State by 2009. A State may also use up to 10 percent of its National Highway System, Surface Transportation Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement or Interstate Maintenance funds for HfL eligible projects as matching funds up to 100 percent in any fiscal year. Based on the level of incentive funding provided in SAFETEA-LU, it is anticipated that individual project funding levels will be in the $500,000 to $1,000,000 range per project.

Spending Plan

The majority of the 2006 HfL funding, in the order of 60 percent, will be used for projects; a significant portion of the funds, approximately 30 percent, will be used for technology transfer and the remainder of the funds would be expended on technology partnerships, information dissemination and stakeholder input and involvement. This approximate distribution of funds includes the costs for monitoring and evaluation for each element. The HfL spending plan will be evaluated yearly and adjusted accordingly.

Accountability

As a means of ensuring appropriate stewardship of public funds, the HfL program will include several monitoring and evaluation efforts to measure the effectiveness of the program and projects, as well as stakeholder input and involvement procedures. Although the individual activities within the HfL program will require extensive effort and funding, there will need to be measurements beyond the basic levels of success or failure of those activities taken individually. The higher level of evaluation should reflect the primary objective of the program as a whole: to improve the highway system as indicated by measurement of safety, construction congestion, quality and user satisfaction on HfL projects.

Monitor and Evaluation

The FHWA has the lead for monitoring and evaluation of HfL projects, and would be responsible for data collection, data storage and access, analysis, and reporting. FHWA personnel and private contractors will be used for this function. The owners of HfL-funded projects would supply or provide access to data and information. Costs associated with these activities are an eligible project expense. The FHWA Division Offices would serve as points of contact and coordination between the FHWA's contractor(s) and the State.

The monitoring and evaluation effort will be used to fully describe and quantify the outputs, results, and outcomes in the goal areas and to provide an assessment of the benefits derived from the overall investment. A cost effective economic analysis on HfL projects will be conducted by the FHWA HfL using economic techniques for measuring and valuing user cost; this might include but not be limited to Event-Only Analysis, Life Cycle Cost Analysis or Benefit-Cost Analysis. The resulting information would serve as a resource to highway program decision makers on the value of the innovations demonstrated in the HfL projects, help maintain the momentum needed to achieve the HfL goals, demonstrate the value of the entire pilot program, and provide the basis for projecting the benefits gained from expanding such an approach in the future.

The monitoring and evaluation element would encompass the entire HfL program. For the HfL projects, information collected prior to, during, and immediately after construction would include a full array of highway condition, financing, design, contracting, construction, operations, and safety data, as well as user statistics and opinions. The costs, outcomes, impacts, and benefits of the technology partnerships would also be fully documented. To the extent possible, information collected for the technology transfer and information dissemination aspects would include objective measures of the effectiveness and impact of the individual activities that are undertaken, in addition to information on the costs of those activities. The information gathered on the HfL projects, technology transfer and technology partnerships will also be used in research and development for the next generation of technologies and innovations and future technology transfer initiatives.

Stakeholder Input

The HfL stakeholders include highway owners, builders, suppliers, consultants, academicians, users (commercial motor carriers, motorists, bicyclist, and pedestrians), and those impacted secondarily by highways (neighbors and adjacent landowners, receivers of goods shipped over highways). Through stakeholder input and involvement, the FHWA desires to refine the approach and implementation of the HfL program as well as to build ownership for the program. Stakeholder input and involvement will be an ongoing element of the HfL program in order to evaluate the progress of the program, consider appropriate redirection in light of progress, and assess of the overall program results. Stakeholders would have opportunities to provide input on both the HfL Implementation plan, and the conduct of the program itself, including:

- The HfL performance goals;
- Applicable technologies and practices;
- Technology partnerships approaches; and
- Evaluation of HfL outcomes and benefits including demonstration projects, technology partnerships, technology transfer and information dissemination.

The FHWA is considering several stakeholder input and involvement approaches for the HfL program. Providing information and soliciting feedback would happen routinely through notices published in the **Federal Register,** presentations at highway town hall meetings or regional forums, and the establishment of a web-based communications interchange site, or "Community of Practice" on the HfL Internet Web site *http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hfl/.*

(**Authority:** Public Law 109–59 Section 1502, 23 U.S.C. 502 and 23 U.S.C. 315)

Issued on December 23, 2005.

J. Richard Capka,

Acting Federal Highway Administrator.

[FR Doc. E5–8107 Filed 12–29–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2005–23433]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 2000–2005 Komet Standard, Classic and Eurolite Trailers Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 2000–2005 Komet Standard, Classic and Eurolite trailers are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This document announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 2000–2005 Komet Standard, Classic and Eurolite trailers that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards (FMVSS) are eligible for importation into the United States because (1) they are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that were

certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is January 30, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Management, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9 am to 5 pm]. Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477–78) or you may visit *http://dms.dot.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Coleman Sachs, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–3151).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable FMVSS shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115, and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable FMVSS.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR Part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

US SPECS of Aberdeen, Maryland (Registered Importer 03–321) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether nonconforming 2000–2005 Komet Standard, Classic and Eurolite trailers are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles which U.S. SPECS believes are substantially similar are 2000–2005 Komet Standard, Classic and Eurolite trailers that were manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by their manufacturer as conforming to all applicable FMVSS.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 2000–2005 Komet Standard, Classic and Eurolite trailers to their U.S.-certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

US SPECS submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 2000–2005 Komet Standard, Classic and Eurolite trailers, as originally manufactured, conform to the FMVSS in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that 2000–2005 Komet Standard, Classic and Eurolite trailers are capable of being altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment:* Installation, on vehicles not already so equipped, of (a) tail lamps; (b) rear side marker lamps; and (c) front side marker lamps. The wiring system must also be modified.

Standard No. 119 *New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles Other than Passenger Cars:* Installation, on vehicles not already so equipped, of tires that conform to the requirements of this standard.

Standard No. 120 *Tire Selection and Rims for Motor Vehicles Other than Passenger Cars:* Installation, on vehicles not already so equipped, of (a) a tire information placard; and (b) rims that conform to the requirements of this standard.

The agency notes that the subject trailers are not equipped with braking systems. As a consequence, there is no need for the petition to discuss the vehicle's compliance with any of the brake standards that apply to trailers that are so equipped.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered. Notice of final action on the petition will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Claude H. Harris,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. E5–8130 Filed 12–29–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34779]

V & S Railway, Inc.—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Rail Line of Colorado, Kansas & Pacific Railway Company

V & S Railway, Inc. (VSR), a Class III rail carrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.41 to acquire (by lease) from Colorado, Kansas & Pacific Railway Company (CKPR) approximately 121.9 miles of rail line between milepost 747.5, near Towner, CO, and milepost 869.4, near NA Junction. VSR states that it has reached an agreement with CKPR and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) for VSR to be the assignee of the lease between CDOT and CKPR,[1] pursuant to which VSR will acquire by lease and operate the line.

VSR certifies that its projected annual revenues as a result of the transaction will not exceed those that would qualify it as a Class III rail carrier and will not exceed $5 million.

Consummation was scheduled to take place on or after December 9, 2005, the date the exemption became effective (7 days after filing).

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. 34779, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423–0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on Fritz R. Kahn, Fritz R. Kahn, P.C., 1920 N Street, NW., (8th fl.), Washington, DC 20036–1601.

[1] The Board approved the lease between CDOT and CKPR in *Colorado, Kansas & Pacific Railway Company—Lease, Operation, and Future Purchase Exemption—Colorado Department of Transportation*, STB Finance Docket No. 33857 (STB served Apr. 7, 2000).