comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act, as amended.

Kirsten J. Moncada,

Executive Director, Office of Privacy and Disclosure, Office of the General Counsel.

Notice of Computer Matching Program, SSA With the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB)

A. Participating Agencies

SSA and RRB

B. Purpose of the Matching Program

The purpose of this matching program is to set forth the terms, conditions, and safeguards under which RRB, as the source agency, will disclose RRB annuity payment data to us, the recipient agency. We will use the information to verify Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Special Veterans Benefits (SVB) eligibility and benefit payment amounts. We will also record the railroad annuity amounts RRB paid to SSI and SVB recipients in the Supplemental Security Income Record (SSR).

C. Authority for Conducting the Matching Program

The legal authority for the disclosure under this agreement for the SSI portion are sections 1631(e)(1)(A) and (B) and 1631(f) of the Social Security Act (Act) (42 U.S.C. 1383(e)(1)(A) and (B) and 1383(f)). The legal authority for the disclosure under this agreement for the SVB portion is section 806(b) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1006(b)).

D. Categories of Records and Persons Covered by the Matching Program

RRB will provide us with an electronic data file containing annuity payment data from RRB's system of records, RRB–22 Railroad Retirement, Survivor, and Pensioner Benefits System, last published on July 26, 2012 (75 *FR* 43727). We will match RRB's data with data maintained in the SSR, Supplemental Security Income Record and Special Veterans Benefits, SSA/ODSSIS, 60–0103, last published on January 11, 2006 (71 *FR* 1830). SVB data also resides on the SSR.

E. Inclusive Dates of the Matching Program

The effective date of this matching program is September 2, 2013, provided that the following notice periods have lapsed: 30 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** and 40 days after notice of the matching program is sent to Congress and OMB. The matching program will continue for 18 months from the effective date and, if both agencies meet certain conditions, it may extend for an additional 12 months thereafter.

[FR Doc. 2013–14808 Filed 6–20–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Space Transportation Infrastructure Matching (STIM) Grants Program

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of non-availability of Space Transportation Infrastructure Matching Grants in FY 2013.

SUMMARY: The Office of Commercial Space Transportation (AST) will not solicit or award grants under the STIM program this fiscal year.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Doug Graham (AST–100), Office of Commercial Space Transportation (AST), 800 Independence Avenue SW., Room 331, Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267–8568; Email *doug.graham@faa.gov.*

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 10, 2013.

George C. Nield,

Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation.

[FR Doc. 2013–14859 Filed 6–20–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

[Docket No. FHWA–2013–0030]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Request for Comments for a New Information Collection

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: FHWA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) approval for a new information collection, which is summarized below under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**. We published a **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day public comment period on this information collection on February 15, 2013. We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Please submit comments by July 22, 2013.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments within 30 days to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, Attention DOT Desk Officer. You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) Whether the proposed collection is necessary for the FHWA's performance; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (3) ways for the FHWA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized, including the use of electronic technology, without reducing the quality of the collected information. All comments should include the Docket number FHWA–2013–0030.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shane D. Boone, 202–493–3064, Nondestructive Evaluation Research Program, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, 6300 Georgetown Pike, McLean, VA 22101. Office hours are from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Non-Destructive Inspection Protocol for Reinforced Concrete Highway Barriers and Bridge Railings.

Background: Highway barriers and bridge railings serve to prevent errant vehicles from departing the travelway at grade separations. Most bridge railings are made of reinforced concrete. Despite the important role that they play in maintaining safety and their ubiquitous nature, barrier inspection rarely moves beyond visual inspection. In August of 2008, tractor-trailer dislodged a section of barrier on the William Preston Lane, Jr. Memorial Bridge. Portions of the displaced barrier separated and the tractor-trailer fatally departed the bridge. Investigations following the accident identified significant corrosion of the anchor bolts attaching the bridge railing to the bridge deck.

As a result of the information gathered during its investigation of the accident, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) made recommendations to the Federal Highway Administration concerning Non-Destructive Evaluation of concrete bridge railings. One of these recommendations (H–10–18) is as follows:

> Expand the research and development of nondestructive evaluation technologies to develop bridge inspection methods that augment visual inspections; offer reliable measurement techniques; and are practical, both in terms of time and cost, for field inspection work; and promote the use of these technologies by bridge owners.

The barrier on the Preston Lane, Jr. Memorial Bridge was unique in that the anchor bolts connecting the barrier to the deck were exposed. This exposure allowed inspection of the remaining anchor bolts directly using ultrasonic testing. In contrast, most barriers have configurations where the steel anchorage is completely embedded in the deck and barrier.

Most reinforced concrete barriers are anchored to the deck of a bridge or retaining wall using reinforcing steel protruding from the main structure or by anchored bars or bolts during retrofits. Corrosion of steel bars or bolts can weaken this attachment and reduce the capacity of the barrier. The most direct damage resulting from corrosion is the reduction of steel diameter and cross-sectional area. Steel corrosion in concrete is caused primarily by two reasons: chloride induced corrosion and carbonation induced corrosion. Barriers are generally located at or very near the gutter-line of a roadway and may have significant long-term exposure to corrosive deicing materials.

It is beyond the capacity of visual inspection to identify and evaluate concrete voids and corrosion of anchorage mechanisms embedded in concrete. A literature review revealed that some promising research has been done using NDE methods to evaluate reinforced concrete and the embedded steel reinforcement.

Effective corrosion detection methods are just one piece of the barrier and railing maintenance puzzle. Identification of when to use advanced NDE tools as well as to what level the capacity is likely impacted by the measured deterioration will be examined as a part of this project. In order to most effectively investigate the correct barrier and railing designs, it was noted that input from the state DOTs was required. Thus, a survey to determine what protocols for design, fabrication, installation, and inspection was created and should be disseminated to the 50 state DOTs and also to the DC and Puerto Rico DOTs.

Respondents: All 50 state DOTs and also DC and Puerto Rico DOTs. 52 total.

Frequency: Once.

Estimated Average Burden per Response: Approximately 2 hours to collect the necessary information and 1 hour to fill out the survey.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: Approximately 156 hours.

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including: (1) Whether the proposed collection is necessary for the FHWA's performance; (2) the accuracy of the estimated burdens; (3) ways for the FHWA to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the collected information; and (4) ways that the burden could be minimized, including the use of electronic technology, without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on: June 17, 2013.

Michael Howell,

Information Collection Officer.

[FR Doc. 2013–14871 Filed 6–20–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

[Docket No. FHWA–2013–0034]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Request for Comments for a New Information Collection

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FHWA invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) approval for a new information collection, which is summarized below under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.** We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Please submit comments by August 20, 2013.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by DOT Docket ID 2013–0034 by any of the following methods:

Web site: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received go to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Fax: 1–202–493–2251.

Mail: Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001.

Hand Delivery or Courier: U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Ferroni, 202–366–3233, Office of Planning, Environment, and Realty, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 6:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Noise Barrier Inventory.

Background: The basis of the Federal-aid highway program is a strong federal-state partnership. At the core of that partnership is a philosophy of trust and flexibility, and a belief that the states are in the best position to make investment decisions and that states base these decisions on the needs and priorities of their citizens. The FHWA noise regulation (23 CFR part 772) gives each state department of transportation (SDOT) flexibility to determine the feasibility and reasonableness of noise abatement by balancing of the benefits of noise abatement against the overall adverse social, economic, and environmental effects and costs of the noise abatement measures. The SDOT must base its determination on the interest of the overall public good, keeping in mind all the elements of the highway program (need, funding, environmental impacts, public involvement, etc.).

Reduction of highway traffic noise should occur through a program of shared responsibility with the most effective strategy being implementation of noise compatible planning and land use control strategies by state and local governments. Local governments can use their power to regulate land development to prohibit noise-sensitive land use development adjacent to a highway, or to require that developers plan, design, and construct development in ways that minimize noise impacts. The FHWA noise regulations limit Federal participation in the construction of noise barriers along existing highways to those projects proposed along lands where land development or substantial construction predated the existence of any highway.

The data reflects the flexibility in noise abatement decision-making. Some states have built many noise barriers while a few have built none. Through the end of 2010, 47 SDOTs and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have constructed over 2,748 linear miles of barriers at a cost of over $4.05 billion ($5.44 billion in 2010 dollars). Three states and the District of Columbia have not constructed noise barriers. Ten SDOTs account for approximately sixty-