I. Background

USTR is providing notice that consultations have been requested pursuant to the WTO Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU). If these consultations do not resolve the matter and a dispute settlement panel is established pursuant to the DSU, the panel, which would hold its meetings in Geneva Switzerland, would be expected to issue a report on its findings and recommendations within nine months after it is established.

II. Major Issues Raised by India

On September 9 2016, India requested consultations concerning certain U.S. measures relating to domestic content requirements and subsidies instituted by the governments of the states of Washington, California, Montana, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Michigan, Delaware and Minnesota (collectively, US States), in the energy sector. India alleges that these domestic content requirements and subsidies are maintained under the following instruments:

1. Renewable Energy Cost Recovery Incentive Payment Program (RECIP) maintained under the authority of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW 82.16.110 through 82.16.130) and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC 458–20–273).
3. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power’s (LADWP) Solar Incentive Program implemented by the LADWP under the Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Incentive Program Guidelines.
5. Montana Tax Credit for Biodiesel Blending and Storage under Montana Code Annotated 2015, Section 15–32–703.
6. Refund for Taxes paid on Biodiesel by Distributor or Retailer under the Montana Code Annotated 2015, Section 15–70–433.
9. Michigan Energy Credit) under the Clean, Renewable and Efficient Energy Act, 2008 (CREEA), Chapter 460, Section 27/(Section 460.1027) and 39(2)/(Section 460.1039); and Experimental Advanced Renewable Energy Program (EARP) under Section 21/(Section 460.1021) of the CREEA read with Rule C10.3 of the Rate Book for Electric Service adopted by Consumers Energy Company and approved by the Michigan Public Service Commission.
11. Made in Minnesota Solar Incentive Program (MSIP) administered pursuant to the criterion established under the Made in Minnesota Solar Energy Production Incentive law (Minnesota Statute § 216C.414, subd. 2 (2013)).

India alleges inconsistencies with Articles II and XVI:4 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994: Article 2.1 of the Agreement on Trade-related Investment Measures; Articles 3.1(b), 3.2, 5(a), 5(c), 6.3(a), 6.3(c), and 25 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures; and Article XVI:4 of the Marrakesh Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization.

III. Public Comments: Requirements for Submissions

USTR invites written comments concerning the issues raised in this dispute. You should submit your comment electronically to www.regulations.gov, docket number USTR–2016–0018. For alternatives to electronic submissions, contact Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–9483. To submit comments via www.regulations.gov, enter docket number USTR–2016–0018 on the home page and click “search.” The site will provide a search-results page listing all documents associated with this docket. Find a reference to this notice by selecting Notice under Document Type on the left side of the search-results page, and click on the link entitled “Comment Now!” For further information on using the www.regulations.gov Web site, please consult the resources provided on the Web site by clicking on “How to Use Regulations.gov” on the bottom of the home page.

The www.regulations.gov Web site allows users to provide comments by filling in a “Type Comment” field, or by attaching a document using an “Upload File” field. USTR prefers that comments be provided in an attached document. If
a document is attached, it is sufficient to type “See attached” in the “Type Comment” field. USTR prefers submissions in Microsoft Word (.doc) or Adobe Acrobat (.pdf). If the submission is in an application other than those two, please indicate the name of the application in the “Type Comment” field.

Submit any comments containing business confidential information by fax to Sandy McKinzy at (202) 395–3640. A person requesting that information contained in a comment be treated as confidential business information must certify that s/he would not customarily release the information to the public. Any page containing business confidential information must be clearly marked “BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL” on the top and bottom of that page. Filers of submissions containing business confidential information also must submit a public version of their comments electronically through regulations.gov. The non-confidential summary will be placed in the docket and will be open to public inspection.

USTR may determine that information or advice contained in a comment, other than business confidential information, is confidential in accordance with section 135(g)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(g)(2)). If a submitter believes that information or advice is confidential, s/he must clearly designate the information or advice as confidential and mark it as “SUBMITTED IN CONFIDENCE” at the top and bottom of the cover page and each succeeding page, and provide a non-confidential summary of the information or advice.

Pursuant to section 127(e) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3537(e)), USTR will maintain a docket on this dispute settlement proceeding, docket number USTR–2016–0018, accessible to the public at www.regulations.gov. The public file will include non-confidential public comments USTR receives regarding the dispute. If a dispute settlement panel is convened, or in the event of an appeal from a panel, USTR will make the following documents publicly available at www.ustr.gov: The U.S. submissions and any non-confidential summaries of submissions received from other participants in the dispute. If a dispute settlement panel is convened, or in the event of an appeal from a panel, the report of the panel, and, if applicable, the report of the Appellate Body, will also be available on the Web site of the World Trade Organization, at www.wto.org.

Juan Millan, Assistant United States Trade Representative for Monitoring and Enforcement, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

Notice of Availability of the Federal Aviation Administration Record of Decision and Adoption of Department of Navy’s Final Environmental Impact Statement for Military Readiness Activities at the Naval Weapons Systems Training Facility Boardman, Oregon

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of record of decision.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its decision to adopt the Department of the Navy’s (DoN) Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Military Readiness Activities at Naval Weapons Systems Training Facility Boardman, Oregon, EIS No. 201503535. In accordance with Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (“NEPA”), the Council on Environmental Quality’s (“CEQ”) regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and other applicable authorities, including The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Order 1050.1F, Environmental Impacts: Procedures and Procedures, paragraph 8–2, and FAA Order JO 7400.2K, “Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters,” paragraph 32–2–3, the FAA has conducted an independent review and evaluation of the DoN’s Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Military Readiness Activities at the Naval Weapons Systems Training Facility (NWSTF) Boardman, Oregon, dated December 2015. As a cooperating agency with responsibility for approving special use airspace under 40 CFR 1508.5, the FAA provided subject matter expertise and closely coordinated with the DoN during the environmental review process, including preparation of the Draft EIS and the Final EIS. Based on its independent review and evaluation, the FAA has determined the Final EIS, including its supporting documentation, as incorporated by reference, adequately assesses and discloses the environmental impacts of the for Military Readiness Activities at the at NWSTF Boardman, Oregon, and that adoption of the Final EIS by the FAA is authorized under 40 CFR 1506.3. Adoption. Accordingly, the FAA adopts the FEIS, and takes full responsibility for the scope and content that addresses the proposed changes to special use airspace for NWSTF Boardman.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paula Miller, Airspace Policy and Regulations Group, Office of Airspace Services, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267–7378.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

Background

In August 2012, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations, the DoN released a Draft EIS. The Draft EIS presented the potential environmental consequences of the DoN’s proposal to achieve and maintain military readiness by analyzing the military training activities at NWSTF Boardman, Oregon. As a result of public, agency, and tribal comments during the 60-day public comment period on the Draft EIS, and the FAA aeronautical review process, the DoN, FAA, other federal and state agencies, and tribal governments have consulted to mitigate concerns while continuing to meet national defense training requirements. The DoN is the proponent for the NWSTF Boardman and is the lead agency for the preparation of the FEIS. The FAA is a cooperating agency responsible for approving special use airspace as defined in 40 CFR 1508.5.

Implementation

As a result of the public comments received, the aeronautical studies, environmental analysis, the FAA is establishing the Boardman Low Military Operations Area (MOA) and amending the Boardman MOA. The Boardman MOA legal description has been modified from the description circularized to the public from July 18 through August 31, 2014. After the conclusion of the Aeronautical Study comment period, the FAA changed the coordinates of the airspace action to incorporate the proposed expansion that was circularized to the public consistent with the intent of the proposal stated in the circular and Aeronautical Study recommendation. The result is the change amends the existing Boardman MOA’s description instead of creating a separate MOA for the expansion area. One coordinate in the Boardman Low MOA was changed to more accurately...