

impacts on cultural resources or eligible historic properties; (5) presence of known contamination due to industrial activities; (6) presence of natural visual screening; and (7) accessibility. For each of the three proposed compressor stations and their proposed sites, the EIS determined the alternative either offered no significant environmental advantage or would have a more substantial impact on wetlands compared to the proposed site.

Regarding the associated aboveground facilities for the pipeline expansion, the proposed aboveground facilities were all within the existing GPPL pipeline right-of-way. As a result, the EIS did not identify any environmental concerns that indicated the need to evaluate alternative sites.

For alternative sites for pipe storage and contractor yard, the EIS considered one alternative to the proposed site. The alternative site consisted of land with varying commercial/industrial and agricultural uses. If the alternative site was selected, the agricultural use would be displaced. The proposed site, in comparison, is already previously distributed industrial-use land used for the construction of the existing GPPL pipeline. As a result, the alternative site did not offer a significant environmental advantage over the proposed site.

Finally, the EIS included an alternative compressor station design. Instead of the proposed gas-fired compressors, the alternative design evaluated the use of electric-powered compressors. When comparing the two designs, the EIS focused on the issue of additional infrastructure needed to power the electric-power compressor stations. Use of electricity would require each station to install varying lengths of distribution lines to the compressor stations and a substation and/or switch station to meet power requirements. Additionally, the electrical power could come from existing electrical generation plants with varying fuel uses. However, overall emissions reductions resulting from the use of electric-powered versus gas-powered compressor stations will vary depending on the fuel used. As a result, the EIS concluded the alternative did not offer a significant environmental advantage over the proposed compressor station design.

#### Environmentally Preferred Alternative

When compared against the other action alternatives assessed in the EIS, as discussed above, the proposed GPP Export Project and Pipeline Expansion Project are the environmentally preferred alternatives. While the No-Action Alternative would avoid the environmental impacts identified in the

EIS, adoption of this alternative would not meet the GPP Export Project and Pipeline Expansion Project objectives.

#### Decision

DOE has decided to issue Order No. 3978 authorizing GPP to export domestically produced LNG by vessel from the GPP Export Project located near Sabine Pass, Jefferson County, Texas to non-FTA countries, in a volume up to the equivalent to 808 Bcf/yr of natural gas for a term of 20 years to commence on the earlier of the date of first commercial export or seven years from the date that the Order is issued.

Concurrently with this Record of Decision, DOE is issuing Order No. 3978, in which it finds that the requested authorization has not been shown to be inconsistent with the public interest, and that the Application should be granted subject to compliance with the terms and conditions set forth in the Order, including the 83 environmental conditions recommended in the EIS and adopted in the FERC Order at Appendix A. Additionally, this authorization is conditioned on GPP's compliance with any other mitigation measures imposed by other federal or state agencies.

#### Basis of Decision

DOE's decision is based upon the analysis of potential environmental impacts presented in the EIS, and DOE's determination in Order No. 3978 that the opponents of GPP's Application have failed to overcome the statutory presumption that the proposed export authorization is not inconsistent with the public interest. Although not required by NEPA, DOE/FE also considered the Addendum, which summarizes available information on potential upstream impacts associated with unconventional natural gas activities, such as hydraulic fracturing.

#### Mitigation

As a condition of its decision to issue Order No. 3978 authorizing GPP to export LNG to non-FTA countries, DOE is imposing requirements that will avoid or minimize the environmental impacts of the GPP Export Project. These conditions include the 83 environmental conditions recommended in the EIS and adopted in the FERC Order at Appendix A. Mitigation measures beyond those included in Order No. 3978 that are enforceable by other Federal and state agencies are additional conditions of Order No. 3978. With these conditions, DOE/FE has determined that all practicable means to avoid or minimize

environmental harm from the GPP Export Project have been adopted.

#### Floodplain Statement of Findings

DOE prepared this Floodplain Statement of Findings in accordance with DOE's regulations, entitled "Compliance with Floodplain and Wetland Environmental Review Requirements" (10 CFR part 1022). The required floodplain assessment was conducted during development and preparation of the EIS (see Section 4.1.4.1 of the EIS). The EIS determined that the proposed Golden Pass LNG export terminal site is within the 100-year floodplain, as are some portions of the pipeline expansion facilities and one compressor station. While the placement of these facilities within floodplains would be unavoidable, DOE has determined that the current design for the GPP Export Project minimizes floodplain impacts to the extent practicable.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 25, 2017.

**Douglas W. Hollett,**  
Assistant Secretary (Acting), Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 2017-08744 Filed 4-28-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

#### Certification Notice—247; Notice of Filing of Self-Certification of Coal Capability Under the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act

**AGENCY:** Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, DOE.

**ACTION:** Notice of filing.

**SUMMARY:** On March 31, 2017, PSEG Power, LLC, as owner and operator of a new baseload electric generating powerplant, submitted a coal capability self-certification to the Department of Energy (DOE) pursuant to § 201(d) of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 (FUA), as amended, and DOE regulations. The FUA and regulations thereunder require DOE to publish a notice of filing of self-certification in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of coal capability self-certification filings are available for public inspection, upon request, in the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Mail Code OE-20, Room 8G-024, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christopher Lawrence at (202) 586-5260.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Title II of FUA, as amended (42 U.S.C. 8301 *et seq.*), provides that no new base load electric powerplant may be constructed or operated without the capability to use coal or another alternate fuel as a primary energy source. Pursuant to the FUA, in order to meet the requirement of coal capability, the owner or operator of such a facility proposing to use natural gas or petroleum as its primary energy source shall certify to the Secretary of Energy (Secretary) prior to construction, or prior to operation as a base load electric powerplant, that such powerplant has the capability to use coal or another alternate fuel. Such certification establishes compliance with FUA section 201(a) as of the date it is filed with the Secretary. 42 U.S.C. 8311.

The following owner of a proposed new baseload electric generating powerplant has filed a self-certification of coal-capability with DOE pursuant to FUA section 201(d) and in accordance with DOE regulations in 10 CFR 501.60, 61:

*Owner:* PSEG Power, LLC

*Capacity:* 540 megawatts (MW)

*Plant Location:* PSEG Fossil Sewaren Generating Station, Sewaren, NJ

*In-Service Date:* April 2018

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 11, 2017.

**Brian Mills,**

*Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.*

[FR Doc. 2017-08737 Filed 4-28-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[OE Docket No. EA-328-B]

### Application To Export Electric Energy; RBC Energy Services LP

**AGENCY:** Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, DOE.

**ACTION:** Notice of application.

**SUMMARY:** RBC Energy Services LP (Applicant or RBC Energy) has applied to renew its authority to transmit electric energy from the United States to Canada pursuant to section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act.

**DATES:** Comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be submitted on or before May 31, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments, protests, motions to intervene, or requests for more information should be addressed to: Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Mail Code: OE-20, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW.,

Washington, DC 20585-0350. Because of delays in handling conventional mail, it is recommended that documents be transmitted by overnight mail, by electronic mail to *Electricity.Exports@hq.doe.gov*, or by facsimile to 202-586-8008.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Exports of electricity from the United States to a foreign country are regulated by the Department of Energy (DOE) pursuant to sections 301(b) and 402(f) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7151(b), 7172(f)) and require authorization under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)).

On September 28, 2012, DOE issued Order No. EA-328-A to RBC Energy, which authorized the Applicant to transmit electric energy from the United States to Canada as a power marketer for a five-year term using existing international transmission facilities. That authority expires on September 26, 2017. On March 24, 2017, RBC Energy filed an application with DOE for renewal of the export authority contained in Order No. EA-328 for an additional five-year term.

In its application, RBC Energy states that it does not own or operate any electric generation or transmission facilities, and it does not have a franchised service area. The electric energy that RBC Energy proposes to export to Canada would be surplus energy purchased from third parties such as electric utilities and Federal power marketing agencies pursuant to voluntary agreements. The existing international transmission facilities to be utilized by RBC Energy have previously been authorized by Presidential Permits issued pursuant to Executive Order 10485, as amended, and are appropriate for open access transmission by third parties.

**Procedural Matters:** Any person desiring to be heard in this proceeding should file a comment or protest to the application at the address provided above. Protests should be filed in accordance with Rule 211 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.211). Any person desiring to become a party to these proceedings should file a motion to intervene at the above address in accordance with FERC Rule 214 (18 CFR 385.214). Five copies of such comments, protests, or motions to intervene should be sent to the address provided above on or before the date listed above.

Comments and other filings concerning RBC Energy's application to export electric energy to Canada should

be clearly marked with OE Docket No. EA-328-B. An additional copy is to be provided directly to both Chantal Marchese, Royal Bank of Canada, 200 Bay Street, 30th Floor, North Tower, Toronto, Ontario Canada M5J 2J5 and Marcus Chun, RBC Capital Markets, 200 Bay Street, 9th Floor, South Tower, Toronto, Ontario Canada M5J 2J2.

A final decision will be made on this application after the environmental impacts have been evaluated pursuant to DOE's National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures (10 CFR part 1021) and after a determination is made by DOE that the proposed action will not have an adverse impact on the sufficiency of supply or reliability of the U.S. electric power supply system.

Copies of this application will be made available, upon request, for public inspection and copying at the address provided above, by accessing the program Web site at <http://energy.gov/node/11845>, or by emailing [Angela.Troy@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Angela.Troy@hq.doe.gov).

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 11, 2017.

**Brian Mills,**

*Senior Planning Advisor, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.*

[FR Doc. 2017-08735 Filed 4-28-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

#### Proposed Agency Information Collection Extension

**AGENCY:** Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, U.S. Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, intends to extend for three years with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the EERE Environmental Questionnaire (OMB No. 1910-5175). Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of DOE, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of DOE's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be