new powerhouse, containing one 1.2-megawatt Kaplan turbine with a hydraulic capacity of 1,000 cfs and a generator, discharging flows into the Snake River; (5) a gated overflow spillway to pass flood flows around the powerhouse; (6) a 3,000-foot-long, 15-kilovolt transmission line extending to a distribution line owned by Rocky Mountain Power; (7) a switchyard; and (8) appurtenant facilities. Flow diversions for the project would take into account minimum flow requirements for the bypassed reach of the Snake River. The estimated annual generation of the project would be 7.5 gigawatt-hours.

Applicant Contact: Mr. Alan D. Kelsch, Chairman, Idaho Irrigation District, 496 E. 14th Street, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83404; phone: (208) 522–2356.

FERC Contact: Dianne Rodman; phone: (202) 502–6077.

Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene, competing applications (without notices of intent), or notices of intent to file competing applications: 60 days from the issuance of this notice. Competing applications and notices of intent must meet the requirements of 18 CFR 4.36. Comments, motions to intervene, notices of intent, and competing applications may be filed electronically via the Internet. See 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission’s Web site http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eFiling.asp. Commenters can submit brief comments up to 6,000 characters, without prior registration, using the eComment system at http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eComment.asp. You must include your name and contact information at the end of your comments. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at 1–866–208–3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. Comments, protests and interventions may be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper. See, 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission’s Web site under the “e-Filing” link. The Commission strongly encourages intervenors to file electronically. Any person or the Commission’s staff may, within 60 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission’s Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.205), a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefore, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the allowed time for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to section 7 of the NGA.

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
[Docket No. CP11–61–000]

Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

January 24, 2011.

Take notice that on January 19, 2011, Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company (Williston Basin), 1250 West Century Avenue, Bismarck, North Dakota 58503, pursuant to its blanket certificate issued in Docket Nos. CP82–487–000, et al.,1 filed an application in accordance to sections 157.210 and 157.213(b) of the Commission’s Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (NGA) as amended, for the construction and operation of new natural gas storage and transmission facilities located in Fallon County, Montana (Baker Storage Enhancement Project), all as more fully set forth in the application, which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

In order to accommodate requests for increased firm storage and transportation services, Williston Basin proposes to drill three additional storage wells, one observation well, and associated storage field pipelines and measurement facilities at its Baker Storage Reservoir. Williston Basin also adds two natural gas-fueled units, rated at 2,370 hp each, at the Monarch Compressor Station; and one natural gas-fueled unit, rated at 1,680 hp, at the Sandstone Creek Compressor Station. The proposed facilities will enhance the deliverability of the Baker Storage Reservoir by 35,000 Mcf/day and provide 7,000 Mcf/day of incremental transportation transfer capacity. The cost of the proposed facilities is approximately $12,355,000. Williston Basin proposes the facilities to be completed and placed into service by November 1, 2011.

Any questions concerning this application may be directed to Keith A. Tiggelaar, Director of Regulatory Affairs, Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company, 1250 West Century Avenue, Bismarck, North Dakota 58503, (701) 530–1560, or e-mail at keith.tiggelaar@wbip.com.

This filing is available for review at the Commission or may be viewed on the Commission’s Web site at http://www.ferc.gov, using the “eLibrary” link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number filed to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or call toll-free at (866) 206–3676, or, for TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. Comments, protests and interventions may be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper. See, 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission’s Web site under the “e-Filing” link. The Commission strongly encourages intervenors to file electronically. Any person or the Commission’s staff may, within 60 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission’s Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.205), a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefore, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the allowed time for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to section 7 of the NGA.

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
[FRL–9260–5]

California State Motor Vehicle and Nonroad Engine Pollution Control Standards; Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment Regulation at Ports and Intermodal Rail Yards; Opportunity for Public Hearing and Comment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of opportunity for public hearing and comment.

SUMMARY: The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has notified EPA that it has adopted regulations for mobile cargo handling equipment at ports and intermodal rail yards (Mobile Cargo
Carb's Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment requirements are designed to use best available control technologies to reduce public exposure to emissions of diesel particulate matter and nitrogen oxides. The requirements apply to any motorized vehicle used to handle cargo, including yard trucks, top handlers, side handlers, rubber-tired gantry cranes, forklifts, dozers, and loaders. By letter dated January 29, 2007, Carb has requested that EPA confirm that certain requirements are within-the-scope of previously granted EPA waivers and authorizations under the Clean Air Act, and grant a new full authorization pursuant to the Clean Air Act for other requirements that are applicable to nonroad engines. This notice announces that EPA has tentatively scheduled a public hearing regarding its request based on written submissions to Carb.

DATES: EPA has tentatively scheduled a public hearing concerning Carb's request on Thursday, February 17, 2011, at 1 p.m. EPA will hold a hearing only if any party notifies EPA by February 7, 2011, expressing its interest in presenting oral testimony. By February 11, 2011, any person who plans to attend the hearing may call David Alexander at (202) 343–9540, to learn if a hearing will be held or may check the following webpage for an update: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/cafr.htm.

PARTIES WISHING TO PRESENT ORAL TESTIMONY AT THE PUBLIC HEARING SHOULD CONTACT: David Alexander at (202) 343–9540. Fax: (202) 343–2800. E-mail: a-and-r-docket@epa.gov.

If EPA does not receive a request for a public hearing, then EPA will not hold a hearing, and instead consider Carb's request based on written submissions to the docket. Any party may submit written comments until March 17, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0862, by one of the following methods:


- E-mail: a-and-r-docket@epa.gov.
- Fax: (202) 566–1741.

1. California's Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment at Ports and Intermodal Rail Yards

In a letter dated January 29, 2007, Carb submitted to EPA its request pursuant to section 209 of the Clean Air Act (“CAA”) or “the Act”), regarding its regulations for Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment at Ports and Intermodal Rail Yards (“Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment” or “CHE”). Carb’s Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment regulations were adopted at Carb’s December 8, 2005 public hearing (by Resolution 05–62) and were subsequently modified.
after making the regulation available for supplemental public comment by CARB’s Executive Officer in Executive Order R-06-007 on June 2, 2006. The Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment regulations are codified at title 12, California Code of Regulations section 2479. CARB’s Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment regulations establish best available control technology (BACT) requirements that affect the sellers, renters, lessors, owners, and operators of mobile cargo handling equipment that are used at California’s ports or intermodal rail yards. For newly purchased, leased, or rented equipment, certified on-road engines would be required if available for the specific equipment type and application. Otherwise, the highest level certified off-road engine would be required, along with installation of the highest level verified diesel emission control strategy (VDECS) within one year of purchase, lease, or rent, or within six months of becoming available, if after a year. The regulations require in-use yard trucks to meet BACT performance standards primarily through accelerated turnover of older yard trucks to those equipped with cleaner, on-road engines (2007 model year or later). Owners or operators who have installed VDECS prior to the end of 2006, or who are already using certified on-road engines, are given additional time to comply. In addition, compliance is phased in for owners or operators who have more than three yard trucks in their fleet. Equipment other than yard trucks (non-yard trucks) would also be required to meet BACT, constituting replacement by cleaner on-road or off-road engines and/or the use of retrofits. When retrofits are used, replacement with Tier 4 off-road engines or installation of a Level 3 VDECS (which achieves an eighty-five percent reduction of emissions of diesel particulate matter) is required for some equipment. The Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment regulations also include recordkeeping and reporting requirements for owners and operators of mobile cargo handling equipment.

II. Clean Air Act New Motor Vehicle and Engine Waivers of Premption

Section 209(a) of the Clean Air Act preempts states and local governments from setting emission standards for new motor vehicles and engines; it provides:

No State or any political subdivision thereof shall adopt or attempt to enforce any standard relating to the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines subject to this part. No state shall require certification, inspection or any other approval relating to the control of emissions from any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine as condition precedent to the initial retail sale, titling (if any), or registration of such motor vehicle, motor vehicle engine, or equipment.

Through operation of section 209(b) of the Act, California is able to seek and receive a waiver of section 209(a)’s preemption. If certain criteria are met, section 209(b)(1) of the Act requires the Administrator, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, to waive application of the prohibitions of section 209(a). Section 209(b)(1) only allows a waiver to be granted for any State that had adopted standards (other than crankcase emission standards) for the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines prior to March 30, 1966, if the State determines that its standards will be, in the aggregate, at least as protective of public health and welfare as applicable Federal standards (if such State makes a “protectiveness determination”). Because California was the only state to have adopted standards prior to 1966, it is the only state that is qualified to seek and receive a waiver.1 The Administrator must grant a waiver unless she finds that: (A) California’s above-noted “protectiveness determination” is arbitrary and capricious; 2 (B) California does not need such State standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions; 3 or (C) California’s standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are not consistent with section 202(a) of the Act.4 EPA has previously stated that consistency with section 202(a) requires that California’s standards must be technologically feasible within the lead time provided, giving due consideration of costs, and that California and applicable Federal test procedures be consistent. 5

III. Clean Air Act Nonroad Engine and Vehicle Authorizations

Section 209(e)(1) of the Act permanently preempts any State, or political subdivision thereof, from adopting or attempting to enforce any standard or other requirement relating to the control of emissions for certain new nonroad engines or vehicles. Section 209(e)(2) requires the Administrator, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, to authorize California to enforce standards and other requirements relating to the control of emissions from new engines not listed under section 209(e)(1), if certain criteria are met. EPA has promulgated regulations implementing these provisions at 40 CFR part 1074. These regulations set forth the criteria that EPA must consider before granting California authorization to enforce its new nonroad emission standards. Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 1074.105 provides:

(a) The Administrator will grant the authorization if California determines that its standards will be, in the aggregate, at least as protective of public health and welfare as otherwise applicable federal standards.

(b) The authorization will not be granted if the Administrator finds that any of the following are true:

(1) California’s determination is arbitrary and capricious.

(2) California does not need such standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions.

(3) The California standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are not consistent with section 209 of the Act.

(c) In considering any request from California to authorize the state to adopt or enforce standards or other requirements relating to the control of emissions from new nonroad spark-ignition engines smaller than 50 horsepower, the Administrator will give appropriate consideration to safety factors (including the potential increased risk of burn or fire) associated with compliance with the California standard.

As stated in the preamble to the section 209(e) rule, EPA has historically interpreted the section 209(e)(2)(iii) “consistency” inquiry to require, at minimum, that California standards and enforcement procedures be consistent with section 209(a), section 209(e)(1), and section 209(b)(1)(C) (as EPA has interpreted that subsection in the context of section 209(b) motor vehicle waivers).6 In order to be consistent with section 209(a), California’s nonroad standards and enforcement procedures must not apply to new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines. To be consistent with section 209(e)(1), California’s nonroad standards and enforcement procedures must not attempt to regulate engine categories that are permanently preempted from state regulation. To determine consistency with section 209(b)(1)(C), EPA typically reviews nonroad authorization requests under the same “consistency” criteria that are applied to motor vehicle waiver requests. Pursuant to section 209(b)(1)(C), the Administrator shall not grant California a motor vehicle waiver.

---

2 Clean Air Act (CAA) section 209(b)(1)(A).
3 CAA section 209(b)(1)(B).
4 CAA section 209(b)(1)(C).
5 See, e.g., 74 FR 32767 (July 8, 2009); see also Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association v. EPA (MEMA II), 627 F.2d 1095, 1126 (D.C.Cir. 1979).
6 See 59 FR 36969 (July 20, 1994).
if she finds that California “standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are not consistent with section 202(a)” of the Act. Previous decisions granting waivers and authorizations have noted that state standards and enforcement procedures are inconsistent with section 202(a) if: (1) There is inadequate lead time to permit the development of the necessary technology giving appropriate consideration to the cost of compliance within that time, or (2) the federal and state testing procedures impose inconsistent certification requirements.  

IV. Within-the-Scope Determinations

If California amends regulations that were previously granted a waiver of preemption or authorization, EPA can confirm that the amended regulations are within-the-scope of the previously granted waiver or authorization. Such within-the-scope amendments are permissible without a full waiver review if three conditions are met. First, the amended regulations must not undermine California’s determination that its standards, in the aggregate, are protective of public health and welfare as applicable federal standards. Second, the amended regulations must not affect consistency with section 202(a) of the Act. Third, the amended regulations must not raise any “new issues” affecting EPA’s prior waivers or authorizations.

V. EPA’s Request for Public Comment

When EPA receives a new waiver or authorization request from CARB, EPA traditionally publishes a notice of opportunity for public hearing and comment, and then publishes a decision in the Federal Register following the conclusion of the comment period. In contrast, when EPA receives a request from CARB for a within-the-scope confirmation, EPA may publish a decision in the Federal Register and concurrently invite public comment if an interested party is opposed to EPA’s decision.

Because CARB’s request regarding its Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment regulations includes both within-the-scope confirmation requests and a request for a full authorization, EPA is inviting comment on several issues. First, we request comment on which criteria we should apply to the various provisions included within CARB’s Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment regulations. More specifically, we are requesting comment on whether any of the particular regulatory provisions included in CARB’s request should be considered as within-the-scope of previous EPA waivers or authorizations, and which particular regulatory provisions should be so considered, or whether EPA should consider all of the regulatory provisions as requiring a full waiver or authorization. Next, we seek comment on application of the appropriate criteria. To the extent that a commenter believes a regulatory provision is within-the-scope, they should also comment on how EPA should apply its within-the-scope criteria; alternatively, should a commenter believe that a particular regulatory provision requires a full waiver or authorization, we request comment on whether California has met the criteria for receipt of a full waiver or authorization.

Within the context of a within-the-scope analysis, EPA invites comment on whether California’s Mobile Cargo Handling Equipment requirements: (1) Undermine California’s previous determination that its standards, in the aggregate, are at least as protective of public health and welfare as comparable Federal standards, (2) affect the consistency of California’s requirements with section 202(a) of the Act, and (3) raise any other new issues affecting EPA’s previous waiver or authorization determinations.

As stated above, EPA is also requesting comment on issues relevant to a full waiver and authorization analyses, in the event that EPA determines that any of California’s standards should not be considered within-the-scope of CARB’s previous waivers and authorizations, and instead require a full waiver or authorization analysis. Specifically, we request comment on: (a) Whether CARB’s determination that its standards, in the aggregate, are at least as protective of public health and welfare as applicable federal standards is arbitrary and capricious, (b) whether California needs such standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions, and (c) whether California’s standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are consistent with section 209 of the Act.

VI. Procedures for Public Participation

If a hearing is held, the Agency will make a verbatim record of the proceedings. Interested parties may arrange with the reporter at the hearing to obtain a copy of the transcript at their own expense. Regardless of whether a public hearing is held, EPA will keep the record open until March 17, 2011. Upon expiration of the comment period, the Administrator will render a decision on CARB’s request based on the record from the public hearing, if any, all relevant written submissions, and other information that she deems pertinent. All information will be available for inspection at the EPA Air Docket No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0862.

Persons with comments containing proprietary information must distinguish such information from other comments to the greatest extent possible and label it as “Confidential Business Information” (CBI). If a person making comments wants EPA to base its decision on a submission labeled as CBI, then a non-confidential version of the document that summarizes the key data or information should be submitted to the public docket. To ensure that proprietary information is not inadvertently placed in the public docket, submissions containing such information should be sent directly to the contact person listed above and not to the public docket. Information covered by a claim of confidentiality will be disclosed by EPA only to the extent allowed, and according to the procedures set forth in 40 CFR Part 2. If no claim of confidentiality accompanies the submission when EPA receives it, EPA will make it available to the public without further notice to the person making comments.

Dated: January 25, 2011.

Margo T. Oge,  
Director, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 2011–0282 Filed 1–31–11; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Public Availability of Federal Election Commission, Procurement Division FY 2010 Service Contract Inventory

AGENCY: Federal Election Commission.

ACTION: Notice of public availability of FY 2010 Service Contract Inventories.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 743 of Division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111–117), FEC PROCUREMENT DIVISION is publishing this notice to advise the public of the availability of the FY 2010 Service Contract inventory. This inventory provides information on service contract actions over $25,000 that were made in FY 2010. The information is organized by function to show how contract resources are distributed throughout the agency. The inventory has been developed in accordance with guidance issued on November 5, 2010 by the Office of Management and Budget’s Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP). OFPP’s guidance is available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/