

## Training Grants

1. Did you complete an assessment of the training needs of the emergency response personnel in your jurisdiction? What factors did you consider to complete the assessment? What was the result of that assessment? What was the amount of HMEP training grant funds devoted to this effort? What percentage of total HMEP training grants funds does this represent?

2. Provide details concerning the number of individuals trained in whole or in part using HMEP training grant funds. You should include separate indications for the numbers of fire, police, emergency medical services (EMS) or other personnel who were trained and the type of training provided based on the categories listed in standards published by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration at 29 CFR 1910.120 pertaining to emergency response training. (Note that "other" personnel include public works employees, accident clean-up crews, and liaison and support officers. Note also that if HMEP training grant funds were used in any way to support the training, such as for books or equipment, you should show that the training was partially funded by HMEP training grant funds.) What was the amount of training dollars devoted to this effort? What percentage of total training dollars does this represent?

3. Did you incur expenses associated with training and activities necessary to monitor such training, including, for example, examinations, critiques, and instructor evaluations? What was the amount of HMEP training grant funds devoted to this activity? What percentage of total HMEP training grant funds does this represent?

4. Did you provide incident command systems training? If so, provide separate indications for the numbers of fire, policy, EMS, or other personnel who were trained. What was the amount of HMEP training grant funds devoted to this effort? What percentage of total HMEP training grant funds does this represent?

5. Did you develop new training using HMEP training grant funds in whole or in part, such as training in handling specific types of incidents or specific types of materials? If so, briefly describe the new programs. Was the program qualified using the HMEP Curriculum Guidelines process? What was the amount of HMEP training grant funds devoted to this effort? What percentage of total HMEP training grant funds does this represent?

6. Did you use HMEP training grant funds to provide staff to manage your training program to increase benefits, proficiency, and rapid deployment of emergency responders? If so, what was the amount of HMEP training grant funds devoted to this effort? What percentage of total HMEP training grant funds does this represent?

7. Do you have a system in place for measuring the effectiveness of emergency response to hazardous materials incidents in your jurisdiction? Briefly describe the criteria you use (total response time, total time at an accident scene, communication among different agencies or jurisdictions, or other criteria). How many State and local response teams are located in your jurisdiction? What is the estimated coverage of these teams (e.g., the percent of state jurisdictions covered)?

## Overall Program Evaluation

1. Using a scale of 1–5 (with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor), how well has the HMEP grants program met your need for preparing hazmat emergency responders?

2. Using a scale of 1–5 (with 5 being excellent and 1 being poor), how well do you think the HMEP grants program will meet your future needs?

3. What areas of the HMEP grants program would you recommend for enhancement?

We do not anticipate that responding to these questions will add significantly to the total time required to complete performance reports. HMEP grant recipients are required to submit performance reports, most of which should include some or all of the information we are requesting. We estimate that providing the specific information requested will add approximately three hours to the total time required for each grant recipient to complete its performance reports.

The questions listed above are intended to ensure that performance reports focus on results and include quantitative data on the planning and training programs funded by the HMEP grants. This data will enable us to more accurately assess the planning and training activities conducted by grant recipients and, thus, to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the HMEP program in improving overall hazardous materials transportation emergency preparedness and response. The data and information requested is only available from the states and Indian tribes participating in the HMEP grants program.

The total revised information collection budget for the HMEP grants program follows:

*Title:* Hazardous Materials Public Sector Training and Planning Grants.  
*OMB Control Number:* 2137–0586.

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

*Abstract:* Part 110 of 49 CFR sets forth the procedures for reimbursable grants for public sector planning and training in support of the emergency planning and training efforts of states, Indian tribes and local communities to manage hazardous materials emergencies, particularly those involving transportation. Sections in this part address information collection and recordkeeping with regard to applying for grants, monitoring expenditures, and reporting and requesting modifications.

*Affected Public:* State and local governments, Indian tribes.

*Recordkeeping:*

*Estimated Number of Respondents:*

66.

*Estimated Number of Responses:* 66.

*Estimated Annual Burden Hours:*

4,302.

*Frequency of collection:* On occasion.

Issued in Washington, DC on June 29, 2007.

**Edward T. Mazzullo,**

*Director, Office of Hazardous Materials Standards.*

[FR Doc. E7–13007 Filed 7–3–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–60–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 35051]

### Progressive Rail Inc.—Acquisition of Control Exemption—Central Midland Railway Company

Progressive Rail Inc. (PRI), a Class III rail carrier,<sup>1</sup> has filed a verified notice of exemption to acquire control of Central Midland Railway Company (CMR), also a Class III rail carrier, pursuant to a stock purchase agreement.<sup>2</sup> CMR currently leases and operates a rail line of Missouri Central Railway Co., and a rail line of Union Pacific Railroad Company.<sup>3</sup>

The transaction is scheduled to be consummated on or about July 19, 2007.

<sup>1</sup> PRI owns rail property interests in the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin and Iowa.

<sup>2</sup> A redacted version of the stock purchase agreement between CMR and PRI was filed with the notice of exemption. The full version of the agreement, as required by 49 CFR 1180.6(a)(7)(ii), was concurrently filed under seal along with a motion for protective order. The request for a protective order is being addressed in a separate decision.

<sup>3</sup> Both rail lines are located in the State of Missouri.

PRI represents that: (1) The involved railroads do not connect with each other or with other railroads in their corporate families; (2) the transaction is not part of a series of anticipated transactions that would connect the railroads with each other or any railroad in their corporate families; and (3) the transaction does not involve a Class I rail carrier.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the transaction is exempt from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 11323. *See* 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(2).

Under 49 U.S.C. 10502(g), the Board may not use its exemption authority to relieve a rail carrier of its statutory obligation to protect the interests of its employees. Section 11326(c), however, does not provide for labor protection for transactions under section 11324 and 11325 that involve only Class III rail carriers. Accordingly, the Board may not impose labor protective conditions here, because all of the carriers involved are Class III carriers.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 35051, must be filed with

the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001. In addition, one copy of each pleading must be served on Michael J. Barron, Jr., Fletcher & Sippel LLC, 29 North Wacker Drive, Suite 920, Chicago, IL 60606–2832.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at <http://www.stb.dot.gov>.

Decided: June 26, 2007.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik,  
Director, Office of Proceedings.

**Vernon A. Williams.**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E7–12753 Filed 7–3–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4915–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Fiscal Service

#### **Surety Companies Acceptable on Federal Bonds—Terminations: Factory Mutual Insurance Company (NAIC #21482), Affiliated FM Insurance Company (NAIC #10014)**

**AGENCY:** Financial Management Service, Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This is Supplement No. 17 to the Treasury Department Circular 570, 2006 Revision, published June 30, 2006, at 71 FR 37694.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Surety Bond Branch at (202) 874–6850.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Notice is hereby given that the Certificates of Authority issued by the Treasury to the above-named companies under 31 U.S.C. 9305 to qualify as acceptable sureties on Federal bonds were terminated effective August 17, 2006. Federal bond-approving officials should annotate their reference copies of the Treasury Department Circular 570 (“Circular”), 2006 Revision to reflect this change.

With respect to any bonds currently in force with these companies, bond-approving officers may let such bonds run to expiration and need not secure new bonds. However, no new bonds should be accepted from these companies, and bonds that are continuous in nature should not be renewed.

The Circular may be viewed and downloaded through the Internet at <http://www.fms.treas.gov/c570>.

Questions concerning this notice may be directed to the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Financial Management Service, Financial Accounting and Services Division, Surety Bond Branch, 3700 East-West Highway, Room 6F01, Hyattsville, MD 20782.

Dated: June 22, 2007.

**Rose M. Miller,**

*Acting Director, Financial Accounting and Services Division, Financial Management Service*

[FR Doc. 07–3239 Filed 7–3–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810–35–M**

<sup>4</sup> In addition to its verified notice of exemption, PRI submitted a facsimile letter dated June 21, 2007, confirming that the qualifications at (i) and (ii) of 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(2) had been met.