

SP0502 (incorporated by reference, see § 195.3), the procedures for direct examination of indications from the indirect examination must include—

\* \* \* \* \*

(ii) Criteria for deciding what action should be taken if either:

(A) Corrosion defects are discovered that exceed allowable limits (Section 5.5.2.2 of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, see § 195.3) provides guidance for criteria); or

(B) Root cause analysis reveals conditions for which ECDA is not suitable (Section 5.6.2 of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, see § 195.3) provides guidance for criteria);

\* \* \* \* \*

(iv) Criteria that describe how and on what basis you will reclassify and re-prioritize any of the provisions specified in Section 5.9 of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, see § 195.3).

(5) *Post assessment and continuing evaluation.* In addition to the requirements in Section 6 of NACE SP 0502 (incorporated by reference, see § 195.3), the procedures for post assessment of the effectiveness of the ECDA process must include—

\* \* \* \* \*

(ii) Criteria for evaluating whether conditions discovered by direct examination of indications in each ECDA region indicate a need for reassessment of the pipeline segment at an interval less than that specified in Sections 6.2 and 6.3 of NACE SP0502 (see appendix D of NACE SP0502) (incorporated by reference, see § 195.3).

■ 34. In Appendix C to part 195, paragraph I. A. introductory text is revised to read as follows:

**Appendix C to Part 195—Guidance for Implementation of an Integrity Management Program**

\* \* \* \* \*

I. \* \* \*

A. The rule defines a High Consequence Area as a high population area, an other populated area, an unusually sensitive area, or a commercially navigable waterway. The Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) will map these areas on the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS). An operator, member of the public or other government agency may view and download the data from the NPMS home page <http://www.npms.phmsa.gov/>. OPS will maintain the NPMS and update it periodically. However, it is an operator's responsibility to ensure that it has identified all high consequence areas that could be affected by a pipeline segment. An operator is also responsible for periodically evaluating its pipeline segments to look for population or environmental changes that may have occurred around the pipeline and to keep its

program current with this information. (Refer to § 195.452(d)(3).)

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 3, 2010, under authority delegated in 49 CFR part 1.

**Cynthia L. Quarterman,**  
*Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2010-19643 Filed 8-10-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-60-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

**49 CFR Part 594**

[Docket No. NHTSA 2010-0035; Notice 2]  
**RIN 2127-AK70**

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

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document adopts fees for Fiscal Year 2011 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 increasing the fees for the registration of a new RI from \$760 to \$795 and the annual fee for renewing an existing registration from \$651 to \$670. The fee to reimburse Customs for conformance bond processing costs will decrease from \$10.23 to \$9.93 per bond. We are decreasing the fees for the importation of a vehicle covered by an import eligibility decision made on an individual model and model year basis. For vehicles determined eligible based on their substantial similarity to a U.S. certified vehicle, the fee will decrease from \$198 to \$158. For vehicles determined eligible based on their capability of being modified to comply with all applicable FMVSS, the fee will also decrease from \$198 to \$158. The fee for the inspection of a vehicle will remain \$827. The fee for processing a conformity package will increase to \$17 from \$14. If the vehicle has been entered electronically with Customs through the Automated Broker Interface (ABI) and the RI 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 \$57, representing a \$9 increase in 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, 2010. Petitions for reconsideration must be received by NHTSA not later than September 27, 2010.

**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, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., West Building, 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:** Clint Lindsay, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-5291). For legal issues, you may call Nicholas Englund, Office of Chief Counsel, NHTSA (202-366-5263).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Introduction**

This rule was preceded by a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that NHTSA published on May 7, 2010 (75 FR 25169).

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, as amended by the

Imported Vehicle Safety Compliance Act of 1988, and recodified at 49 U.S.C. 30141–30147 (“the Act”), provides for fees to cover the costs of the importer registration program, the cost of making import eligibility decisions, and the cost of processing the bonds furnished to Customs. Certain fees became effective on January 31, 1990, and have been in effect, with modifications, since then. On June 24, 1996, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** at 61 FR 32411 that discussed the rulemaking history of 49 CFR Part 594 and the fees authorized by the Act. The reader is referred to that notice for background information relating to this rulemaking action.

We last amended the fee schedule in 2008. See final rule published on September 24, 2008 at 73 FR 54981. Those fees apply to Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010.

The fees adopted in this final rule are based on time expenditures and costs associated with the tasks for which the fees are assessed. They reflect the increase in hourly costs in the past two fiscal years attributable to the approximately 4.78 and 2.42 percent raises (including the locality adjustment for Washington, DC) in salaries of employees on the General Schedule that became effective on January 1, 2009, and on January 1, 2010, respectively.

#### Comments

There were no comments in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking.

#### Requirements of the Fee Regulation

##### *Section 594.6—Annual Fee for Administration of the Importer Registration Program*

Section 30141(a)(3) of Title 49, U.S. Code provides that RIs must pay the annual fee the Secretary of Transportation establishes “\* \* \* to pay for the costs of carrying out the registration program for importers \* \* \*.” This fee is payable both by new applicants and by existing RIs. To maintain its registration, each RI, at the time it submits its annual fee, must also file a statement affirming that the information it furnished in its registration application (or in later submissions amending that information) remains correct. 49 CFR 592.5(f).

In compliance with the statutory directive, we reviewed the existing fees and their bases in an attempt to establish fees that would be sufficient to recover the costs of carrying out the registration program for importers for at least the next two fiscal years. The initial component of the Registration Program Fee is the fee attributable to processing and acting upon registration

applications. We will increase this fee from \$295 to \$320 for new applications. We have also determined that the fee for the review of the annual statement submitted by existing RIs who wish to renew their registrations will be increased from \$186 to \$195. These fee adjustments reflect our time expenditures in reviewing both new applications and annual statements with accompanying documentation, as well as the inflation factor attributable to Federal salary increases and locality adjustments in the two years since the regulation was last amended.

We must also recover costs attributable to maintenance of the registration program that arise from the need for us to review a registrant’s annual statement and to verify the continuing validity of information already submitted. These costs also include anticipated costs attributable to the possible revocation or suspension of registrations and reflect the amount of time that we have devoted to those matters in the past two years.

Based upon our review of these costs, the portion of the fee attributable to the maintenance of the registration program is approximately \$475 for each RI, an increase of \$10. When this \$475 is added to the \$320 representing the registration application component, the cost to an applicant comes to \$795, which is the fee we are adopting. This represents an increase of \$35 over the existing fee. When the \$475 is added to the \$195 representing the annual statement component, the total cost to an RI renewing its registration comes to \$670, which represents an increase of \$19.

Section 594.6(h) enumerates indirect costs associated with processing the annual renewal of RI registrations. The provision states that these costs represent a *pro rata* allocation of the average salary and benefits of employees who process the annual statements and perform related functions, and “a *pro rata* allocation of the costs attributable to maintaining the office space, and the computer or word processor.” The indirect costs that were previously calculated and are now being applied at \$20.31 per man-hour (73 FR 54983, Sep. 24, 2008) are being increased by \$0.36, to \$20.67. This increase is based on the difference between enacted budgetary costs within the Department of Transportation for the last two fiscal years, which were higher than the estimates used when the fee schedule was last amended, and takes account of further projected increases over the next two fiscal years.

##### *Sections 594.7, 594.8—Fees To Cover Agency Costs in Making Importation Eligibility Decisions*

Section 30141(a)(3) also requires RIs to pay other fees the Secretary of Transportation establishes to cover the costs of “\* \* \* (B) making the decisions under this subchapter.” This includes decisions on whether the vehicle sought to be imported is substantially similar to a motor vehicle that was originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and certified by its original manufacturer as complying with all applicable FMVSS, and whether the vehicle is capable of being readily altered to meet those standards. Alternatively, where there is no substantially similar U.S.-certified motor vehicle, the decision is whether the safety features of the vehicle comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, the FMVSS based on destructive test information or such other evidence that NHTSA deems to be adequate. These decisions are made in response to petitions submitted by RIs or manufacturers, or on the Administrator’s own initiative.

The fee for a vehicle imported under an eligibility decision made in response to a petition is payable in part by the petitioner and in part by other importers. The fee to be charged for each vehicle is the estimated *pro rata* share of the costs in making all the eligibility decisions in a fiscal year. Inflation and General Schedule raises must also be taken into account in the computation of costs.

The agency believes that the volume of petition-based imports for the next two fiscal years should not be projected on the basis of any single year. The agency estimates the number of vehicles that will be imported under an import eligibility petition in each year for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012 will equal the average number of such imports over that past five years. Further, the agency estimates the number of import eligibility petitions that will be filed in each year for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012 will equal the average number of petitions filed each year since 2000. Based on these estimates, we project that 554 vehicles would be imported under petition-based eligibility decisions and that 25 petition-based import eligibility decisions would be made.

Based on these estimates, we project that for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012, the agency’s costs for processing these 25 petitions will be \$95,479. The petitioners will pay \$8,125 of that amount in the processing fees that accompanied the filing of their

petitions, leaving the remaining \$87,354 to be recovered from the importers of the 554 vehicles imported under petition-based import eligibility decisions. Dividing \$87,354 by 554 yields a *pro rata* fee of \$158 for each vehicle imported under an eligibility decision that resulted from the granting of a petition. We are therefore decreasing the *pro rata* share of petition costs that are to be assessed against the importer of each vehicle by \$40, from \$198 to \$158. The same \$158 fee would be paid regardless of whether the vehicle was petitioned under 49 CFR 593.6(a), based on the substantial similarity of the vehicle to a U.S.-certified model, or was petitioned under 49 CFR 593.6(b), based on the safety features of the vehicle complying with, or being capable of being modified to comply with, all applicable FMVSS.

We are not increasing the current fee of \$175 that covers the initial processing of a “substantially similar” petition. We are also maintaining the existing fee of \$800 to cover the initial costs for processing petitions for vehicles that have no substantially similar U.S.-certified counterparts.

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 importation fee varies depending upon the basis on which the vehicle is determined to be eligible. For vehicles covered by an eligibility decision on the agency’s own initiative (other than vehicles imported from Canada that are covered by import eligibility numbers VSA–80 through 83, for which no eligibility decision fee is assessed), the fee remains \$125. NHTSA determined that the costs associated with previous eligibility decisions on the agency’s own initiative will be fully recovered by October 1, 2010. We will apply the fee of \$125 per vehicle only to vehicles covered by determinations made by the agency on its own initiative on or after October 1, 2010.

*Section 594.9—Fee for Reimbursement of Bond Processing Costs and Costs for Processing Offers of Cash Deposits or Obligations of the United States in Lieu of Sureties on Bonds*

Section 30141(a)(3) also requires an RI to pay any other fees the Secretary of Transportation establishes “\* \* \* to pay for the costs of—(A) processing bonds provided to the Secretary of the Treasury \* \* \*.” Under Section 30141(d), the bond is provided at the time a nonconforming vehicle is imported to ensure that the vehicle will be brought into compliance within 120

days, as required by 49 CFR 591.8(d)(1), or if the vehicle is not brought into compliance within such time, that it be exported, without cost to the United States, or abandoned to the United States. See Section 30141(d)(1)(B).

The Department of Homeland Security (Customs) administers the functions associated with the processing of these bonds. The statute contemplates that we will make a reasonable determination of the cost that Customs incurs in processing the bonds. In essence, the cost to Customs is based upon an estimate of the time that a GS–9, Step 5 employee spends on each entry, which Customs has judged to be 20 minutes.

Based on General Schedule salary and locality raises that were effective in January 2009 and 2010 and the inclusion of costs for benefits, we are decreasing the processing fee by \$0.30, from \$10.23 per bond to \$9.93. This decrease reflects the fact that GS–9 salaries were increased by a smaller amount than we previously projected when we last amended the fee schedule in 2008. This fee will reflect the direct and indirect costs that are actually associated with processing the bonds.

In lieu of sureties on a DOT conformance bond, an importer may offer United States money, United States bonds (except for savings bonds), United States certificates of indebtedness, Treasury notes, or Treasury bills (collectively referred to as “cash deposits”) in an amount equal to the amount of the bond. 49 CFR 591.10(a). The receipt, processing, handling, and disbursement of the cash deposits that have been tendered by RIs cause the agency to consume a considerable amount of staff time and material resources. NHTSA has concluded that the expense incurred by the agency to receive, process, handle, and disburse cash deposits may be treated as part of the bond processing cost, for which NHTSA is authorized to set a fee under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(3)(A). We first established a fee of \$459 for each vehicle imported on and after October 1, 2008, for which cash deposits or obligations of the United States are furnished in lieu of a conformance bond. See final rule published on July 11, 2008 at 73 FR 39890.

The agency considered its direct and indirect costs in calculating the fee for the review, processing, handling, and disbursement of cash deposits submitted by importers and RIs in lieu of sureties on a DOT conformance bond. We are increasing the fee \$55, from \$459 to \$514. The factors that the agency has taken into account for this fee include time expended by agency personnel, the

increase in General Schedule salary raises that were effective in January 2009 and 2010, and increased contractor and overhead costs.

*Section 594.10—Fee for Review and Processing of Conformity Certificate*

Each RI is currently required to pay \$14 per vehicle to cover the costs the agency incurs in reviewing a certificate of conformity. We have found that these costs have increased to an average of \$17 per vehicle because of increased contractor and overhead costs. Based on these costs, we are increasing the fee charged for vehicles for which a paper entry and fee payment is made, from \$14 to \$17, a difference of \$3 per vehicle. However, if an RI enters a vehicle through the ABI system, has an e-mail address to receive communications from NHTSA, and pays the fee by credit card, the cost savings that we realize allow us to significantly reduce the fee to \$6. We are maintaining the fee of \$6 per vehicle if all the information in the ABI entry is correct.

Errors in ABI entries not only eliminate any time savings, but also require additional staff time to be expended in reconciling the erroneous ABI entry information with the conformity data that is ultimately submitted. Our experience with these errors has shown that staff members must examine records, make time-consuming long distance telephone calls, and often consult supervisory personnel to resolve the conflicts in the data. We have calculated this staff and supervisory time, as well the telephone charges, to amount to approximately \$57 for each erroneous ABI entry. Adding this to the \$6 fee for the review of conformity packages on automated entries yields a total of \$63, representing a \$9 increase in the fee that is currently charged when there are one or more errors in the ABI entry or omissions in the statement of conformity.

**Statutory Basis for the Final Rule and Effective Date**

NHTSA is required under 49 U.S.C. 30141(e) to “review and make appropriate adjustments at least every 2 years in the amounts of the fees” relating to the registration of importers, the processing of bonds, and making decisions concerning the importation of nonconforming vehicles. The statute further requires the agency to “establish the fees for each fiscal year before the beginning of that year.” This final rule implements the statutory provisions. In the NPRM, we proposed to make this rule effective October 1, 2010, and did not receive any comments on this issue.

Accordingly, the effective date of this final rule is October 1, 2010.

### Rulemaking Analyses and Notices

#### A. Executive Order 12866 and DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures

Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review" (58 FR 51735, Oct. 4, 1993), provides for making determinations whether a regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review and to the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines a "significant regulatory action" as one that is likely to result in a rule that may:

- (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities;
- (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;
- (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or
- (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

NHTSA has considered the impact of this rulemaking action under Executive Order 12866 and the Department of Transportation's regulatory policies and procedures. This rulemaking is not significant. Accordingly, the Office of Management and Budget has not reviewed this rulemaking document under Executive Order 12886. Based on the level of the fees and the volume of affected vehicles, NHTSA currently anticipates that the costs of the final rule would be so minimal as not to warrant preparation of a full regulatory evaluation. The action does not involve any substantial public interest or controversy. There would be no substantial effect upon State and local governments. There would be no substantial impact upon a major transportation safety program. A regulatory evaluation analyzing the economic impact of the final rule establishing the registered importer program, adopted on September 29, 1989, was prepared, and is available for review in the docket.

#### B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory

Enforcement Fairness Act (SBFEFA) of 1996, whenever an agency is required to publish a notice of proposed rulemaking for any proposed or final rule, it must prepare and make available for public comment a regulatory flexibility analysis that describes the effect of the rule on small entities (*i.e.*, small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions). The Small Business Administration's regulations at 13 CFR Part 121 define a small business, in part, as a business entity "which operates primarily within the United States." (13 CFR 121.105(a). No regulatory flexibility analysis is required if the head of an agency certifies that the rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The SBFEFA amended the Regulatory Flexibility Act to require Federal agencies to provide a statement of the factual basis for certifying that a rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The agency has considered the effects of this rulemaking under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and certifies that the adopted amendments will not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities.

The following is NHTSA's statement providing the factual basis for the certification (5 U.S.C. 605(b)). The adopted amendments will primarily affect entities that currently modify nonconforming vehicles and which are small businesses within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act; however, the agency has no reason to believe that these companies would be unable to pay the fees adopted in this rulemaking action. In most instances, these fees would not be changed or be only modestly increased (and in some instances decreased) from the fees previously being paid by these entities. Moreover, consistent with prevailing industry practices, these fees should be passed through to the ultimate purchasers of the vehicles that are altered and, in most instances, sold by the affected registered importers. The cost to owners or purchasers of nonconforming vehicles that are altered to conform to the FMVSS may be expected to increase (or decrease) to the extent necessary to reimburse the registered importer for the fees payable to the agency for the cost of carrying out the registration program and making eligibility decisions, and to compensate Customs for its bond processing costs.

Governmental jurisdictions will not be affected at all since they are generally neither importers nor purchasers of nonconforming motor vehicles.

#### C. Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)

Executive Order 13132 on "Federalism" requires NHTSA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have Federalism implications." Executive Order 13132 defines the term "policies that have federalism implications" to include regulations that 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." Under Executive Order 13132, NHTSA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or NHTSA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

The amendments adopted in this final rule will 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. Moreover, NHTSA is required by statute to impose fees for the administration of the RI program and to review and make necessary adjustments in those fees at least every two years. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this rulemaking action.

#### D. National Environmental Policy Act

NHTSA has analyzed this action for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act. The action would not have a significant effect upon the environment because it is solely concerned with the adjustment of fees associated with the agency's vehicle importation program. On account of those fee adjustments, the annual volume of motor vehicles imported through registered importers is not anticipated to vary significantly from that existing before promulgation of the rule.

#### E. Executive Order 12778 (Civil Justice Reform)

Pursuant to Executive Order 12988 "Civil Justice Reform," this agency has considered whether the amendments adopted in this final rule will have any

retroactive effect. NHTSA concludes that those amendments will not have any retroactive effect. Judicial review of the final rule may be obtained pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 702. That section does not require that a petition for reconsideration be filed prior to seeking judicial review.

F. *Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995*

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) requires agencies to prepare a written assessment of the costs, benefits, and other effects of proposed or final rules that include a Federal mandate likely to result in the expenditure by State, local, or tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of more than \$100 million annually (adjusted for inflation with the base year of 1995). Before promulgating a rule for which a written assessment is needed, Section 205 of the UMRA generally requires NHTSA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and to adopt the least costly, most cost-effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of Section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, Section 205 allows NHTSA to adopt an alternative other than the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative if the agency publishes with the final rule an explanation why that alternative was not adopted. Because this final rule will not require the expenditure of resources beyond \$100 million annually, this action is not subject to the requirements of Sections 202 and 205 of the UMRA.

G. *Paperwork Reduction Act*

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, a person is not required to respond to a collection of information by a Federal agency unless the collection displays a valid OMB control number. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, a person is not required to respond to a collection of information by a Federal agency unless the collection displays a valid OMB control number. Part 594 includes collections of information for which NHTSA has obtained OMB Clearance No. 2127-0002, a consolidated collection of information for "Importation of Vehicles and Equipment Subject to the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety, Bumper and Theft Prevention Standards," approved through 11/30/2010. This final rule would not affect the burden hours associated with Clearance No. 2127-0002 because we

are only adjusting the fees associated with participating in the registered importer program. These proposed new fees will not impose new collection of information requirements or otherwise affect the scope of the program.

H. *Executive Order 13045*

Executive Order 13045 applies to any rule that (1) is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under Executive Order 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental, health, or safety risk that NHTSA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, we must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned rule is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by us. This rulemaking is not economically significant and does not concern an environmental, health, or safety risk.

I. *National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act*

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272) directs NHTSA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless doing so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies, such as the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE). The NTTAA directs the agency to provide Congress, through the OMB, explanations when we decide not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

In this final rule, we are adjusting the fees associated with the registered importer program. We are making no substantive changes to the program nor do we adopt any technical standards. For these reasons, Section 12(d) of the NTTAA would not apply.

J. *Privacy Act*

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all submissions received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment or petition (or signing the comment or petition, 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).

K. *Regulation Identifier Number (RIN)*

The Department of Transportation assigns a regulation identifier number (RIN) to each regulatory action listed in the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulations. The Regulatory Information Service Center publishes the Unified Agenda in April and October of each year. You may use the RIN that appears in the heading on the first page of this document to find this action in the Unified Agenda.

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 594, Schedule of Fees Authorized by 49 U.S.C. 30141, in Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

**List of Subjects in 49 CFR part 594**

Imports, Motor vehicle safety, Motor vehicles.

**PART 594—SCHEDULE OF FEES AUTHORIZED BY 49 U.S.C. 30141**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 594 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30141, 31 U.S.C. 9701; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

- 2. Amend § 594.6 by:
  - (a) Revising the introductory text of paragraph (a);
  - (b) Revising paragraph (b);
  - (c) Revising the first sentence of paragraph (d);
  - (d) Revising the second sentence of paragraph (h); and
  - (e) Revising paragraph (i) to read as follows:

**§ 594.6 Annual fee for administration of the registration program.**

(a) Each person filing an application to be granted the status of a Registered Importer pursuant to part 592 of this chapter on or after October 1, 2010, must pay an annual fee of \$795, as calculated below, based upon the direct and indirect costs attributable to:

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) That portion of the initial annual fee attributable to the processing of the application for applications filed on and after October 1, 2010, is \$320. The sum of \$320, representing this portion, shall not be refundable if the application is denied or withdrawn.

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) That portion of the initial annual fee attributable to the remaining activities of administering the registration program on and after October 1, 2010, is set forth in paragraph (i) of this section. \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(h) \* \* \* This cost is \$20.67 per man-hour for the period beginning October 1, 2010.

(i) Based upon the elements and indirect costs of paragraphs (f), (g), and (h) of this section, the component of the initial annual fee attributable to administration of the registration program, covering the period beginning October 1, 2010, is \$475. When added to the costs of registration of \$320, as set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, the costs per applicant to be recovered through the annual fee are \$795. The annual renewal registration fee for the period beginning October 1, 2010, is \$670.

■ 3. Amend § 594.7 by revising the first sentence of paragraph (e) to read as follows:

**§ 594.7 Fee for filing petitions for a determination whether a vehicle is eligible for importation.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) For petitions filed on and after October 1, 2010, the fee payable for seeking a determination under paragraph (a)(1) of this section is \$175.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

■ 4. Amend § 594.8 by revising the first sentence of paragraph (b) and the first sentence of (c) to read as follows:

**§ 594.8 Fee for importing a vehicle pursuant to a determination by the Administrator.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) If a determination has been made pursuant to a petition, the fee for each vehicle is \$158. \* \* \*

(c) If a determination has been made on or after October 1, 2010, pursuant to the Administrator's initiative, the fee for each vehicle is \$125. \* \* \*

■ 5. Amend § 594.9 by revising paragraph (c) and (e) to read as follows:

**§ 594.9 Fee for reimbursement of bond processing costs and costs for processing offers of cash deposits or obligations of the United States in lieu of sureties on bonds.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) The bond processing fee for each vehicle imported on and after October 1, 2010, for which a certificate of conformity is furnished, is \$9.93.

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) The fee for each vehicle imported on and after October 1, 2010, for which cash deposits or obligations of the United States are furnished in lieu of a conformance bond, is \$514.

■ 6. Amend § 594.10 by revising paragraph (d) to read as follows:

**§ 594.10 Fee for review and processing of conformity certificate.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) The review and processing fee for each certificate of conformity submitted on and after October 1, 2010 is \$17.

However, if the vehicle covered by the certificate has been entered electronically with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security through the Automated Broker Interface and the registered importer submitting the certificate has an e-mail address, the fee for the certificate is \$6, provided that the fee is paid by a credit card issued to the registered importer. If NHTSA finds that the information in the entry or the certificate is incorrect, requiring further processing, the processing fee shall be \$57.

**Marilena Amoni,**

*Associate Administrator for The National Center for Statistics and Analysis.*

[FR Doc. 2010-19771 Filed 8-10-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 0910051338-0151-02]

RIN 0648-XY03

#### Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Implementation of Trip Limit for Witch Flounder and Removal of Trip Limit for Pollock

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Temporary rule; inseason adjustment of landing limits.

**SUMMARY:** This action implements a landing limit for witch flounder and removes the trip limit for pollock for Northeast (NE) multispecies vessels fishing under common pool regulations for the 2010 fishing year (FY). This action also corrects a previously published cod trip limit for common pool vessels fishing under a limited access Handgear A permit. This action is authorized by the regulations implementing Amendment 16 and Framework Adjustment 44 (FW 44) to the NE Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and is intended to decrease the likelihood of harvest exceeding the subcomponent of the annual catch limit (ACL) for witch flounder allocated to the common pool (common pool sub-ACL) and underharvesting the sub-ACL for

pollock during FY 2010 (May 1, 2010, through April 30, 2011). This action is being taken to optimize the harvest of NE regulated multispecies under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

**DATES:** Changes to the pollock and cod Handgear A trip limits are effective August 6, 2010, through April 30, 2011. The witch flounder trip limit is effective August 9, 2010, through April 30, 2011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brett Alger, Fishery Management Specialist, (978) 675-2153, fax (978) 281-9135.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Regulations governing possession and landing limits for vessels fishing under common pool regulations are found at 50 CFR 648.86. The regulations authorize vessels issued a valid limited access NE multispecies permit and fishing under a NE multispecies day-at-sea (DAS), or fishing under a NE multispecies Small Vessel or Handgear A or B category permit, to fish for and retain NE multispecies, under specified conditions. The vessels fishing in the common pool are allocated a sub-ACL equivalent to that portion of the commercial groundfish ACL that is not allocated to the 17 approved NE multispecies sectors for FY 2010. The final rule implementing FW 44 (75 FR 18356, April 9, 2010) established ACLs for FY 2010, including the common pool sub-ACL for witch flounder of 25 mt. A subsequent emergency rule published on July 20, 2010 (75 FR 41996), increased the ACL for pollock based on the results of a new stock assessment, and changed the FY 2010 common pool sub-ACL from 62 mt to 375 mt. Currently, there is no landing limit for witch flounder, and the landing limit for pollock is 1,000 lb (453.6 kg) per DAS up to 10,000 lb (4,535.9 kg) per trip.

The regulations at § 648.86(o) authorize the Administrator, Northeast (NE) Region, NMFS (Regional Administrator) to increase or decrease the trip limits for vessels in the common pool to prevent over-harvesting or under-harvesting the common pool sub-ACL. Exceeding the common pool sub-ACL prior to April 30, 2011, would likely require drastic trip limit reductions and/or imposition of differential DAS counting for the remainder of FY 2010 to minimize the overage, and would trigger accountability measures (AMs) in FY 2011, including differential DAS counting, to prevent future overages.

Initial Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) and dealer reports indicate that