(a) None. If all sensors report no fault, the truck may bypass the station.

(b) Would still need/want USDOT registration number to check carrier history.

(c) Would still need/want CDL or other license information to check driver history.

(d) For trucks randomly sampled for inspection, no matter what information about the carrier, driver or truck was transmitted, the truck would still need to pass in front of inspectors at slow speed to allow for quick visual inspection.

(e) Other.

9. Please rank the following concerns/challenges with implementing an ''automated'' wireless type of safety inspection concept, with 1 being the greatest concern and 5 being the least concern.

(a) __Privacy concerns

(b) __Electronic falsification of data

(c) __Accuracy of measured data

(d) __Operator resistance to implementation

(e) __Added operational and maintenance requirements

(f) __Other (please specify)

10. Regarding driver HOS violations, what would be sufficient to transmit to the inspection station? (select one)

(a) A simple ''in-violation'' versus ''no-violation'' signal.

(b) Information that indicates if an operator is approaching a violation threshold.

(c) The actual HOS for each rule (*e.g.,* 60-hr., 70 hr., etc.).

(d) The complete logbook regardless of status of violation.

(e) Other.

11. Regarding the options described below, which would you deem more helpful for improving the overall screening, inspection process, and safety of commercial vehicles and why? (select one)

Option 1: Utilize on-board vehicle sensors to monitor brake wear, tire pressure, and other critical parameters. Also, electronically identify the driver CDL information using smart cards/readers and electronically coded U.S. DOT and license numbers. Combine all electronic information (vehicle health, CDL, and carrier identifier data) to form a ''safety data message set'' that could be wirelessly transmitted from the vehicle to a fixed or mobile roadside inspection station, or other locations as needed. This data could be used to eliminate portions of a manually-performed vehicle inspection, reduce the amount of time spent inspecting each truck, improve effectiveness, and assist in identifying which trucks to inspect. Information could be sent to carriers as well to provide vehicle diagnostic and driver data for fleet safety management purposes. In the future, when sufficient accuracy and system security (anti-tampering) can be assured, a new automated inspection level could be defined, *i.e.,* ''Level 7,'' where citations would be given to the drivers and automatically sent to carriers.

Option 2: Implement a screening procedure whereby vehicle, carrier, and driver identifier-only information (*i.e.,* no ''real-time'' vehicle health or driver status data) could be downloaded wirelessly from each vehicle well in advance of the weigh/inspection station. The information could then be used to query databases containing driver history and credentialing data, past vehicle inspection history, and carrier-safety-rating data. Vehicle weight would be monitored using in-road (WIM) equipment and correlated with the identifier information obtained wirelessly.

Option 3: Similar to Option 2, except carrier and vehicle identifier data are obtained from roadside equipment only (no transponder on vehicle) using high-accuracy video that reads DOT and license numbers. Vehicle weight would be monitored using in-road (WIM) equipment and correlated with the identifier data.

Option 4: Maintain the same procedures currently used, but increase the number of trucks inspected through use of additional manpower and facilities.

__Option 1 __ Option 2 __ Option 3 __ Option 4

Comments:

12. What technology for wirelessly transmitting data from the vehicle to the roadside inspection site should be favored and why? (select one)

__Wi-Fi__Cellular__Satellite__Other __Any and all of the above

Comments:

13. As noted earlier, on average, a heavy duty commercial vehicle (tractor-trailer) is likely to receive an inspection approximately once per year with trucks from higher risk carriers often inspected more frequently. How frequently would inspections need to occur before carriers and operators (particularly high-risk carriers) would begin to significantly modify their behavior relative to vehicle maintenance and driver compliance? Once a month? Once a week? Other? If a subset of inspection information could be electronically screened at all inspection sites (*i.e.,* brake, tire, and lighting system diagnostic data; electronic hours-of-service record; CDL information; and carrier and vehicle identification data), how would this impact carrier and operator behavior?

14. If such a program were implemented on a national scale (together with high-speed WIM technology), it could reduce the amount of time vehicles spend at roadside inspection facilities. Depending on the cost of implementing such technology from the motor carrier's perspective, the increase in efficiency may well be cost beneficial. However, it has been argued that such new technology systems are often adopted by ''good carriers'' and, as such, they do little to improve the safety of poorer performing carriers. Please comment on possible strategies and approaches for implementing a nationwide wireless vehicle inspection program that would encourage broad-based participation from a significant percentage of motor carriers. Could a voluntary program with incentives be successful (identify and explain potential incentives)? Should a phased-in regulatory approach be considered? Other?

15. Please provide any other comments on the safety benefits, technical barriers, institutional challenges and/or costs of implementation associated with a wireless, automated safety inspection program.

Issued on: August 5, 2005.

Annette M. Sandberg,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 05–16163 Filed 8–15–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Waiver Petition Docket Number FRA–2002–11809]

North County Transit District; Supplementary Notice of Waiver Request; Notice of Public Hearing; and Extension of Comment Period

As a supplement to North County Transit District's (NCTD) Petition for Approval of Shared Use and Waiver of Certain Federal Railroad Administration Regulations (the waiver was granted by the FRA on June 24, 2003), NCTD seeks a permanent waiver of compliance from additional sections of Title 49 of the CFR for operation of its SPRINTER rail line between Oceanside, CA and Escondido, CA. *See* Statement of Agency Policy Concerning Jurisdiction Over the Safety of Railroad Passenger Operations and Waivers Related to Shared Use of the Tracks of the General Railroad System by Light Rail and

Conventional Equipment, 65 FR 42529 (July 10, 2000). See also Joint Statement of Agency Policy Concerning Shared Use of the Tracks of the General Railroad System by Conventional Railroads and Light Rail Transit Systems, 65 FR 42626 (July 10, 2000).

In this regard, NCTD has advanced the design and construction of the SPRINTER rail line towards implementation and in the process, has identified the following additional regulations from which it hereby seeks waivers: 49 CFR part 223 Safety Glazing Standards—Locomotives, Passenger Cars and Cabooses, Section 223.9(c), and part 229 Railroad Locomotive Safety Standards, Section 229.125(a).

As a result of the comments received by FRA concerning this waiver petition, FRA has determined that a public hearing is necessary before a final decision is made on this petition. A public hearing was originally scheduled for July 27, 2005. However, due to the unavailability of some of the interested parties, FRA opened the public hearing and announced that a second public hearing would be scheduled in this matter. Accordingly, a public hearing is set to begin at 9:30 a.m. on September 14, 2005, in Rooms 4438 and 4440 at the Department of Transportation Headquarters Nassif Building, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Interested parties are invited to present oral statements at this hearing.

The hearing will be informal and conducted in accordance with FRA's Rules of Practice (49 CFR part 211.25) by a representative designated by FRA. FRA's representative will make an opening statement outlining the scope of the hearing, as well as any additional procedures for the conduct of the hearing. The hearing will be a non-adversarial proceeding in which all interested parties will be given the opportunity to express their views regarding this waiver petition without cross-examination. After all initial statements have been completed, those persons wishing to make a brief rebuttal will be given an opportunity to do so in the same order in which initial statements were made. Additional procedures, if necessary for the conduct of the hearing, will be announced at the hearing.

In addition, FRA is extending the comment period in this proceeding until September 23, 2005. FRA reserves the right to announce a further extension of the comment period for the purpose of receiving post-hearing submissions should that appear appropriate in the judgment of the Board based on testimony received at the public hearing.

All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (Waiver Petition Docket Number FRA–2002–11809) and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, DOT Docket Management Facility, Room PL–401 (Plaza Level), 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.–5 p.m.) at the above facility. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility's Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

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). The Statement may also be found at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

Issued in Washington, DC on August 11, 2005.

Michael Logue,

Deputy Associate Administrator.

[FR Doc. 05–16282 Filed 8–15–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket Number FRA–2005–21015]

Central New York Railroad Corporation, Norfolk Southern Corporation, and New York, Susquehanna and Western Railway Corporation; Notice of Public Hearing and Extension of Comment Period

The Central New York Railroad Corporation, Norfolk Southern Corporation, and New York, Susquehanna and Western Railway Corporation have jointly petitioned the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) seeking approval of the proposed discontinuance and removal of the interlocking, automatic block signal, and traffic control systems, on the single and double main tracks, between CP Sparrow Bush, milepost 89.9, near Port Jervis, New York, and, CP BD, milepost 213.0, near Binghamton, New York, a distant of approximately 123 miles. This block signal application proceeding is identified as Docket Number FRA–2005–21015.

FRA has issued a public notice seeking comments of interested parties and is conducting its own field investigation in this matter. However, after examining the carrier's proposal and numerous letters of comments from interested parties; FRA has determined that a public hearing is necessary before a final decision is made on this proposal. FRA is also extending the comment period to one week beyond the date of the public hearing. If information received at the public hearing warrants the need to extend the comment period further, a separate notice will be published indicating such extension.

Accordingly, a public hearing is hereby set for 9 a.m. daylight-saving time, on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, in Conference Room 1, on the 18th floor, of the State Office Building, at 44 Hawley Street, in Binghamton, New York 13901. Interested parties are invited to present oral statements at the hearing.

The hearing will be an informal one and will be conducted in accordance with Rule 25 of the FRA Rules of Practice (49 CFR part 211.25), by a representative designated by the FRA.

The hearing will be a non adversary proceeding and, therefore, there will be no cross-examination of persons presenting statements. The FRA representative will make an opening statement outlining the scope of the hearing. After all initial statements have been completed, those persons wishing to make brief rebuttal statements will be given the opportunity to do so in the same order in which they made their initial statements. Additional procedures, if necessary for the conduct of the hearing, will be announced at the hearing.

In addition, FRA is extending the comment period to October 5, 2005. All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (*e.g.*, Waiver Petition Docket Number FRA–2005–21015) and must be submitted to the Docket Clerk, DOT Docket Management Facility, Room PL–401 (Plaza Level), 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. All written communications concerning these proceedings are available for examination during regular business hours (9 a.m.–5 p.m.) at the above facility. All documents in the public docket are also available for inspection and copying on the Internet at the docket facility's Web site at *http://dms.dot.gov.*

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