Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

Title: Part 121 Pilot Age Limit.

Type of Request: New collection.

OMB Control Number: 2120–XXXX.

Forms(s): There are no FAA forms associated with this collection.

Affected Public: A total of 15,649 Respondents.

Frequency: The information is collected semi-annually.

Estimated Average Burden Per Response: Approximately 15 minutes per response.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: An estimated 3,912 hours annually.

Abstract: The FAA is proposing to raise the upper age limit for pilots serving in domestic, flag, and supplemental operations until they reach their 65th birthday as long as the other pilot at the controls is under age 60. This action would impose new paperwork requirements. Under this proposal, all pilots over age 60 serving in part 121 operations would have to hold a first-class medical certificate, valid for 6 months and would require a line check (evaluation) every six months. Although it is projected that most older pilots serving in part 121 operations hold a first-class medical certificate, some pilots may not since they may serve as co-pilot and hold a commercial pilot certificate which requires a second-class medical certificate, valid for 12 months. Affected pilots would have to apply for medical examination twice a year to maintain a first-class medical certificate instead of once a year to maintain a second-class medical certificate.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the FAA at the following address: Ms. Carla Mauney, Room 712, Federal Aviation Administration, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, AES–200, 800 Independence Ave., SW., Washington, DC 20591.

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 June 24, 2009.

Carla Mauney,

FAA Information Collection Clearance Officer, IT Enterprises Business Services Division, AES–200.

[FR Doc. E9–15521 Filed 7–1–09; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board [STB Finance Docket No. 35254]

Red River Valley & Western Railroad Company and Rutland Line, Inc.— Corporate Family Transaction Exemption

Red River Valley & Western Railroad Company (RRVW) and Rutland Line, Inc. (Rutland), both Class III rail carriers, have filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(3) for a transaction within a corporate family. Applicants state that, on or about June 27, 2007, all of the stock in Rutland was transferred to RRVW, thereby causing Rutland to become a wholly-owned subsidiary of RRVW.1 At the time, the sole shareholders of applicants were Douglas M. Head and Charles H. Clay, with Mr. Head owning the vast majority of the stock in each of these companies and Mr. Clay owning the remaining shares. Applicants state that the transfer merely resulted in the shareholders indirectly controlling Rutland through their control of RRVW, rather than controlling Rutland directly.2 According to applicants, RRVW inadvertently failed to seek Board authority in 2007 to control Rutland prior to the transfer of ownership interest and they now seek to remedy that oversight. The purpose of the transaction was to enable Rutland to be treated as a Qualified Subchapter S Subsidiary of RRVW for tax purposes.

The exemption will be effective on July 19, 2009.

This is a transaction within a corporate family of the type exempted from prior review and approval under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(3). The parties state that the transaction will not result in adverse changes in service levels,

significant operational changes, or changes in the competitive balance with carriers outside the corporate family.

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 is employees. Section 11326(c), however, does not provide for labor protection for transactions under sections 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 rail carriers.

If the 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. Petitions for stay will be due no later than July 10, 2009 (at least 7 days before the effective date of the exemption).

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 35254, 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 applicants' representative, Rose-Michele Nardi, 1300 19th Street, NW., 5th Floor, Washington, DC 20036.

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

Decided: June 25, 2009.

By the Board, Joseph H. Dettmar, Acting Director, Office of Proceedings.

Jeffrey Herzig,

Clearance Clerk.

[FR Doc. E9–15461 Filed 7–1–09; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

General Wayne A. Downing Peoria International Airport; Noise Exposure Map

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its determination that the noise exposure maps submitted by the Metropolitan Airport Authority of Peoria for General Wayne A. Downing Peoria International Airport under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 47501 et seq. (Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act) and 14 CFR part 150 are in compliance with

¹ Applicants note that Mr. Clay died on March 1, 2009, that his ownership interest in RRVW currently is owned by his estate, and that it is expected that RRVW will purchase Mr. Clay's shares. They add that Mr. Head continues to hold his ownership interest in RRVW.

² Applicants state that there was no written agreement governing the transfer of the shareholders' stock in Rutland to RRVW. In its place, they attach as Exhibit B a "Written Action by the Board of Directors and Shareholders of Rutland Line. Inc."