

“Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use” (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001). This action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. Accordingly, the Administrator certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). Because this rule approves pre-existing requirements under state law and does not impose any additional enforceable duty beyond that required by state law, it does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4).

This rule also does not have tribal implications because it will not have a substantial direct effect on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). This action also does not have Federalism implications because it does not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government, as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). This action merely approves a state rule implementing a Federal standard, and does not alter the relationship or the distribution of power and responsibilities established in the Clean Air Act. This rule also is not subject to Executive Order 13045 “Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks” (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997), because it is not economically significant.

In reviewing SIP submissions, EPA’s role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In this context, in the absence of a prior existing requirement for the State to use voluntary consensus standards (VCS), EPA has no authority to disapprove a SIP submission for failure to use VCS. It would thus be inconsistent with applicable law for EPA, when it reviews a SIP submission, to use VCS in place of a SIP submission that otherwise satisfies the provisions of the Clean Air Act. Thus, the requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and

Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) do not apply. This rule does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A major rule cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by October 2, 2006. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: July 14, 2006.

Laura Yoshii,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.
[FR Doc. E6-12483 Filed 8-2-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL-8205-1]

National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Technical Correction of final partial deletion of the Motor Wheel Disposal Superfund Site from the National Priorities List.

SUMMARY: On June 23, 2006 (70 FR 36019) EPA published a technical correction to a final notice of deletion from the National Priorities List for the Motor Wheel, Lansing, Michigan Site. The technical correction had an error in the amendatory language. This action is correcting this error.

DATES: *Effective Date:* This action is effective as of August 3, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Comprehensive information on the Site, as well as the comments that were received during the comment period are available at: Robert Paulson, Community Involvement Coordinator, U.S. EPA, P19J, 77 W. Jackson, Chicago, IL, (312) 886-0272 or 1-800-621-8431.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gladys Beard, State NPL Deletion Process Manager, U.S. EPA (SR-6J), 77 W. Jackson, Chicago, IL 60604, (312) 886-7253 or 1-800-621-8431.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Information Repositories: Repositories have been established to provide detailed information concerning this decision at the following address: U.S. EPA Region V, 77 W. Jackson, Chicago, IL 60604, (312) 353-5821, Monday through Friday 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.; The Lansing Public Library, Reference Section, 401 Capital Ave., Lansing, MI 48933. On June 22, 2000 (65 FR 38806), EPA published a “Notice of intent to delete 3.45 acres of land from the Motor Wheel Disposal Site from the National Priorities List; request for comments,” and on June 22, 2000 (65 FR 38774), a “Direct final notice of deletion for 3.45 acres of land for the Motor Wheel Superfund Site from the National Priorities List (NPL).” The EPA is publishing this Technical Correction to the June 22, 2000, final notice of deletion due to errors that were published in that notice, a subsequent technical correction dated June 23, 2006, and in the National Priorities List at 40 CFR part 300, Appendix B. After review of the final notice of deletion and the National Priorities List, EPA is

publishing this Technical Correction today to change the word “revising” in the June 23, 2006 Direct final notice of deletion to the word “adding” and to amend 40 CFR part 300, Appendix B by adding the Motor Wheel, Lansing, Michigan, and inserting a “P” in the Notes(a) column for the Motor Wheel Site, Lansing, Michigan. EPA will place a copy of the final partial deletion package in the site repositories.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous substances, Hazardous waste, Intergovernmental relations, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Water pollution control, Water supply.

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1321(c)(2); 42 U.S.C. 9601–9657; E.O. 12777, 56 FR 54757, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p. 351; E.O. 12580, 52 FR 2923; 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p. 193.

Dated: July 24, 2006.

Norman Neidergang,

Acting Regional Administrator, EPA Region V.

■ For the reasons stated in the preamble, 40 CFR part 300 is amended as follows:
 ■ 2. Table 1 of Appendix B to part 300 is amended under Michigan “MI” by adding the entry for “Motor Wheel” to read as follows:

Appendix B to Part 300—National Priorities List

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

| State | Site name | City/County | Notes ^a |
|-------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|
| MI | Motor Wheel | Lansing | P |

^a * * *

P = Sites with partial deletions.

* * * *

[FR Doc. E6–12446 Filed 8–2–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 594

[Docket No. NHTSA 2006–24128; Notice 3]

RIN 2127–AJ87

Schedule of Fees Authorized by 49 U.S.C. 30141

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.
ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document adopts fees for Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 and until further notice, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 30141, relating to the registration of importers and the importation of motor vehicles not certified as conforming to the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS). These fees are needed to maintain the registered importer (RI) program.

We are decreasing the fees for the registration of a new RI from \$830 to \$677 and the annual fee for renewing an existing registration from \$745 to \$570. These fees include the costs of maintaining the RI program. The fee required to reimburse the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (Customs) for conformance bond processing costs will increase from

\$9.30 to \$9.77 per bond. We are also increasing the fees assessed against the importer of each vehicle covered by the decision to grant import eligibility. For vehicles determined eligible based on their substantial similarity to a U.S. certified vehicle, the fee is increased from \$150 to \$208. For vehicles determined eligible based on their capability of being modified to comply with all applicable FMVSS, the fee is increased from \$150 to \$208. In the event that a petitioner requests an inspection of a vehicle, the fee for such an inspection will remain \$827 for vehicles that are the subject of either type of petition. The fee that an RI must pay as a processing cost for review of each conformity package that it submits to NHTSA will decrease to \$13 from \$18 per certificate. If the vehicle has been entered electronically with Customs through the Automated Broker Interface (ABI) and the registered importer has an e-mail address, the fee for processing the conformity package will continue to be \$6, provided the fee is paid by credit card. However, if NHTSA finds that the information in the entry or the conformity package is incorrect, the processing fee will be \$48, representing no change from the fee that is currently charged when there are one or more errors in the ABI entry or omissions in the statement of conformity.

DATES: The amendments established by this final rule will become effective on October 1, 2006, the beginning of FY 2007. Petitions for reconsideration must be received by NHTSA not later than September 18, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Petitions for reconsideration of this final rule should refer to the docket and notice numbers identified above and be submitted to: Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. It is requested, but not required, that 10 copies of the petition be submitted. The petition must be received not later than 45 days after publication of this final rule in the **Federal Register**. Petitions filed after that time will be considered petitions filed by interested persons to initiate rulemaking pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301.

The petition must contain a brief statement of the complaint and an explanation as to why compliance with the final rule is not practicable, is unreasonable, or is not in the public interest. Unless otherwise specified in the final rule, the statement and explanation together may not exceed 15 pages in length, but necessary attachments may be appended to the submission without regard to the 15-page limit. If it is requested that additional facts be considered, the petitioner must state the reason why they were not presented to the Administrator within the prescribed time. The Administrator does not consider repetitious petitions and unless the Administrator otherwise provides, the filing of a petition does not stay the effectiveness of the final rule.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For legal issues: Michael Goode, Office of