equipment manufacturer modifies the system. Applying that paragraph to non-OEM replacement parts, the non-OEM supplier may obtain certified equipment, substitute its own replacement part(s), and submit the modified device to a third party certification body for testing. Non-OEMs seeking interim certification of their replacement parts in OEM lighting equipment will be required to follow the same procedures as OEMs of lighting equipment as provided in paragraph 2a of AC 150/5345–53B. Also, these non-OEMs will be required to pay for the costs of testing their products in OEM lighting equipment, just as OEMs, under paragraph 2b of that advisory circular bear, the costs of testing their equipment. The addendum to AC 150/5345/53B will be modified to include equipment certified in this manner with specific substitute part(s). Separate tests will be required for each combination of substitute parts (*e.g.,* a supplier selling both a flash tube and a timing circuit must have a device certified with each part substituted independently, and then together).

As part of this interim procedure, non-OEM components will be subject to Appendix 2 of AC 150/5345–53B with the following exception. Paragraph 7 of Appendix 2 of that AC notes that ''substitution of stock electrical items such as resistors, capacitors, transistors, etc., which are identical in form, fit, and function and which are equal to or better in quality and rating is permissible.'' This exemption is not extended automatically to non-OEM suppliers, as OEM specifications for stock items may be more stringent than those applied by the manufacturers of those items. However, this exemption may be granted at the third party certification body's judgment. The requirements of Appendix 5, Lamp Life Test Procedure, in AC 150–5345–53B, will apply to replacement lamps. Upon the issuance of any permanent change to the certification program, the FAA will decide if substitute parts certified under this interim program will require further testing to retain certified status.

Issued in Washington DC, on November 4, 2004.

J.R. White,

Director of Airport Safety and Standards.

[FR Doc. 04–25209 Filed 11–10–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: San Bernardino County, CA

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is republishing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared for the proposed highway project along State Route 18 in San Bernardino County, California. It is being republished due to the length of time since the original Notice of Intent (NOI) was published, which was August 30, 1990 (**Federal Register**, vol. 55, no. 169) and project changes.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. César E. Pérez, Team Leader—South Region, Federal Highway Administration, 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4–100, Sacramento, California 95814, Telephone: (916) 498–5065.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation, is preparing an EIS for the proposed Big Bear Lake Dam Bridge Replacement Project on State Route 18 in San Bernardino County, California. The proposed project will facilitate completion of the Big Bear Dam spillway project, move vehicular traffic off the dam structure, and improve the geometrics of the approach roadways. Existing State Route 18, within the project limits (kilo-post miles 71.1/71.9 [post miles 44.2/44.7]) has curves where the posted speed limit is less than 25 miles per hour. These curves will be realigned and the overall roadway brought up to current design standards within the project limits. This includes a wider bridge with three lanes to accommodate existing and future travel demands within the Big Bear Lake area, as well as 10-foot shoulders to accommodate nonmotorized travel and better facilitate winter snow removal. The original NOI proposed four lanes.

The U.S. Forest Service is a cooperating agency. Consultation with the U.S. Forest Services has been, and will continue to be, undertaken to minimize impacts to the surrounding San Bernardino National Forest associated with the construction of the proposed project.

Alternatives currently under consideration are the result of the 1990 public and agency scoping meetings, as well as comments received from multiple public information meetings/open houses held in the Big Bear area. These alternatives include: Alternative 1—No Action; Alternative 4—construct new bridge upstream of the existing bridge crossing over Big Bear Lake; and alternative 5—construct new bridge crossing over Bear Creek Canyon downstream of the existing bridge. Alternatives 2 and 3 were eliminated after initial scoping due to a higher level of anticipated impacts to properties eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and a larger impact area and subsequent adverse impacts to biological and visual resources. In addition, Alternative 2 would have replaced the roadway on the existing bridge. Seismic concerns and conflicts with operation of the dam also supported the decision to eliminate replacing the roadway on the existing bridge as was identified as an alternative in the 1990 NOI.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments were previously sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have expressed, or are known to have, an interest in this proposal. A formal agency scoping meeting was held June 5, 1990, in the City of Big Bear Lake, California. A public scoping meeting was held July 9, 1990, also in the City of Big Bear Lake, California. At the request of the Big Bear Kiwanis and Big Bear Lions Clubs, the proposed project was presented to the clubs in the City of Big Bear Lake, California, on May 15, 1990, and August 16, 1990, respectively. On August 8, 1997, in the City of Big Bear Lake, California, a public participation meeting was held in accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regulations regarding section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to discuss/comment on the draft Finding of Effect. Public information meetings/open houses were held in the City of Big Bear Lake, California, on September 30, 1997, and May 3, 2001, to keep the public up to date and continue with the public information program. Finally, public agency coordination and update meetings were also held on May 2, 2002, and August 20, 2003. The public information program will continue throughout the environmental process.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed, and all significant issues are identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address previously provided in this notice. The Draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior

to the public hearing for the proposed action. It is anticipated that the Draft EIS will be available for review in early 2005.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulation implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program)

Issued on: November 5, 2004.

Mr. John E. Dewar,

Acting Chief Operating Officer, Sacramento, California.

[FR Doc. 04–25194 Filed 11–10–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

Request for Comments

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Requirement (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden. The **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on September 2, 2004 (69 FR 53765).

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before December 13, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert Brogan, Office of Safety, Planning and Evaluation Division, RRS–21, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Ave., NW., Mail Stop 25, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493–6292), or Ms. Debra Steward, Office of Information Technology and Productivity Improvement, RAD–20, Federal Railroad Administration, 1120 Vermont Ave., NW., Mail Stop 35, Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: (202) 493–6139). (These telephone numbers are not toll-free.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Pub. L. No. 104–13, Section 2, 109 Stat. 163 (1995) (codified as revised at 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), and its implementing regulations, 5 CFR part 1320, require Federal agencies to issue two notices seeking public comment on information collection activities before OMB may approve paperwork packages. 44 U.S.C. 3506, 3507; 5 CFR 1320.5, 1320.8(d)(1), 1320.12. On September 2, 2004, FRA published a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** soliciting comment on ICRs that the agency was seeking OMB approval. 69 FR 53765. FRA received no comments in response to this notice.

Before OMB decides whether to approve these proposed collections of information, it must provide 30 days for public comment. 44 U.S.C. 3507(b); 5 CFR 1320.12(d). Federal law requires OMB to approve or disapprove paperwork packages between 30 and 60 days after the 30 day notice is published. 44 U.S.C. 3507 (b)–(c); 5 CFR 1320.12(d); *see also* 60 FR 44978, 44983, Aug. 29, 1995. OMB believes that the 30 day notice informs the regulated community to file relevant comments and affords the agency adequate time to digest public comments before it renders a decision. 60 FR 44983, Aug. 29, 1995. Therefore, respondents should submit their respective comments to OMB within 30 days of publication to best ensure having their full effect. 5 CFR 1320.12(c); *see also* 60 FR 44983, Aug. 29, 1995.

The summary below describes the nature of the information collection requirement (ICR) and the expected burden, and is being submitted for clearance by OMB as required by the PRA.

Title: Safety Appliance Concern Recommendation Report; Safety Appliance Standards Guidance Checklist Forms.

OMB Control Number: 2130–NEW.

Type of Request: New collection.

Affected Public: Businesses.

Abstract: In an ongoing effort to conduct more thorough and more effective inspections of railroad freight equipment and to further enhance safe rail operations, FRA has developed a safety concern recommendation report form, and a group of guidance checklist forms that will facilitate railroad, rail car owner, and rail equipment manufacturer compliance with agency Railroad Safety Appliance Standards regulations. In lieu of completing an official inspection form (FRA F 6180.96), which takes subject railroad equipment out of service and disrupts rail operations, proposed new Form FRA F 6180.4a will enable Federal and State safety inspectors to report to agency headquarters systemic or other safety concerns. FRA headquarters safety specialists can then contact railroads, car owners, and equipment manufacturers to address the reported issue(s) in a timely fashion without unnecessarily having to take affected rail equipment out of service, unless deemed defective. Proposed forms FRA F 6180.4(b)–(m) will be used in conjunction with the Special Inspection of Safety Appliance Equipment form (Form FRA F 6180.4) to assist Motive, Power, and Equipment (MP&E) field inspectors in ensuring that critical sections of 49 CFR part 231 (Railroad Safety Appliance Standards), pertaining to various types of freight equipment, are complied with through the use of a check-off list. By simplifying their demanding work, check-off lists for 12 essential sections of part 231 will ensure that FRA MP&E field personnel completely and thoroughly inspect each type of freight car for compliance with its corresponding section in part 231. The proposed Guidance Checklist forms may later be used by state field inspectors as well. FRA believes that the proposed collection of information will result in improved construction of newly designed freight cars and improved field inspections of all freight cars currently in use. This, in turn, will serve to reduce the number of accidents/incidents and corresponding injuries and fatalities that occur every year due to unsafe or defective equipment that was not promptly repaired/replaced.

Annual Estimated Burden Hours: 240 hours.

Addressee: Send comments regarding this information collection to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, DC, 20503, Attention: FRA Desk Officer.

Comments Are Invited on the Following: Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

A comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501–3520.