

and public procedure is impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest. This determination must be supported by a brief statement. 5 U.S.C. 808(2). As stated previously, EPA had made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefore, and established an effective date of May 16, 2006. 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**. This correction to 40 CFR part 52 for Minnesota is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Intergovernmental relations, Lead, Nitrogen dioxide, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: May 5, 2006.

**Norman Niedergang,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

■ For the reasons stated in the preamble, part 52, title 40, chapter I of the Code of the Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

#### PART 52—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

#### § 52.2587 [Redesignated]

■ 2. Section 52.2587 is redesignated as § 52.2589.

[FR Doc. 06-4551 Filed 5-15-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 261

[SW-FRL-8169-5]

#### Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is granting a petition submitted by Bayer Material Science LLC (Bayer) to exclude (or delist) a certain solid waste generated by its Baytown, TX plant from the lists of

hazardous wastes. This final rule responds to the petition submitted by Bayer to delist K027, K104, K111, and K112 spent carbon generated from the facility's waste water treatment plant.

After careful analysis and use of the Delisting Risk Assessment Software (DRAS), EPA has concluded the petitioned waste is not hazardous waste. This exclusion applies to 7,728 cubic yards per year of the spent carbon.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* May 16, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** The public docket for this final rule is located at the EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202, and is available for viewing in EPA's Freedom of Information Act review room on the 7th floor from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. Call (214) 665-6444 for appointments. The reference number for this docket is [R6-TXDEL-FY06-Bayer-Spent Carbon]. The public may copy material from any regulatory docket at no cost for the first 100 pages and at a cost of \$0.15 per page for additional copies.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ben Banipal, Section Chief of the Corrective Action and Waste Minimization Section, Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division (6PD-C), EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202. For technical information concerning this notice, contact Michelle Peace, EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, (6PD-C), Dallas, Texas 75202, at (214) 665-7430, or [peace.michelle@epa.gov](mailto:peace.michelle@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The information in this section is organized as follows:

#### I. Overview Information

- A. What Action Is EPA Finalizing?
- B. Why Is EPA Approving This Action?
- C. What Are the Limits of This exclusion?
- D. How Will Bayer Manage the Waste, If It Is Delisted?
- E. When Is the Final Delisting Exclusion Effective?
- F. How Does this Final Rule Affect States?

#### II. Background

- A. What Is a Delisting?
- B. What Regulations Allow Facilities To Delist a Waste?
- C. What Information Must the Generator Supply?

#### III. EPA's Evaluation of the Waste Information and Data

- A. What Waste Did Bayer Petition EPA To Delist?
- B. How Much Waste Did Bayer Propose To Delist?
- C. How Did Bayer Sample and Analyze the Waste Data in This Petition?

#### IV. Public Comments Received on the Proposed Exclusion

- Who Submitted Comments on the Proposed Rule?

#### V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

### I. Overview Information

#### A. What Action Is EPA Finalizing?

After evaluating the petition, EPA proposed, on February 14, 2006, to exclude the waste from the lists of hazardous waste under 40 CFR 261.31 and 261.32 (see 71 FR 7704). EPA is finalizing the decision to grant Bayer's delisting petition to have its spent carbon generated from treating waste waters at the plant subject to certain continued verification and monitoring conditions.

#### B. Why Is EPA Approving This Action?

Bayer's petition requests a delisting from the K027, K104, K111, and K112, waste listings under 40 CFR 260.20 and 260.22. Bayer does not believe that the petitioned waste meets the criteria for which EPA listed it. Bayer also believes no additional constituents or factors could cause the waste to be hazardous. EPA's review of this petition included consideration of the original listing criteria and the additional factors required by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984. See section 3001(f) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6921(f), and 40 CFR 260.22(d)(1)-(4) (hereinafter all sectional references are to 40 CFR unless otherwise indicated). In making the final delisting determination, EPA evaluated the petitioned waste against the listing criteria and factors cited in § 261.11(a)(2) and (a)(3). Based on this review, EPA agrees with the petitioner that the waste is nonhazardous with respect to the original listing criteria. If EPA had found, based on this review, that the waste remained hazardous based on the factors for which the waste was originally listed, EPA would have proposed to deny the petition. EPA evaluated the waste with respect to other factors or criteria to assess whether there is a reasonable basis to believe that such additional factors could cause the waste to be hazardous. EPA considered whether the waste is acutely toxic, the concentration of the constituents in the waste, their tendency to migrate and to bioaccumulate, their persistence in the environment once released from the waste, plausible and specific types of management of the petitioned waste, the quantities of waste generated, and waste variability. EPA believes that the petitioned waste does not meet the listing criteria and thus should not be a listed waste. EPA's final decision to delist waste from Bayer's facility is based on the information submitted in support of this rule, including descriptions of the wastes and analytical data from the Baytown, TX facility.

### *C. What Are the Limits of This Exclusion?*

This exclusion applies to the waste described in the petition only if the requirements described in 40 CFR part 261, appendix IX, Table 2 and the conditions contained herein are satisfied.

### *D. How Will Bayer Manage the Waste, If It Is Delisted?*

Bayer will dispose of the spent carbon in a Subtitle D landfill.

### *E. When Is the Final Delisting Exclusion Effective?*

This rule is effective May 16, 2006. The Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 amended section 3010 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6930(b)(1), allows rules to become effective less than six months after the rule is published when the regulated community does not need the six-month period to come into compliance. That is the case here because this rule reduces, rather than increases, the existing requirements for persons generating hazardous waste. This reduction in existing requirements also provides a basis for making this rule effective immediately, upon publication, under the Administrative Procedure Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d).

### *F. How Does This Final Rule Affect States?*

Because EPA is issuing this exclusion under the Federal RCRA delisting program, only states subject to Federal RCRA delisting provisions would be affected. This would exclude states which have received authorization from EPA to make their own delisting decisions.

EPA allows states to impose their own non-RCRA regulatory requirements that are more stringent than EPA's requirements, under section 3009 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6929. These more stringent requirements may include a provision that prohibits a Federally issued exclusion from taking effect in the state. Because a dual system (that is, both Federal (RCRA) and State (non-RCRA) programs) may regulate a petitioner's waste, EPA urges petitioners to contact the State regulatory authority to establish the status of their wastes under the State law.

EPA has also authorized some states (for example, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Georgia, and Illinois) to administer a RCRA delisting program in place of the Federal program; that is, to make state delisting decisions. Therefore, this exclusion does not apply in those authorized states unless that state makes the rule part of its authorized program.

If Bayer transports the petitioned waste to or manages the waste in any state with delisting authorization, Bayer must obtain delisting authorization from that state before it can manage the waste as nonhazardous in the state.

## **II. Background**

### *A. What Is a Delisting Petition?*

A delisting petition is a request from a generator to EPA, or another agency with jurisdiction, to exclude or delist from the RCRA list of hazardous waste, certain wastes the generator believes should not be considered hazardous under RCRA.

### *B. What Regulations Allow Facilities To Delist a Waste?*

Under §§ 260.20 and 260.22, facilities may petition EPA to remove their wastes from hazardous waste regulation by excluding them from the lists of hazardous wastes contained in §§ 261.31 and 261.32. Specifically, § 260.20 allows any person to petition the Administrator to modify or revoke any provision of 40 CFR parts 260 through 265 and 268. Section 260.22 provides generators the opportunity to petition the Administrator to exclude a waste from a particular generating facility from the hazardous waste lists.

### *C. What Information Must the Generator Supply?*

Petitioners must provide sufficient information to EPA to allow EPA to determine that the waste to be excluded does not meet any of the criteria under which the waste was listed as a hazardous waste. In addition, the Administrator or his delegate must determine, where he/she has a reasonable basis to believe that factors (including additional constituents) other than those for which the waste was listed could cause the waste to be a hazardous waste and that such factors do not warrant retaining the waste as a hazardous waste.

## **III. EPA's Evaluation of the Waste Information and Data**

### *A. What Waste Did Bayer Petition EPA to Delist?*

On September 26, 2003, Bayer petitioned EPA to exclude from the lists of hazardous waste contained in § 261.32, spent carbon generated from its facility located in Baytown, Texas. The waste falls under the classification of a listed waste under § 261.30.

### *B. How Much Waste Did Bayer Propose to Delist?*

Specifically, in its petition, Bayer requested that EPA grant a conditional

exclusion for 7,728 cubic yards per year of the spent carbon.

### *C. How Did Bayer Sample and Analyze the Waste Data in This Petition?*

To support its petition, Bayer submitted:

(1) Analytical results of the toxicity characteristic leaching procedure (TCLP) and total constituent analysis for volatile and semivolatile organics, pesticides, herbicides, dioxins/furans, PCBs and metals for six spent carbon samples;

(2) Analytical results from multiple pH leaching of metals; and

(3) Descriptions of the waste water treatment process and carbon regeneration process.

## **IV. Public Comments Received on the Proposed Exclusion**

### *Who Submitted Comments on the Proposed Rule?*

There were no comments submitted on the proposed rule.

## **V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

Under Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review" (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), this rule is not of general applicability and therefore is not a regulatory action subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). 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.*) because it applies to a particular facility only. Because this rule is of particular applicability relating to a particular facility, it is not subject to the regulatory flexibility provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), or to sections 202, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104-4). Because this rule will affect only a particular facility, it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as specified in section 203 of UMRA. Because this rule will affect only a particular facility, this final rule does not have federalism implications. It 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, "Federalism" (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999). Thus, Executive Order 13132 does not apply to this rule. Similarly, because this rule will affect only a particular facility, this final rule does not have tribal

implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175, "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments" (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this rule. 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 as defined in Executive Order 12866, and because the Agency does not have reason to believe the environmental health or safety risks addressed by this action present a disproportionate risk to children. The basis for this belief is that the Agency used the DRAS program, which considers health and safety risks to infants and children, to calculate the maximum allowable concentrations for this rule. This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355 (May 22, 2001)), because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866. This rule does not involve technical standards; 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. As required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988, "Civil Justice Reform", (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996), in issuing this rule, EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct. 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. Section 804 exempts from section 801 the following types of rules: (1) Rules of particular applicability; (2) rules relating to agency management or personnel; and (3) rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties, 5 U.S.C. 804(3). EPA is not required to submit a rule report regarding today's

action under section 801 because this is a rule of particular applicability.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 261

Environmental protection, Hazardous waste, Recycling, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: May 3, 2006.

**Carl E. Edlund,**

*P.E., Director, Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, Region 6.*

■ For the reasons set out in the preamble, 40 CFR part 261 is to be amended as follows:

#### PART 261—IDENTIFICATION AND LISTING OF HAZARDOUS WASTE

■ 1. The authority citation for part 261 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 6905, 6912(a), 6921, 6922, and 6938.

■ 2. In Table 2 of Appendix IX of part 261 add the following waste stream in alphabetical order by facility to read as follows:

**Appendix IX to Part 261—Waste Excluded Under §§ 260.20 and 260.22**

TABLE 2.—WASTE EXCLUDED FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES

Facility	Address	Waste description
Bayer Material Science LLC ...	Baytown, TX ...	Spent Carbon (EPA Hazardous Waste Nos. K027, K104, K111, and K112) generated at a maximum rate of 7,728 cubic yards per calendar year after May 16, 2006. For the exclusion to be valid, Bayer must implement a verification testing program that meets the following Paragraphs: (1) Delisting Levels: All concentrations for those constituents must not exceed the maximum allowable concentrations in mg/l specified in this paragraph. Spent Carbon Leachable Concentrations (mg/l): Antimony–0.251; Arsenic–0.385, Barium–8.93; Beryllium–0.953; Cadmium–0.687; Chromium–5.0; Cobalt–2.75; Copper–128.0; Cyanide–1.65; Lead–5.0; Mercury–0.0294; Nickel–3.45; Selenium–0.266; Tin–2.75; Vanadium–2.58; Zinc–34.2; Aldrin–0.0000482; Acetophenone–87.1; Aniline–2.82; Benzene–0.554; Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate–0.342; Benzyl alcohol–261; Butylbenzylphthalate–3.54; Chloroform–0.297; Di-n-octyl phthalate–0.00427; 2,4-Dinitrotoluene–0.0249; 2,6-Dinitrotoluene–0.0249; Diphenylamine–1.43; 1,4-Dioxane–14.6; Di-n-butylphthalate–2.02; Kepone–0.000373; 2-Nitrophenol–87.9; N-Nitrodiphenylamine–3.28; Phenol–52.2; 2,4-Toluenediamine–0.00502; Toluene diisocyanate–0.001. (2) Waste Holding and Handling: (A) Waste classification as non-hazardous can not begin until compliance with the limits set in paragraph (1) for spent carbon has occurred for two consecutive quarterly sampling events and the reports have been approved by EPA. (B) If constituent levels in any sample taken by Bayer exceed any of the delisting levels set in paragraph (1) for the spent carbon, Bayer must do the following: (i) notify EPA in accordance with paragraph (6) and (ii) manage and dispose the spent carbon as hazardous waste generated under Subtitle C of RCRA. (3) Testing Requirements: Upon this exclusion becoming final, Bayer must perform quarterly analytical testing by sampling and analyzing the spent carbon as follows: (A) Quarterly Testing: (i) Collect two representative composite samples of the spent carbon at quarterly intervals after EPA grants the final exclusion. The first composite samples may be taken at any time after EPA grants the final approval. Sampling should be performed in accordance with the sampling plan approved by EPA in support of the exclusion.

TABLE 2.—WASTE EXCLUDED FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES—Continued

Facility	Address	Waste description
		<p>(ii) Analyze the samples for all constituents listed in paragraph (1). Any composite sample taken that exceeds the delisting levels listed in paragraph (1) for the spent carbon must be disposed as hazardous waste in accordance with the applicable hazardous waste requirements.</p> <p>(iii) Within thirty (30) days after taking its first quarterly sample, Bayer will report its first quarterly analytical test data to EPA. If levels of constituents measured in the samples of the spent carbon do not exceed the levels set forth in paragraph (1) of this exclusion for two consecutive quarters, Bayer can manage and dispose the non-hazardous spent carbon according to all applicable solid waste regulations.</p> <p>(B) Annual Testing:</p> <p>(i) If Bayer completes the quarterly testing specified in paragraph (3) above and no sample contains a constituent at a level which exceeds the limits set forth in paragraph (1), Bayer can begin annual testing as follows: Bayer must test two representative composite samples of the spent carbon for all constituents listed in paragraph (1) at least once per calendar year.</p> <p>(ii) The samples for the annual testing shall be a representative composite sample according to appropriate methods. As applicable to the method-defined parameters of concern, analyses requiring the use of SW-846 methods incorporated by reference in 40 CFR 260.11 must be used without substitution. As applicable, the SW-846 methods might include Methods 0010, 0011, 0020, 0023A, 0030, 0031, 0040, 0050, 0051, 0060, 0061, 1010A, 1020B, 1110A, 1310B, 1311, 1312, 1320, 1330A, 9010C, 9012B, 9040C, 9045D, 9060A, 9070A (uses EPA Method 1664, Rev. A), 9071B, and 9095B.</p> <p>Methods must meet Performance Based Measurement System Criteria in which the Data Quality Objectives are to demonstrate that samples of the Bayer spent carbon are representative for all constituents listed in paragraph (1).</p> <p>(iii) The samples for the annual testing taken for the second and subsequent annual testing events shall be taken within the same calendar month as the first annual sample taken.</p> <p>(iv) The annual testing report must include the total amount of waste in cubic yards disposed during the calendar year.</p> <p>(4) Changes in Operating Conditions:</p> <p>If Bayer significantly changes the process described in its petition or starts any process that generates the waste that may or could affect the composition or type of waste generated (by illustration, but not limitation, changes in equipment or operating conditions of the treatment process), it must notify EPA in writing and it may no longer handle the wastes generated from the new process as non-hazardous until the wastes meet the delisting levels set in paragraph (1) and it has received written approval to do so from EPA.</p> <p>Bayer must submit a modification to the petition complete with full sampling and analysis for circumstances where the waste volume changes and/or additional waste codes are added to the waste stream.</p> <p>(5) Data Submittals:</p> <p>Bayer must submit the information described below. If Bayer fails to submit the required data within the specified time or maintain the required records on-site for the specified time, EPA, at its discretion, will consider this sufficient basis to reopen the exclusion as described in paragraph (6). Bayer must:</p> <p>(A) Submit the data obtained through paragraph 3 to the Chief, Corrective Action and Waste Minimization Section, Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 6, 1445 Ross Ave., Dallas, Texas, 75202, within the time specified. All supporting data can be submitted on CD-ROM or some comparable electronic media.</p> <p>(B) Compile records of analytical data from paragraph (3), summarized, and maintained on-site for a minimum of five years.</p> <p>(C) Furnish these records and data when either EPA or the State of Texas requests them for inspection.</p> <p>(D) Send along with all data a signed copy of the following certification statement, to attest to the truth and accuracy of the data submitted:</p> <p>“Under civil and criminal penalty of law for the making or submission of false or fraudulent statements or representations (pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Federal Code, which include, but may not be limited to, 18 U.S.C. 1001 and 42 U.S.C. 6928), I certify that the information contained in or accompanying this document is true, accurate and complete. As to the (those) identified section(s) of this document for which I cannot personally verify its (their) truth and accuracy, I certify as the company official having supervisory responsibility for the persons who, acting under my direct instructions, made the verification that this information is true, accurate and complete.</p> <p>If any of this information is determined by EPA in its sole discretion to be false, inaccurate or incomplete, and upon conveyance of this fact to the company, I recognize and agree that this exclusion of waste will be void as if it never had effect or to the extent directed by EPA and that the company will be liable for any actions taken in contravention of the company's RCRA and CERCLA obligations premised upon the company's reliance on the void exclusion.”</p> <p>(6) Reopener:</p>

TABLE 2.—WASTE EXCLUDED FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES—Continued

Facility	Address	Waste description
*	*	<p>(A) If, anytime after disposal of the delisted waste Bayer possesses or is otherwise made aware of any environmental data (including but not limited to leachate data or ground water monitoring data) or any other data relevant to the delisted waste indicating that any constituent identified for the delisting verification testing is at a level higher than the delisting level allowed by EPA in granting the petition, then the facility must report the data, in writing, to EPA within 10 days of first possessing or being made aware of that data.</p> <p>(B) If either the quarterly or annual testing of the waste does not meet the delisting requirements in paragraph 1, Bayer must report the data, in writing, to EPA within 10 days of first possessing or being made aware of that data.</p> <p>(C) If Bayer fails to submit the information described in paragraphs (5),(6)(A) or (6)(B) or if any other information is received from any source, EPA will make a preliminary determination as to whether the reported information requires action to protect human health and/or the environment. Further action may include suspending, or revoking the exclusion, or other appropriate response necessary to protect human health and the environment.</p> <p>(D) If EPA determines that the reported information requires action, EPA will notify the facility in writing of the actions it believes are necessary to protect human health and the environment. The notice shall include a statement of the proposed action and a statement providing the facility with an opportunity to present information explaining why the proposed EPA action is not necessary. The facility shall have 10 days from the date of EPA's notice to present such information.</p> <p>(E) Following the receipt of information from the facility described in paragraph (6)(D) or (if no information is presented under paragraph (6)(D)) the initial receipt of information described in paragraphs (5), (6)(A) or (6)(B), EPA will issue a final written determination describing the actions that are necessary to protect human health and/or the environment. Any required action described in EPA's determination shall become effective immediately, unless EPA provides otherwise.</p>
*	*	

[FR Doc. 06-4514 Filed 5-15-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### 49 CFR Part 578

[Docket No. NHTSA-05-24109; Notice 2]

RIN 2127-AJ83

#### Civil Penalties

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document amends NHTSA's regulation on civil penalties by increasing the maximum civil penalties for violations of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, as amended (Vehicle Safety Act). This action is taken pursuant to the Federal Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, as amended by the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, which requires NHTSA to review and, as warranted, adjust penalties based on inflation at least every four years. In addition, this document codifies amendments to the penalty provisions of the Vehicle Safety Act by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A

Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and makes a technical correction to the text of the agency's penalty regulation.

**DATES:** This rule is effective on June 15, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael Kido, Office of Chief Counsel, NHTSA, telephone (202) 366-5263, facsimile (202) 366-3820, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This rule amends NHTSA's regulations on civil penalties under the Vehicle Safety Act, 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301. As explained below, it makes four changes to 49 CFR Part 578 *Civil and Criminal Penalties*. These changes were proposed and explained in our March 9, 2006 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM") at 71 FR 12156. There were no comments on that notice.

First, this rule adjusts for inflation the maximum available penalties codified at 49 CFR 578.6(a). In order to preserve the remedial impact of civil penalties and to foster compliance with the law, the Federal Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990 (28 U.S.C. 2461 Notes, Pub. L. 101-410), as amended by the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, (Pub. L. 104-134) (referred to collectively as the "Adjustment Act" or, in context, the "Act"), requires us and other Federal agencies to regularly adjust civil penalties for inflation. Under the Adjustment Act, following an

initial adjustment that was capped by the Act, these agencies must make further adjustments, as warranted, to the amounts of penalties in statutes they administer at least once every four years.

NHTSA is adjusting the maximum penalty for a single violation of the Vehicle Safety Act. The agency last published a rule stating the maximum civil penalty for a single violation or a single violation per day under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 301 on November 14, 2000, 65 FR 68108. This rule incorporated amendments to 49 U.S.C. 30165(a) in the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability, and Documentation (TREAD) Act, Pub. L. 106-414, 114 Stat. 1800. In the TREAD Act, Congress set the maximum penalty for a single violation of the Vehicle Safety Act or a regulation thereunder at \$5,000. The TREAD Act also set the maximum penalty for a violation of 49 U.S.C. 30166 or a regulation thereunder at \$5,000 per violation per day. The agency codified these amounts at 49 CFR 578.6(a)(1) and (a)(2), respectively. In today's rule, NHTSA is adjusting these amounts from \$5,000 to \$6,000 based on the Adjustment Act, for the reasons set forth in the NPRM.

Additionally, the agency is adjusting the maximum penalty amounts for a related series of violations of the Vehicle Safety Act or a regulation thereunder and for a related series of