(e) The application should include a proposed schedule or timeline depicting the development of the 511 deployment plan. The schedule should include milestone events or targeted activities, especially indicating any activities that require ITS–JPO actions or actions by organizations typically not influenced by the applying agency. The schedule should also indicate targets for delivery of any products or outputs from development activities.

2. Financial Plan

The Financial Plan should demonstrate that sufficient funding is available to successfully complete all aspects of the proposed development of the 511 deployment plan as described in section 1. The Financial Plan should also provide the financial information described under the heading, Matching Share/Cost Sharing.

An acceptable Financial Plan should:

(a) Provide a clear identification of the proposed funding for activities leading to the development of a comprehensive plan for deploying 511 services, and a commitment that no more than 80 percent of the total cost will be supported by these Federal ITS funds. As appropriate, financial commitments from other public agencies and from private firms should be documented in appropriate documents, such as memorandums of understanding.

(b) Describe how the 511 deployment plan will be developed to ensure its timely implementation and the continued, long-term operations of the system.

(c) As appropriate, include corresponding public and/or private investments that minimize the relative percentage and amount of Federal ITS funds, and evidence of continuing fiscal capacity and commitment from anticipated public and private sources.

Alternate Use of Funding

If a 511 deployment plan is developed and development activities do not exhaust all funding allocated under agreements resulting from this request, or if a 511 deployment plan exists, this funding may be used to offset the capital costs associated with converting traveler information telephone numbers to 511. Conversion activities that will be considered appropriate include telephone call routing or other call handling software modifications, necessary hardware changes, and system or acceptance testing. In addition, upon completion of a 511 deployment plan, this funding may also be used toward activities to develop 511 services. These activities may include development of basic traveler information services if none exist or are inadequate for delivery by 511.

Financial records shall be maintained that detail the activities or equipment provided by Federal funding, indicating appropriate total matching requirements, as described under the heading, Matching Share/Cost Sharing. As noted under that heading, the ITS–JPO and the Comptroller General of the United States have the right to access all documents pertaining to the use of Federal ITS funds and non-Federal contributions.

Authority: sec. 5001(a)(5), Pub. L. 105–178, 112 Stat. 107, 420; 23 U.S.C. 315; and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on: July 12, 2001.

Christine M. Johnson,

Program Manager, Operations Director, ITS Joint Program Office.

[FR Doc. 01–18303 Filed 7–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

National Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture; New User Service Procedure

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to announce that the U.S. Department of Transportation, through the ITS Joint Program Office (JPO), has developed a procedure for the introduction and integration of a new user service into the National ITS Architecture, as well as other significant changes encompassing several existing user services in the National ITS Architecture . This procedure will aid stakeholders in determining how to articulate their transportation needs for integration into the National ITS Architecture. Additionally, this procedure will increase public awareness of the incorporation process and will enable all interested parties to participate in the user service integration into the National ITS Architecture.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *For information on the National ITS Architecture User Service Procedure:* Mr. Lee Simmons, (202) 366–8048, ITS Joint Program Office (HOIT–1). *For Legal Questions:* Ms. Gloria Hardiman-Tobin, (202) 366–1397, Office of the Chief Counsel (HCC–40). Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal Holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded by using a computer, modem and suitable communications software from the Government Printing Office's Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202) 512–1661. Internet users may reach the Office of the Federal Register's home page at: *http://www.nara.gov/fedreg* and the Government Printing Office's web site at: *http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara*.

The entire National ITS Architecture may be reviewed and retrieved from the ITS web site: *http://www.its.dot.gov*. Follow the available link to Architecture.

Background

The National ITS Architecture provides a common framework for planning, defining, and integrating intelligent transportation systems. This common framework represents the starting point for more detailed regional and/or project architectures in which local characteristics are more appropriately addressed. The scope of the National ITS Architecture is defined by a set of user services. Each user service represents the most common activities and operations that transportation stakeholders perform to sustain efficient and safe travel.

The National ITS Architecture began as a program in 1993 to incorporate the 29 user services that were defined in the National ITS Program Plan. That stakeholder-based consensus effort was completed in 1996. Since that time, three new user services have been defined as follows: Highway Rail Intersection User Service was incorporated into the National ITS Architecture in January 1997, Archived Data User Service was incorporated into the current version (version 3.0) of the National ITS Architecture in December 1999, and the Maintenance and Construction Operations User Service, published in the **Federal Register** on April 18, 2001, at 66 FR 20026, has been defined and is in the process of being incorporated into the National ITS Architecture. The stakeholders involved represent a broad cross section of the ITS, construction, and maintenance communities, including transportation practitioners, systems engineers, system developers, technology specialists, and consultants.

The National ITS Architecture describes, for each of the user services, the functions required to perform the

services, and the key interfaces required to perform these functions.

The current set of user services can be grouped into the following categories:

1. Travel and Traffic Management;
2. Public Transportation Management;
3. Electronic Payment;
4. Commercial Vehicle Operations;
5. Emergency Management;
6. Advanced Vehicle Safety Systems;
7. Information Management; and
8. Maintenance and Construction Management.

The DOT recognizes that the current set of 32 user services do not cover all possible aspects of transportation systems, and there could be additions made to enhance the National ITS Architecture or to add new user services. Because the National ITS Architecture is a consensus architecture, the DOT would like to encourage continued involvement by the stakeholder community that best understands the need for enhancing the National ITS Architecture.

The following paragraphs describe a procedure for the development of a new user service and the introduction and integration of this new user service into the National ITS Architecture. It may also be used for a significant change cutting across a number of existing user services that does not call for the specific addition of a new user service. The procedure is not intended to be all-encompassing, nor is it intended to be restrictive. It should serve only as a guide to stakeholders who are interested in amending the National ITS Architecture to incorporate additional transportation practices and activities that are not currently reflected.

National ITS Architecture New User Service Procedure

The procedure consists of two phases. Phase one of the procedure is the principal responsibility of the stakeholder community and involves addressing its transportation system needs, formalizing them in an acceptable user service, and securing acceptance for integration into the National ITS Architecture. Phase two of the procedure is the principal responsibility of the ITS JPO and involves its actions to integrate the user service into the National ITS Architecture, coordinate its activities with the stakeholders, and ensure that the final product has stakeholder consensus and support. In both phases, it is necessary to engage in public outreach activities to ensure adequate awareness among the stakeholder and ITS communities and to offer the opportunity for them to participate.

Phase I

a. The first step is for the interested group of stakeholders to determine their collective concerns. Although it is not required, there are three sources of advocacy where the stakeholders may go for advice before proceeding. They are the ITS JPO, the applicable office or modal administration in the DOT, and ITS America. Voicing stakeholder concerns to an advocate should lead to a partnership and understanding of these concerns, and a better stakeholder understanding of the process to cause the National ITS Architecture to be modified.

b. The second step is for the stakeholders to review Volume II of the ''National ITS Program Plan, Intelligent Transportation Systems''.[1] This volume describes each of the 29 original user services. The 30th and 31st user services, addressing highway-rail intersection and archived data, have been separately developed and approved, and have been added to the appendix of the ''National Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Plan, Five-Year Horizon.'' [2] The description of the ''Maintenance and Construction Operations User Service'' represents the 32nd user service that is now being incorporated into the National ITS Architecture.[3] The review of these three documents enables the stakeholders to better understand the user needs currently addressed by the National ITS Architecture and how they are described. If their current needs are not satisfied in the three plans, then the stakeholders may choose to propose actions to add a newly defined user service to the National ITS Architecture.

At this point, the ITS JPO, in conjunction with other modal administrations as appropriate, will make a decision regarding the appropriateness and viability of the proposed new user service. If the decision is to proceed, there will be a notification to the broader transportation community of the intent to modify the National ITS Architecture in response to stakeholder concerns. This can be accomplished through a notice in the **Federal Register**; press releases to other print media; notices posted on the ITS DOT and ITS America websites; [4] notification to specific transportation committees including those of the Transportation Research Board (TRB), the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and the American Public Transportation Association (APTA); and notification to appropriate ITS America technical committees and task forces.

After reviewing the proposal for a new user service, the ITS JPO may determine that a new user service is not needed as the problem may be addressed by amending and/or modifying the existing user services. If they are not significant, recommendations in these areas should be forwarded to the ITS JPO for subsequent disposition and National ITS Architecture modification. If they are significant and cut across a number of existing user services, the same steps outlined below may be followed.

c. The third step is for the stakeholders to identify their specific transportation needs. It should be noted that the National ITS Architecture is a consensus architecture, and no individual or small group of persons will be able to change it without the full consent of the larger stakeholder community.

d. The fourth step is the development of the user service which will become an addendum to Volume II of the National ITS Program Plan, Intelligent Transportation Systems (see footnote 1) or an appendix to the National ITS Program Plan, Five-Year Horizon (see footnote 2). The definition of the new user service follows the general format shown in Volume II of the National ITS Program Plan, Intelligent Transportation Systems, and thus may require assistance from one of the advocacy sources. Prior to completing development, it is suggested that public outreach similar to the second step of Phase I be used again to invite reviews of the draft user service from within the known stakeholder community, as well as from the broader ITS community.

e. The fifth step is an ITS screening process used by the ITS JPO, working in conjunction with other modal administrations as appropriate. This entails a review of the definition of ITS to ensure that the user service improves the availability, efficiency, and safety of operations of the transportation system.

[1] Volume II of the National ITS Program Plan, Intelligent Transportation Systems, dated March 1995 is available at the following URL: *http://www.itsdocs.fhwa.dot.gov/jpodocs/repts_pr/2×601!.pdf*

[2] The National Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Plan, Five-Year Horizon, dated August 2000, is available at the following URL: *http://www.itsdocs.fhwa.dot.gov/jpodocs/repts_pr/97r01!.pdf*[2]

[3] The Maintenance and Construction Operations User Service is available at the following URL: *http://www.itsdocs.fhwa.dot.gov/jpodocs/repts_pr/13465.pdf*

[4] The URLs for the following web sites are provided: ITS JPO: *http://www.its.dot.gov*; National ITS Architecture: *http://www.its.dot.gov/arch/arch.htm*; ITS America: *http://www.itsa.org*

The screening process also ensures that the user service is consistent with the goals of integration and standardization. The ITS JPO will make the appropriate changes to the draft user service to ensure that its scope is consistent with the other user services.

f. The final step in Phase I is for the ITS JPO, with formal advice from ITS America, to determine whether or not to accept and include the completed user service into the National ITS Program Plan or the National ITS Five-Year Program Plan. Once accepted by the ITS JPO, the user service will be incorporated into the National ITS Architecture.

Phase II

a. The first step is for the ITS JPO to coordinate the revision of the National ITS Architecture that will satisfy the intent of the stakeholder community.

b. The second step is to develop a milestone schedule that includes a kickoff meeting and interim program review(s) to engage representatives of the stakeholder community, address the user service, and begin a formal National ITS Architecture integration effort.

At this stage, it is appropriate to invite a group of stakeholders who, where possible, will be involved in the kickoff meeting and each of the reviews to lend continuity and understanding to the overall effort and to ensure stakeholder concerns and needs are met. This will require an outreach effort prior to the kickoff meeting, again similar to the second step in Phase I.

c. The third step is to integrate the new user service into the National ITS Architecture. In addition to the technical work, the effort involves program reviews, and the possibility of outreach meetings with selected members of the stakeholder community.

d. The fourth step is to render a final report to the stakeholder community representatives by the ITS JPO. This is a brief oral report highlighting the changes and indicating that the integration effort is complete.

e. The final step is to post the changed National ITS Architecture on the ITS JPO and National ITS Architecture websites and to release the next version of the National ITS Architecture on CD–ROM, if appropriate.

There will be an outreach effort to announce the change and new version of the National ITS Architecture through the same media used previously. Phase II of the ITS JPO integration activities should be accomplished within 6 to 9 months, depending upon the detail and complexity of the new user service.

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 101, 106, 109 ,133, 315, and 508; sec 5206(e), Pub. L. 105–178,112 Stat. 457 (23 U.S.C. 502 note); and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued on: July 12, 2001.

Christine M. Johnson,

Program Manager, Operations Director, ITS Joint Program Office.

[FR Doc. 01–18246 Filed 7–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2000–7744; Notice 2]

General Motors Corporation; Denial of Application for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance

General Motors Corporation (GM) of Warren, Michigan, determined that certain headlamps on 1999 Buick Century and Buick Regal models do not meet the photometric requirements of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 108, ''Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment,'' and filed the report required by 49 CFR part 573, notifying the agency of the noncompliance. GM has also applied to be exempted from the notification and remedy requirements of 49 U.S.C. chapter 301—''Motor Vehicle Safety'' on the basis that the noncompliance is inconsequential to motor vehicle safety.

Notice of receipt of the application was published in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 49632) on August 14, 2000. Opportunity was afforded for public comment until September 13, 2000. One comment was received from Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety (Advocates).

GM manufactured 201,472 Buick Century and Buick Regal models between October 1998 and June 1999, some of whose headlamps do not meet the photometric requirements in FMVSS No. 108 for test points above the horizontal (intended for overhead sign illumination). To evaluate the noncompliance, GM randomly collected 10 pairs of lamps from production and photometrically tested them. Additionally, GM tested the same 10 pairs of lamps using accurately-rated bulbs. These are bulbs that have their filaments positioned within strict tolerances. In large scale bulb production, the filament positions vary slightly and, therefore, can produce varying photometric output. The photometric output of a lamp using an accurately-rated bulb is intended to closely represent the output that was intended in its design, and not that which would occur in a mass produced headlamp as sold on motor vehicles.

The test results indicate that five test points (production bulbs) and three test points (accurately-rated bulbs), respectively, failed to meet the minimum candela requirements. The test results also indicate that the amount of light below the minimum required was generally less than 10 percent at all noncomplying test points. However, seven failures at certain test points that were greater than 16 percent below the minimum, with the maximum variation being 24.4 percent (at 1.5 degrees up) with a production bulb. Transport Canada conducted tests on headlamps used on the same types of vehicles, and found that all the test points in question met the requirements. GM believes that these results show the noncomplying results were related to manufacturing variations and were present in only a portion of the lamps.

GM supports its application for inconsequential noncompliance with the following statements:

> The test points at issue are all above the horizon and are intended to measure illumination of overhead signs. They do not represent areas of the beam that illuminate the road surface, and the headlamps still fulfill applicable Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 108 requirements regarding road illumination.
>
> For years the rule of thumb has been that a 25 percent difference in light intensity is not significant to most people for certain lighting conditions.
>
> GM has not received any complaints from owners of the subject vehicles about their ability to see overhead signs.
>
> GM is not aware of any accidents, injuries, owner complaints or field reports related to this condition for these vehicles.

GM also cites a number of inconsequentiality applications that the agency has granted in the past as support for granting its application. Those cited were submitted by GM [59 FR 65428; December 19, 1994], Subaru of America, [56 FR 59971; November 26, 1991], and Hella, Inc. [55 FR 37602; September 12, 1990]. GM also cites a University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI) report entitled ''Just Noticeable Differences for Low-Beam Headlamp Intensities'' (UMTRI–97–4, February 1997).

In the only public comment received, Advocates stated its ''strongest opposition to NHTSA granting a finding of inconsequential noncompliance for the GM headlamps which are the subject of this notice.'' Advocates first points out that it believes GM's purported lack of complaints about inadequate headlamp illumination has ''no merit whatever.'' It believes that it is unlikely that drivers would attribute