

committee consensus on a draft for Final Review and Comment (FRAC). The committee will also consider plans for coordination and implementation of its recommendation on T-PED spurious emissions. Working group sessions are on Tuesday and Thursday afternoon. Plenary Sessions are Wednesday and Thursday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 5 U.S.C., Appendix 2), notice is hereby given for a Special Committee 202 Portable Electronic Devices meeting. The agenda will include:

- April 17:
  - Chairmen's Strategy Session—MacIntosh-NBAA & Hilton-ATA Rooms
  - Progress and Status Update, Overall Review of Plan and Schedule for Document Completion, recommendations coordination and implementation
  - Working Group 5 Kickoff and Coordination—MacIntosh-NBAA & Hilton-ATA Rooms
  - Working Groups Sessions
  - Working Group 5 Overall DO-YYY Document—MacIntosh-NBAA & Hilton-ATA Rooms
  - Working Group 6: PED Spurious Emissions Recommendations—ARINC Conference Room
  - Sub Group on PED Statistical Analysis and Characterization—Small Conference Room
  - Sub Group on IPL Test—Colson Board Room
  - Sub Group on Certification Aspects—Garmin Room
  - Chairmen's Strategy Session
  - Coordinate Recommendations to Plenary: Plan and Schedule for Remaining Committee Work.
- April 18 and 19:
  - Opening Plenary Session (Welcome and Introductory Remarks, Review Agenda, Review/Approve previous Summary)
  - Results of RTCA PMC Meeting March 22, 2007 on revisions to SC-202 TOR
  - Update from Regulatory Agencies (FAA, UK-CAA, Canadian TSB, FCC, or others present)
  - Update on EUROCAE Working Group WG58 Status
  - Update on CEA activities, including the CEA Bulletin-Recommended Practice for T-PEDs
  - Overview of Work on DO-YYY "Aircraft Design and Certification for Portable Electronic Device (PED) Tolerance"
  - Update on Aircraft IPL Test Methods by WG5 Sub Group
  - Update on Target IPL Values for aircraft design by WG5 IPL Sub Group

- Summary of PED Emissions Statistical Characterization by WG5-T-PED Characterization Sub Group
- Summary of Certification Aspects WG5 Certification Sub Group
- Working Group 5: Airplane Design and Certification Guidance
- Plan to complete remaining work, schedule and process for completion of open issues, recommendation to publish FRAC draft, identify any risks to completing final document at the July Plenary and proposed action to mitigate that risk
- Working Group 6: PED Spurious Emissions Recommendations Coordination
  - Implementation Assessment (joint working group with CEA)
  - Schedule and plan for dialog with CE manufactures
  - Committee Discussion on Final Phase 2 Work Plan and Schedule for DO-YYY Document
  - Committee Discussion on Final Phase 2 Work Plan and Schedule for DO-YYY Document
  - Break-out Session for WG's Required
    - WG5 Overall Document and Process—MacIntosh—NBAA & Hilton-ATA-Rooms
    - WG6 PED Spurious Emissions Recommendation—ARINC Conference Room
    - Sub Group on PED Statistical Analysis and Characterization—Small Conference Room
    - Sub Groups on IPL Test—Colson Board Room
    - Sub Group on Certification Aspect—Garmin Room
  - April 19
  - Chairman's Day 2 Opening Remarks and Process Check
  - Final Overall Working Group Report
    - Identification and Plan for Closure of Open Issues
    - Remaining work plan and Schedule for Completion of DO-YYY
    - Recommendation on publication of FRAC draft
    - Working Group 5 Airplane Design and Certification Guidance recommendation for FRAC
    - Working Group 6 PED Spurious Emissions Recommendations (reporting on plan for completion of recommendations coordination and implementation)
    - Plenary Consensus on Plans to:
      - DO-YYY Recommended Guidance for Airplane Design and Certification ready for FRAC
      - WG6 plan to coordinate and implement PED Spurious Emissions Recommendations
    - Closing Session (Other Business, Date and Place of Upcoming Meetings

(Nineteenth Plenary at RTCA, July 23–27, 2007.)

- Complete Disposition of FRAC comments on draft Airplane Design & Guidance Recommendation draft
- Committee consensus to recommend publication of DO-YYY
- CEA/SC-202 Consenses Recommendation for implementation of SC-202 recommendation
- Plenary Session Tuesday & Thursday, WG Monday, Wednesday, Friday
- Adjourn to Break-out sessions for Working Groups if required and time permits

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairmen, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 13, 2007.

**Francisco Estrada C.,**  
*RTCA Advisory Committee.*

[FR Doc. 07-1343 Filed 3-20-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket No. FRA-2005-23281, Notice No. 4]

### Safety of Private Highway-Rail Grade Crossings; Notice of Safety Inquiry

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

**ACTION:** Notice of safety inquiry.

**SUMMARY:** On July 27, 2006, FRA published a notice announcing its intent to conduct a series of open meetings throughout the United States, in cooperation with appropriate State agencies, to consider issues related to the safety of private highway-rail grade crossings. To date, FRA has conducted four meetings and on January 5, 2007, FRA published a notice announcing the scheduling of an additional meeting to be held February 15, 2007, in Syracuse, New York. Due to inclement weather, it was necessary to reschedule the February 15 meeting for April 26, 2007.

At the meeting, FRA intends to solicit oral statements from private crossing owners, railroads and other interested parties on issues related to the safety of private highway-rail grade crossings,

which will include, but not be limited to, current practices concerning responsibility for safety at private grade crossings, the adequacy of warning devices at private crossings, and the relative merits of a more uniform approach to improving safety at private crossings. FRA has also opened a public docket on these issues so that interested parties may submit written comments for public review and consideration.

**DATES:** The fifth public meeting will be held in Syracuse, New York on April 26, 2007, at the Renaissance Syracuse Hotel, 701 East Genesee Street, Syracuse, New York 13210, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

Persons wishing to participate are requested to provide their names, organizational affiliation and contact information to Michelle Silva, FRA Docket Clerk, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: 202-493-6030). Persons needing sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodation for disability are also encouraged to contact Ms. Silva at the above-referenced telephone number.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ron Ries, FRA Office of Safety, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: 202-493-6299); Miriam Kloeppel, FRA Office of Safety, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: 202-493-6299); or Kathryn Shelton, FRA Office of Chief Counsel, 1120 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20590 (telephone: 202-493-6038).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information, please see the initial notice published July 27, 2006 in the **Federal Register** (71 FR 42713) and available at <http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20061800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2006/pdf/06-6501.pdf>.

#### Request for Comments

While FRA solicits discussion and comments on all areas of safety at private highway-rail grade crossings, we particularly encourage comments on the following topics:

- At-grade highway-rail crossings present inherent risks to users, including the railroad and its employees and other persons in the vicinity, should a train derail into an occupied area or release hazardous materials. When passenger trains are involved, the risks are heightened. From the standpoint of public policy, how do we determine whether the creation or continuation of a private crossing is justified?

- Is the current assignment of responsibility for safety at private

crossings effective? To what extent do risk management practices associated with insurance arrangements result in "regulation" of safety at private crossings?

- How should improvement and/or maintenance costs associated with private crossings be allocated?
- Is there a need for alternative dispute resolution mechanisms to handle disputes that may arise between private crossing owners and the railroads?
- Should the State or Federal government assume greater responsibility for safety at private crossings?
- Should there be nationwide standards for warning devices at private crossings or for intersection designs of new private grade crossings?
- How do we determine when a private crossing has a "public purpose" and is subject to public use?
- Should some crossings be categorized as "commercial crossings" rather than as "private crossings?"
- Are there innovative traffic control treatments that could improve safety at private crossings on major rail corridors, including those on which passenger service is provided?
- Should the Department of Transportation request the enactment of legislation to address private crossings? If so, what should it include?

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 15, 2007.

**Jo Strang,**

*Associate Administrator for Safety.*

[FR Doc. E7-5143 Filed 3-20-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-06-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[DOT Docket No. NHTSA-06-26554]

#### Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Request for public comment on proposed collection of information.

**SUMMARY:** This notice solicits public comment on continuation of the requirements for the collection of information on safety standards. Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995,

before seeking approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatement of previously approved collections.

This document describes a collection of information associated with 49 CFR Part 574, Tire Identification and Recordkeeping.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before April 20, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments must refer to the docket notice number cited at the beginning of this notice and be submitted to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Att'n: Desk Officer for NHTSA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503. Please identify the proposed collection of information for which a comment is provided, by referencing its OMB clearance number. It is requested, but not required, that 2 copies of the comment be provided.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Complete copies of each request for collection may be obtained from Mr. George Soodoo, NVS-122, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Soodoo's telephone number is (202) 366-5274.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before a proposed collection of information is submitted to OMB for approval, Federal agencies must first publish a document in the **Federal Register** providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB's regulation (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following:

(i) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) How to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) How to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of