

(b) *The FAA Response.* The FAA is a strong supporter of ASRS (both conceptually and financially), and does not intend or expect that this part 193 designation for ASAP will negatively impact the NASA program. Nearly all ASAPs entail the submission of a NASA ASRS report as a standard procedure whenever an ASAP report involves possible noncompliance with the regulations. These NASA ASRS submissions are made either by the company on behalf of the ASAP reporting pilot or by the pilot himself. The FAA believes that this will continue to occur because ASRS can provide the submitter with eligibility for a waiver of the imposition of sanction from FAA enforcement action in the event that an ASAP report is excluded from the program. Since at the time of submission of an ASAP report, a pilot cannot know with certainty whether an ASAP ERC will determine that the report should be accepted under ASAP, there is a strong incentive for air carrier pilots to continue to submit reports to both programs. The FAA does not agree that extending part 193 protection to ASAP will stop the flow of useful information into the NASA ASRS. Rather, the FAA anticipates that establishing part 193 protection for ASAP will have the opposite effect. It will increase industry participation in ASAP, thereby also increasing the reporting of events under the NASA ASRS. At the same time, it will allow the FAA to obtain the more detailed information on specific events and their followup that occurs under an ASAP, but cannot occur under the ASRS, due to the requirement to de-identify the data so thoroughly. ASRS will continue to serve as a valuable source to the aviation community of thoroughly de-identified safety-related information.

(8) FAA should not protect the content of an ASAP report once the identity of the employee and certificate holder have been redacted.

(a) *Comment.* We object to protecting the content of an employee's ASAP report. We believe the FAA has failed to articulate a convincing case for protecting the entire content of an employee's ASAP report when "sanitization" is all that is called for to afford the protection that the FAA claims is required. In short, why withhold the entire content of the ASAP report when simply withholding the identity of the employee and the certificate holder would eliminate the problems described by the FAA?

(b) *The FAA Response.* In order to protect the identity of the employee who has submitted an accepted ASAP report, and that of the certificate holder, more than simply removing the identities of each is required. For example, reports entered into the ASRS database also entail removing information on make, model, and series of aircraft, airport city pair information, and any other specific information that might potentially enable a third party to derive identity information. Because of the thoroughness with which ASRS has removed all information that might enable identification of the employee or certificate holder, the ASRS has been effective in establishing a high level of trust with the aviation community that identity information would be protected. In contrast,

the value of ASAP for safety enhancement lies in its capacity to retain specific information on individual events, including, for example, specific information on aircraft make, model, and series. In addition, an ASAP requires that the ERC determine whether corrective action is required to resolve a safety issue associated with an individual report. If so, the employee must complete that corrective action to the satisfaction of all members of the ERC, or the report will be excluded from the program. For this reason, this order protects not only the actual report and the content of the report, but also the information gathered during an ERC investigation by persons other than the FAA, and a certificate holder's database of reports and events collected over time. While the ASRS achieves protection of identity information by a thorough process of "sanitization," the FAA seeks through this order of designation under part 193 to enable it to access the more specific information on safety-related events and their followup than is available through ASRS. The FAA believes that the public interest in aviation safety enhancement is better served by enabling the acquisition through ASAP of specific information on safety-related events and their resolution and the protection from disclosure of that information under part 193. The FAA also believes that extending this protection to ASAP is clearly consistent with the intent of Congress in enacting 49 U.S.C., section 41023.

[FR Doc. 03-23769 Filed 9-17-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Advisory Circular (AC) 23-8B, Flight Test Guide for Certification of Part 23 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of issuance of advisory circular.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the issuance of Advisory Circular (AC) 23-8B, Flight Test Guide for Certification of Part 23 Airplanes. The AC aids standardization in normal, utility, acrobatic, and commuter category airplanes and consolidates existing policy and certain other advisory circulars into a single document. The material in the advisory circular is intended as a reference for airplane manufacturers, modifiers, FAA engineers, flight test engineers, and flight test pilots, including Delegation Option Authorization, Designated Alteration Station, and Designated Engineering Representative personnel. The AC cancels AC 23-8A and incorporates material harmonized with the European Joint Aviation Authorities.

DATES: Advisory Circular 23-8B was issued by the Manager of the Small Airplane Directorate on August 14, 2003.

How to Obtain Copies: A paper copy of AC 23-8B may be obtained by writing to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Subsequent Distribution Office, DOT Warehouse, SVC-121.23, Ardmore East Business Center, 3341Q 75th Avenue, Landover, MD 20785, telephone 301-322-5377, or by faxing your request to the warehouse at 301-386-5394. The AC will also be available on the Internet at <http://www.airweb.faa.gov/AC>.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on September 3, 2003.

Frank Paskiewicz,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 03-23871 Filed 9-17-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Notice of Intent To Rule on Application 03-05-C-00-MBS To Impose and Use the Revenue From a Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) at MBS International Airport, Saginaw, Michigan

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Rule on Application.

SUMMARY: The FAA proposes to rule and invites public comment on the application to impose and use the revenue from a PFC at MBS International Airport under the provisions of the 49 U.S.C. 40117 and part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 20, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this application may be mailed or delivered in triplicate to the FAA at the following address: Detroit Airports District Office, 11677 South Wayne Road—Suite 107, Romulus, Michigan 48174.

In addition, one copy of any comments submitted to the FAA must be mailed or delivered to Ms. Elizabeth E. Owen, Airport Manager of the MBS International Airport at the following address: 8500 Garfield Road—Suite 101, Freeland, Michigan 48623.

Air carriers and foreign air carriers may submit copies of written comments previously provided to the MBS International Airport Commission under section 158.23 of part 158.