephone: (801) 955-3500, e-mail [Edward.Woolford@dot.gov](mailto:Edward.Woolford@dot.gov); or Charles Mace, Project Manager, Utah Department of Transportation, Region One Office, 166 West Southwell Street, Ogden, UT 84404-4194, Telephone: (801) 620-1685, e-mail [cmace@utah.gov](mailto:cmace@utah.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** FHWA, in cooperation with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), will prepare an EIS on a proposal to address current and projected traffic demand on 1800 North (SR-37) in the cities of Clinton and Sunset in Davis County, Utah. The proposed project area extends from 2000 West to I-15 along 1800 North, a distance of approximately 2 miles. Transportation improvements in this area are needed to address current and projected 2040 traffic demand along the existing two-lane 1800 North corridor, provide better east-west access, and improve safety.

The FHWA will consider a reasonable range of alternatives that meet the project purpose and need and are based on agency and public input. These alternatives include: (1) Taking no action; (2) using alternate travel modes; (3) upgrading and adding lanes to the existing roadway network, including 1800 North; (4) a grade separation at the Union Pacific Railroad crossing on 1800 North; (5) a new interchange on I-15 at 1800 North; (6) improving adjacent interchanges on I-15; (7) combinations of any of the above; and (8) other feasible alternatives identified during the scoping process.

A Coordination Plan is being prepared to define the agency and public participation procedure for the environmental review process. The plan will outline how agencies and the public will provide input during the scoping process, the development of the