

published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFGP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The Bureau reserves the right to reduce, revise, or increase proposal budgets in accordance with the needs of the program and the availability of funds. Awards made will be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements per section VI.3 above.

Dated: January 8, 2007.

**Dina Habib Powell,**

*Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. E7-631 Filed 1-17-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710-05-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Agency Information Collection Activity Seeking OMB Approval

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) revision of a current information collection. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of information was published on September 14, 2006, vol. 71, no. 178, page 54330. FAR Part 157 requires that each person who intends to construct, deactivate, or change the status of an airport, runway, or taxiway must notify the FAA of such activity.

**DATES:** Please submit comments by February 20, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Carla Mauney at [Carla.Mauney@faa.gov](mailto:Carla.Mauney@faa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

*Title:* Notice of Landing Area Proposal.

*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*OMB Control Number:* 2120-0036.

*Form(s):* 7480-1.

*Affected Public:* An estimated 1500 Respondents.

*Frequency:* This information is collected on occasion.

*Estimated Average Burden Per Response:* Approximately 45 minutes per response.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* An estimated 1125 hours annually.

*Abstract:* The information collected provides the basis for determining the

effect the proposed action would have on existing airports and on the safe and efficient use of airspace by aircraft, determining the effects the proposed action would have on existing or contemplated traffic patterns of neighboring airports, determining the effects the proposed action would have on the existing airspace structure and projected programs of the FAA, and determining the effects that existing or proposed manmade objects (on file with the FAA) and natural objects within the affected area would have on the airport proposal.

*Addresses:* Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed information collection to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. Comments should be addressed to Nathan Lesser, Desk Officer, Department of Transportation/FAA, and sent via electronic mail to [oir\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_submission@omb.eop.gov) or faxed to (202) 395-6974.

*Comments are invited on:* 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 estimates 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.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 10, 2007.

**Carla Mauney,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, Strategy and Investment Analysis Division, AIO-20.*

[FR Doc. 07-151 Filed 1-17-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Agency Information Collection Activity Seeking OMB Approval

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) revision of a current information collection. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on the following collection of

information was published on September 14, 2006, vol. 71, no. 178, pages 54330-54331. Title 49, United States Code, Section 44702 authorizes the appointment of appropriately qualified persons to be representatives of the Administrator to allow those persons to examine, test and certify other persons for the purpose of issuing them pilot and instructor certificates.

**DATES:** Please submit comments by February 20, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Carla Mauney at [Carla.Mauney@faa.gov](mailto:Carla.Mauney@faa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

*Title:* Representatives of the Administrator.

*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*OMB Control Number:* 2120-0033.

*Form(s):* 8110-14, 8110-28, 8710-6, 8710-10.

*Affected Public:* An estimated 5015 Respondents.

*Frequency:* This information is collected on occasion.

*Estimated Average Burden Per Response:* Approximately 1.42 hour per response.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:* An estimated 7098 hours annually.

*Abstract:* Title 49, United States Code, Section 44702 authorizes the appointment of appropriately qualified persons to be representatives of the Administrator to allow those persons to examine, test and certify other persons for the purpose of issuing them pilot and instructor certificates.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed information collection to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. Comments should be addressed to Nathan Lesser, Desk Officer, Department of Transportation/FAA, and sent via electronic mail to [oir\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_submission@omb.eop.gov) or faxed to (202) 395-6974.

*Comments are invited on:* 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 estimates 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.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 10, 2007.

**Carla Mauney,**

*FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, Strategy and Investment Analysis Division, AIO-20.*

[FR Doc. 07-152 Filed 1-17-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Railroad Administration

#### Safety Advisory 2007-01

**AGENCY:** Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of Safety Advisory; Safety in Yards; Behavior of Employees On or About Tracks; and Point Protection.

**SUMMARY:** FRA is issuing Safety Advisory 2007-01, which addresses the safety of shoving or pushing movements in yards, including those involving remote control locomotives. This advisory also addresses the behavior of employees on or about tracks.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alan H. Nagler, Trial Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, FRA, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20590, telephone (202-493-6049 or 202-493-6052); Edward Pritchard, Director, Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance, Office of Safety, FRA, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20590, telephone (202-493-6300).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Although the overall safety of railroad operations has improved in recent years, a recent fatal accident involving a carman struck by a remote control yard movement while he was backing a pickup truck onto an in-yard private railroad grade crossing (yard crossing) highlights the need to review current railroad procedures and practices.

#### Results of Preliminary Investigation

The following discussion of the circumstances surrounding a fatal accident that occurred on December 14, 2006, is based on FRA's preliminary investigation. The accident is still under investigation by FRA and local authorities. The causes and contributing factors, if any, have not yet been established; therefore, nothing in this Safety Advisory should be construed as placing blame or responsibility for the accident on the acts or omissions of any person or entity.

The fatal accident occurred in Manlius, New York, a suburb of Syracuse, in CSX Transportation, Inc.'s

(CSX) DeWitt Yard at about 5:25 p.m. on December 14, 2006. The victim was a 54-year-old carman with about 30 years of railroad service. While backing a pickup truck onto a yard crossing, he was struck by a yard movement of railroad cars shoved by a remote control locomotive. The remote control operator (RCO) aligned a track switch, initiated the yard movement by remote control, and was driven to the East End Yardmasters Tower by another CSX employee while the yard movement was underway.

The RCO stated that as he was riding to the East End Yardmasters Tower, he made a visual determination that the track (including the track at the two yard crossings over which the movement traversed) was clear of equipment or other obstructions. The yard movement was not conducted in an activated remote control zone. During the approximately ¼-mile shoving movement, the leading end of the movement was not under continuous observation by the RCO. The route traversed included both the yard crossing on which the accident occurred and a second, paved yard crossing.

The leading end of the yard movement, which is the end that struck the carman's pickup truck, consisted of six empty flat cars. Due to its low profile, the approach of an empty flat car is less perceptible than the approach of other rolling stock, e.g., box car, tank car, locomotive. This was exacerbated by darkness, as the sun had set approximately 1 hour before the accident.

Upon impact, the carman's truck was shoved for about 444 feet whereupon it flipped onto its roof and was additionally shoved approximately 490 feet. Immediately after the accident, the truck was observed with its backup lights illuminated and its backup alarm sounding, indicating that the carman had backed onto the crossing ahead of the yard movement.

The RCO stated that he stopped the yard movement when he noticed a strange white light at the leading end of the yard movement and heard a radio transmission to stop the yard movement. The preliminary investigation disclosed that upon impact, the carman in the pickup truck transmitted his urgent plea on the mechanical department radio channel to stop the movement. That transmission was heard by the yardmaster because he could monitor the mechanical department channel in the yard office. Within seconds, the yardmaster observed the carman's truck being shoved and radioed the RCO to stop. Because the carman and the RCO were

utilizing different radio channels, the carman was unable to contact the RCO directly. The yard movement finally came to rest about 1,490 feet from where the movement was initiated and 934 feet from where it struck the carman's truck. The autopsy determined that the cause of death was due to injuries sustained when the truck overturned while being shoved by the yard movement. Post-accident testing of the carman's urine specimen revealed the presence of marijuana metabolite (THCA) at low levels. Neither the parent drug (THC) nor the marijuana metabolite was detected in the blood at the established cutoff point. Since the marijuana metabolite was not active and the parent drug was not reported in the blood, these findings do not provide scientific evidence that would support any conclusion regarding possible impairment of the carman's faculties. This is particularly the case since death occurred shortly after the impact, and marijuana constituents remain stable in these fluids for long periods after metabolism ceases.

#### Safety Issues

CSX's General and Operating Equipment Rule R15 (published in CSX System Bulletin 001 of October 1, 2006, under Instructions Governing Remote Control Locomotive Operation) states, in relevant part, that

[P]oint protection must be provided when cars, platform or engines are being moved and conditions require. A crewmember must take a position on the lead equipment to see that the track ahead is clear, or be ahead of the movement. When an RCO operator is providing point protection, that operator should be the primary operator when practicable.

CSX rules do not define the term "point protection." Although the RCO was ahead of the movement as permitted by CSX rule, he did not observe the collision and initiated a brake application only after hearing a radio transmission from the yardmaster.

The preliminary investigation indicates that the RCO controlled the yard movement while riding in a moving motor vehicle. CSX General and Operating Equipment Rule R8 states, in relevant part, that "[an] RCL [remote control locomotive] crew member will not operate an RCL \* \* \* while riding in a moving motor vehicle or other machinery that is not connected to their consist." This rule goes further than FRA's published guidelines for the operation of remote control locomotives, which states, in relevant part: "[W]hen operating an RCL, the RCO should not operate any other type of machinery [66 FR 10340, 10344 (Feb. 14, 2001) (Notice