

the reworking of existing wells would not require the use of unique waste disposal or treatment technologies and would result in negligible impacts on the capacity and management of landfills and disposal facilities in the area.

### Potential Environmental Impacts of the No Action Alternative

Under no action sub-alternative 1, Leucadia would build neither the Gasification Plant nor the Lake Charles CCS project. The resources necessary for construction would be available for construction of other industrial projects in this area or elsewhere. The Port of Lake Charles would continue to ship pet coke worldwide for use as fuel in power plants. The use of pet coke in conventional power plants would likely emit more air emissions than its use in the Gasification Plant because of the stringent emission requirements imposed on the plant compared to conventional power plants. Environmental conditions would not change. The impacts to the community from noise, traffic, air emissions, and disruption of land use, jobs, and economic development would not occur. The impacts on the environment from air emissions, disruption of wildlife, use of surface water, discharge of wastewater, and loss of wetlands would not occur. Denbury would continue to inject CO<sub>2</sub> obtained from geologic sources in its ongoing EOR operations. The Lake Charles CCS project would not fund a research MVA program at the West Hastings oil field. Sub-alternative 1 of the no action alternative would not contribute to the demonstration of the next generation of technologies to capture CO<sub>2</sub> from industrial sources.

Under no action sub-alternative 2, Leucadia would build the Gasification Plant and vent the CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere. The impacts from the construction and operation of the Gasification Plant would still occur. Leucadia would still capture the CO<sub>2</sub> from the syngas using Rectisol<sup>®</sup>. Leucadia would route the CO<sub>2</sub> stream to discharge to the atmosphere under the current air permit issued by LDEQ. Approximately 5.2 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> would be emitted per year from the carbon capture technology that would otherwise be captured. Emissions produced by the construction of the pipeline, and indirect emissions associated with electricity use by the CO<sub>2</sub> capture and compression facility, would not occur. No impacts related to construction of the CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline would occur. Denbury would continue to inject CO<sub>2</sub> obtained from geologic sources in

its ongoing EOR operations. The Lake Charles CCS project would not fund a research MVA program at the West Hastings oil field. If the CCS project is not built, the opportunity to capture an average of 4.6 million tons of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> per year over the 30 year life of the Gasification Plant for use in EOR would be lost. Sub-alternative 2 would not contribute to DOE's goal of demonstrating the next generation of technologies that capture CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from industrial sources.

### Environmentally Preferred Alternative

From a local perspective, no action sub-alternative 1 is the environmentally preferable alternative because it would result in no changes to existing environmental conditions. However, from a national perspective, DOE's proposed action is the environmentally preferred alternative. Successful operation of the proposed project could facilitate the deployment of advanced technology integrated with an industrial source to capture CO<sub>2</sub> that would otherwise be emitted to the atmosphere.

### Floodplain Statement of Findings

DOE prepared this floodplain statement of findings in accordance with its regulations entitled "Compliance With Floodplain and Wetland Environmental Review Requirements" (10 CFR 1022). DOE completed the required floodplain assessment in coordination with development and preparation of the EIS, and incorporated the results and discussion in Sections 3.4, 4.4, and Appendix E of the final EIS.

Based on the FEMA Flood Insurance Map and Rita Recovery Maps, the Gasification Plant and the CO<sub>2</sub> Capture and Compression facilities site's Advisory Base Flood Elevation (ABFE) is 10 feet above mean sea level (MSL). The Gasification Plant and Capture and Compression site would be filled to an elevation that is above the ABFE. The 120-acre area, which would include 40 acres for equipment laydown during construction and methanol/sulfuric acid storage during operation, is within the 100-year floodplain of the Calcasieu River. DOE assumes that the site would continue to be filled above the base flood elevation set by FEMA. Given the relative size of the 70-acre site and the 40-acre site compared to the designated floodway of 8 miles along the Calcasieu ship channel and 3,976 acres drainage area, the fill would not result in a measurable increase in the upstream base flood elevation as determined by FEMA, nor have a measurable effect on the performance of the designated floodway. The proposed water and

hydrogen pipelines associated with Gasification Plant would be installed below ground within the 100-year floodplain of Bayou d'Inde and Calcasieu River.

The proposed CCS CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline route is located in proximity to the floodplains of Bayou d'Inde, the Houston River, and the Calcasieu River, and much of the proposed route is located within 100-year floodplains of the Calcasieu River and its tributaries. The proposed pipeline would be installed below ground, therefore no alteration of infiltration rates and no substantial decrease in the volume of surface water that flows downstream would result.

Approximately one-third of the West Hastings research MVA area, including two proposed well locations, is within the 100-year floodplain of Chigger Creek. However, research MVA activities would not increase the potential for floods, alter a floodway or floodplain, or otherwise impede or redirect flows such that human health, the environment, or personal property could be affected. Activities would be conducted on existing wells and no new construction would occur.

As a result of location requirements, i.e., being adjacent to navigable waters and existing rail, road, and pipeline infrastructure, the proposed project and connected action were found to have no practicable siting alternatives. Based upon DOE's review and the project proponents' coordination with the local floodplain administrator and local USACE District, and adoption of minimization measures, DOE's proposed action would not result in potential harm to or within floodplains.

Issued in Pittsburgh, PA on this 28 day of December 2013.

**Scott M. Klara,**

*Acting Director, National Energy Technology Laboratory.*

[FR Doc. 2014-00299 Filed 1-9-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-9012-9]

### Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

*Responsible Agency:* Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564-7146 or <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/>.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements filed 12/30/2013 through 01/03/2014 pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

**Notice**

Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act requires that EPA make public its comments on EISs issued by other Federal agencies. EPA's comment letters on EISs are available at: <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/eisdata.html>.

*EIS No. 20130384, Draft Supplement, USFS, NV, Ely Westside Rangeland Project, Comment Period Ends: 02/24/2014, Contact: Vernon Keller 775-335-5336*

*EIS No. 20140000, Draft EIS, USACE, NC, Village of Bald Head Island Shoreline Protection Project, Comment Period Ends: 02/24/2014, Contact: Ronnie Smith 910-251-4829*

*EIS No. 20140001, Draft EIS, APHIS, 00, Determinations of Nonregulated Status for 2, 4-D-Resistant Corn and Soybean Varieties, Comment Period Ends: 02/24/2014, Contact: Sid Abel 301-734-6352*

Dated: January 7, 2014.

**Cliff Rader,**

*Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 2014-00214 Filed 1-9-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

**FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY**

[No. 2014-N-01]

**Notice of Annual Adjustment of the Cap on Average Total Assets That Defines Community Financial Institutions**

**AGENCY:** Federal Housing Finance Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) has adjusted the cap on average total assets that defines a "Community Financial Institution" based on the annual percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers (CPI-U) as published by the Department of Labor (DOL). These changes took effect on January 1, 2014.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Nathan D. Wallingford, Division of Federal Home Loan Bank Regulation, (202) 649-3630, [Nathan.Wallingford@fhfa.gov](mailto:Nathan.Wallingford@fhfa.gov), or Eric M. Raudenbush, Assistant General Counsel, (202) 649-3084, [Eric.Raudenbush@fhfa.gov](mailto:Eric.Raudenbush@fhfa.gov), (not toll-free numbers), Federal Housing Finance Agency, Constitution Center, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20024.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Statutory and Regulatory Background**

The Federal Home Loan Bank Act (Bank Act) confers upon insured depository institutions that meet the statutory definition of a "Community Financial Institution" (CFI) certain advantages over non-CFI insured depository institutions in qualifying for Federal Home Loan Bank (Bank) membership, and in the purposes for which they may receive long-term advances and the collateral they may pledge to secure advances.<sup>1</sup> Section 2(10)(A) of the Bank Act and § 1263.1 of FHFA's regulations define a CFI as any Bank member the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and that has average total assets below a statutory cap.<sup>2</sup> The Bank Act was amended in 2008 to set the statutory cap at \$1 billion and to require the Director of FHFA to adjust the cap annually to reflect the percentage increase in the CPI-U, as published by the DOL, for the prior year.<sup>3</sup> For 2013, FHFA set the CFI asset cap at \$1,095,000,000, which reflected a 1.8 percent increase over 2012, based upon the increase in the CPI-U between 2011 and 2012.<sup>4</sup>

**II. The CFI Asset Cap for 2014**

As of January 1, 2014, FHFA has increased the CFI asset cap from \$1,095,000,000 to \$1,108,000,000, which reflects a 1.2 percent increase in the unadjusted CPI-U from November 2012 to November 2013. The new amount was obtained by rounding to the nearest million, as has been the practice for all prior adjustments. Consistent with the practice of other Federal agencies, FHFA bases the annual adjustment to the CFI asset cap on the percentage increase in the CPI-U from November of the year prior to the preceding calendar year to November of the preceding calendar year, because the November figures represent the most recent available data as of January 1st of the current calendar year.

In calculating the CFI asset cap, FHFA uses CPI-U data that have not been seasonally adjusted (*i.e.*, the data have not been adjusted to remove the estimated effect of price changes that normally occur at the same time and in about the same magnitude every year). The DOL encourages use of unadjusted CPI-U data in applying "escalation" provisions such as that governing the CFI asset cap, because the factors that are used to seasonally adjust the data

are amended annually, and seasonally adjusted data that are published earlier are subject to revision for up to five years following their original release. Unadjusted data are not routinely subject to revision, and previously published unadjusted data are only corrected when significant calculation errors are discovered.

Dated: January 3, 2014.

**Edward J. DeMarco,**

*Acting Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency.*

[FR Doc. 2014-00193 Filed 1-9-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 8070-01-P**

**FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM****Agency Information Collection Activities: Announcement of Board Approval Under Delegated Authority and Submission to OMB**

**AGENCY:** Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

**SUMMARY:** *Background.* Notice is hereby given of the final approval of a proposed information collection by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) under OMB delegated authority, as per 5 CFR 1320.16 (OMB Regulations on Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public). Board-approved collections of information are incorporated into the official OMB inventory of currently approved collections of information. Copies of the Paperwork Reduction Act Submission, supporting statements and approved collection of information instruments are placed into OMB's public docket files. The Federal Reserve may not conduct or sponsor, and the respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection that has been extended, revised, or implemented on or after October 1, 1995, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Federal Reserve Board Clearance Officer—Cynthia Ayouch—Office of the Chief Data Officer, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551 (202-452-3829) Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) users may contact (202-263-4869), Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC 20551.

OMB Desk Officer—Shagufta Ahmed—Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503.

*Final approval under OMB delegated authority of the revision, without extension, of the following reports:*

<sup>1</sup> See 12 U.S.C. 1424(a), 1430(a).

<sup>2</sup> See 12 U.S.C. 1422(10)(A); 12 CFR 1263.1.

<sup>3</sup> See 12 U.S.C. 1422(10); 12 CFR 1263.1 (defining the term *CFI asset cap*).

<sup>4</sup> See 78 FR 19262 (Mar. 29, 2013).