

continue to increase. Cementing mutual understanding and streamlining the process involved will save money and time for both railroads and public agencies. In turn, road users will see the positive results of more rapid highway renewal on facilities and budget. The model agreements also lay out standardized construction and operational needs, thereby enhancing safety for workers and reducing delays for users.

#### 7. *Electronic Project Document Management Tools (e-construction)*

The administration of a project through the design and construction process requires significant communications and documentation of events. This has traditionally required writing and mailing letters through a Post Office or an internal mail system, keeping project journals, maintaining large file cabinets and file rooms, using physical signatures on paper, and taking notes at in-person meetings. With the advent of enhanced electronic project management tools, different modes of meeting, communicating, and assuring a secure version approval process, we are now accelerating the decisionmaking process. Some additional benefits noted by State DOTs using this technology are improved communications and partnering, decreased cost of printing and mailing services, opportunity to perform parallel work activities.

#### 8. *Geotechnical Solutions for Soil Improvement, Rapid Embankment Construction and Stabilization of the Pavement Working Platform (SHRP2 R02)*

The Geotechnical Solutions are a Technology Catalog with detailed information on 46 geoconstruction and ground improvement techniques. In addition, the product contains a Technology Selection system to aid in identifying potential technologies for ground modification based on user-defined project conditions. The geotechnical solutions are on a Web site developed as part of the research under the SHRP2 R02 project. The scope was aimed at identifying design and construction solutions for risk elements that may be encountered in project delivery related to: (a) Construction of new embankments and roadways over unstable soils, (b) widening and expansion of existing roadways and embankments and (c) stabilization of geotechnical pavement components and of working platforms. The R02 research team is deploying the product worldwide by promoting it to subject matter experts. Deployment efforts have been targeted at experienced users of the

geotechnologies. While the technologies are mature, the Web sites' technology selection system and technology catalog provide a significant resource for critically important information that assists in the design and construction of ground improvement techniques.

#### 9. *Ultra High Performance Concrete for Advanced Connection Technology for Prefabricated Bridge Elements and Systems*

Ultra-High Performance Concrete (UHPC) has proven to be a technology that can facilitate simplified, effective-use prefabricated bridge elements and systems (PBES). The proliferation of PBES concepts over the past 4 years has led to recognition among owners and specifiers that robust connection systems are a key part of any successful bridge construction project. The UHPC is a steel fiber reinforced cementitious composite possessing exceptionally high mechanical strengths and durability properties. Field casting of UHPC into the interstitial spaces between prefabricate components engages a strong connection concept, freeing the owner from concerns regarding the short- and long-term performance of the connection. Research and development on this topic over the past 5 years addressed specific connection concepts that are most relevant to the highway bridge community.

#### 10. *Road Diet (Roadway Configuration)*

The classic roadway reconfiguration, commonly referred to as a "road diet," involves converting an undivided four-lane roadway into three lanes, made up of two through lanes and a center two-way left-turn lane. The reduction of lanes allows the roadway to be reallocated for other uses such as bike lanes, pedestrian crossing islands and parking. Road diets have multiple safety and operational benefits for drivers as well as nonmotorists. Midblock locations can benefit from road diets because they tend to experience higher travel speeds, contributing to increased injury and fatality rates. More than 80 percent of pedestrians hit by vehicles traveling at 40 mph or faster die, while less than 10 percent die when hit by a vehicle traveling 20 mph or less. When appropriately applied, road diets generated benefits to users of all modes of transportation, including bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists. The resulting benefits include reduced vehicle speeds, improved mobility and access, reduced collisions and injuries and improved livability and quality of life. When modified from four travel lanes to two travel lanes with a two-way left-turn

lane, roadways experienced a 29 percent reduction in all roadway crashes. The benefits to pedestrians include reduced crossing distance and fewer midblock crossing locations, which account for more than 70 percent of pedestrian fatalities.

Road diets can be low cost if planned in conjunction with reconstruction or simple overlay projects, since a road diet mostly consists of restriping. The reduction of lanes allows the roadway to be reallocated for other uses such as bike lanes, pedestrian crossing islands, and parking. Road diets have multiple safety and operational benefits for vehicles as well as pedestrians, such as:

- Decreasing vehicle travel lanes for pedestrians to cross, therefore, reducing the multiple-threat crash for pedestrians (when one vehicle stops for a pedestrian in a travel lane on a multilane road, but the motorist in the next lane does not, resulting in a crash),
- Providing room for a pedestrian crossing island,
- Improving safety for bicyclists when bike lanes are added (such lanes also create a buffer space between pedestrians and vehicles),
- Providing the opportunity for on-street parking (also a buffer between pedestrians and vehicles),
- Reducing rear-end and side-swipe crashes, and
- Improving speed limit compliance and decreasing crash severity when crashes do occur.

Issued on: December 27, 2013.

**Victor M. Mendez,**

*FHWA Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2014-00079 Filed 1-7-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Transit Administration

[Safety Advisory 14-1]

#### Right-of-Way Worker Protection

**AGENCY:** Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice of Safety Advisory.

**SUMMARY:** On December 31, 2013, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued Safety Advisory 14-1 to provide guidance to State Safety Oversight Agencies (SSOAs) and rail fixed guideway public transportation agencies on redundant protections for roadway workers in the rail transit industry, and review and revision of rules and procedures to protect roadway workers from trains and moving equipment. FTA

issued this guidance in response to a number of recent accidents in the industry, and two urgent recommendations by the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB). FTA's Safety Advisory 14-1, "Right-of-Way Worker Protection," is available in its entirety on the agency's public Web site (<http://www.fta.dot.gov/tso.html>). Further, FTA has asked each SSOA to coordinate with every rail transit agency within its jurisdiction to complete and submit Appendix 1 to Safety Advisory 14-1, "Right-of-Way Worker Protection Assessment Checklist," and to conduct formal hazard analyses regarding the presence of workers in rail transit rights-of-way.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For program matters, Thomas Littleton, Associate Administrator for Safety and Oversight, telephone (202) 366-9239 or [Thomas.Littleton@dot.gov](mailto:Thomas.Littleton@dot.gov). For legal matters, Scott Biehl, Senior Counsel, telephone (202) 366-0826 or [Scott.Biehl@dot.gov](mailto:Scott.Biehl@dot.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On December 19, 2013, the NTSB issued two urgent safety recommendations to FTA. The first, R-13-39, recommends that all rail transit agencies be required to provide redundant protection for their roadway workers, such as positive train control, secondary warning devices, or shunting devices on track. The second, R-13-40, recommends that all rail transit agencies be required to review their rules and procedures for wayside workers and revise them, as necessary, to eliminate any authorization for worker access to transit rights-of-way in which the workers are dependent solely upon themselves to provide protection from trains and moving equipment. These two NTSB recommendations follow an October 19, 2013 accident in which two workers inspecting a dip in track on the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system were killed when both their backs were turned to a train traveling more than sixty miles per hour. The workers had access to the BART right-of-way under a procedure called "simple approval," which required mere notification to the agency's operations control center—there were no other protections in place for their safety.

The two recommendations are not limited to the BART accident, however. R-13-39 and R-13-40 reflect the results of recent NTSB investigations into fatalities and serious injuries to track workers on the rail transit systems in Boston, Chicago, Houston, Miami, New York, Sacramento, and Washington, DC. October 2013 was one of the deadliest months on record for the nation's rail

transit workers. Three workers were killed and two were seriously injured in two separate accidents on the rail transit right-of-way (ROW). Since 2002, 28 rail transit workers have lost their lives while working to maintain the nation's rail transit infrastructure.

We at the FTA and the U.S. Department of Transportation appreciate the urgency of the NTSB's findings, and the critical safety challenge in front of us. Over the last decade, 28 workers have been killed in accidents on the rail transit right-of-way and the systems, rules and procedures put in place to protect transit workers failed each time. We agree, wholeheartedly, with the NTSB's observation that "all rail transit systems are at risk for roadway worker fatalities and injuries." In response, specifically, to R-13-39 and R-13-40, FTA is issuing Safety Advisory 14-1: Right-of-Way Worker Protection, to both the agencies that own and operate rail fixed guideway systems and the SSOAs that oversee the safety of those systems. Safety Advisory 14-1 is designed to support a comprehensive review of the Right-of-Way Worker Protection ("RWP") programs already in place at rail transit agencies. It offers options and tools to enhance those programs. The guidance identifies available resources, current industry activities to improve RWPs, and a compilation of lessons learned from right-of-way worker accidents over the last decade, all of which are framed to help rail transit agencies assess their programs within the context of the broader national experience. Safety Advisory 14-1 is available in full on the Transit Safety and Oversight Web page of the FTA public Web site at <http://www.fta.dot.gov/tso.html>, together with the Federal Transit Administrator's *Dear Colleague* letter of December 31, 2013, and a letter of that same date from the FTA Associate Administrator for Safety and Oversight addressed to the SSOAs and the chief safety officers of rail transit agencies.

Additionally, FTA has asked each SSOA, in coordination with every rail transit agency within its jurisdiction, to complete and submit Appendix 1 to Safety Advisory 14-1, the "Right-of-Way Worker Protection Assessment Checklist," no later than February 28, 2014, and to oblige every rail transit agency to conduct a formal hazard analysis for the presence of workers on its rail transit right-of-way, no later than May 16, 2014. FTA will use the data and information from the assessment checklists in conducting a broader analysis for a response to NTSB recommendation R-13-39. FTA will use

the results of the formal hazard analyses in developing a full response to NTSB recommendation R-13-40. FTA has asked that the formal hazard analyses address the "simple approval" procedure at issue in the BART accident, as appropriate, as well as emergency and scheduled access in work zones and procedures for moving crews, both under traffic and in exclusive occupancy. Also, FTA has stated its interest in how SSOAs and rail transit agencies view the benefits of "lock outs" and various other redundant protections, such as positive train control, secondary warning devices, and shunting devices attached to track. Please see the summaries at <http://www.ntsbt.gov/doclib/recltters/2013/R-13-039-040.pdf>.

FTA's issuance of Safety Advisory 14-1 is in accordance with the Federal Transit Administrator's authority to "investigate public transportation accidents and incidents and provide guidance to recipients regarding prevention of accidents and incidents." 49 U.S.C. 5329(f)(5). The requests for information and data from the SSOAs and the rail transit agencies within their jurisdiction are based on FTA's authority to request program information pertinent to rail transit safety under the State Safety Oversight rule, 49 CFR 659.39(d).

Issued in Washington, DC this 2nd day of January, 2014.

**Peter Rogoff,**

*Federal Transit Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2014-00076 Filed 1-7-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[U.S. DOT Docket Number NHTSA-2013-0138]

### Reports, Forms, and Record Keeping Requirements

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

**ACTION:** Request for public comment on extension of a currently approved collection of information.

**SUMMARY:** 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 OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of