

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed public transportation improvement project in Fulton County, Georgia is being rescinded.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Stan Mitchell, Environmental Protection Specialist, Federal Transit Administration Region IV, 230 Peachtree Street NW, Atlanta, GA 30303, phone 404-865-5643, email stanley.a.mitchell@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FTA, as lead federal agency, and MARTA published a NOI on March 31, 2015 (80 FR 17147) to prepare an EIS for the MARTA GA 400 Transit Initiative project. This project would extend the existing north-south rail Heavy Rail Transit (HRT) line northward from the North Springs MARTA Station to Windward Parkway near the Fulton/Forsyth County border.

Since that time, FTA and MARTA have reevaluated the transit need in the corridor and have determined that a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) option is more suitable. Based on this change in the transit mode, FTA is rescinding the March 31, 2015 NOI. The environmental impacts of the BRT service along on GA 400 will be evaluated in a yet-to-be-determined document. No changes will be made to the HRT services as described in the March 31, 2015 NOI. Comments and questions concerning the proposed action should be directed to FTA at the address provided above.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 5323(c); 40 CFR 1501.7.

Yvette G. Taylor,

Regional Administrator, FTA Region IV.

[FR Doc. 2019-15696 Filed 7-23-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-57-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA-2019-0149; PDA-40(R)]

Hazardous Materials: The State of Washington Crude Oil by Rail—Vapor Pressure Requirements

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), DOT.

ACTION: Public Notice and Invitation to comment.

SUMMARY: Interested parties are invited to comment on an application by the State of North Dakota and the State of Montana for an administrative determination as to whether Federal hazardous material transportation law

preempts the State of Washington's rules relating to the volatility of crude oil received in the state.

DATES: Comments received on or before August 23, 2019 and rebuttal comments received on or before September 23, 2019 will be considered before an administrative determination is issued by PHMSA's Chief Counsel. Rebuttal comments may discuss only those issues raised by comments received during the initial comment period and may not discuss new issues.

ADDRESSES: North Dakota and Montana's application and all comments received may be reviewed in the Docket Operations Facility (M-30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. The application and all comments are available on the U.S. Government *Regulations.gov* website: <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Comments must refer to Docket No. PHMSA-2019-0149 and may be submitted by any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- **Fax:** 1-202-493-2251.

- **Mail:** Docket Operations Facility (M-30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.
- **Hand Delivery:** Docket Operations Facility (M-30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

A copy of each comment must also be sent to (1) Wayne Stenehjem, Attorney General, The State of North Dakota, Office of the Attorney General, 600 East Boulevard Avenue, Department 125, Bismarck, ND 58505-0040, and (2) Tim Fox, Attorney General, The State of Montana, Office of the Attorney General, Justice Building, Third Floor, 215 North Sanders, Helena, MT 59620-1401. A certification that a copy has been sent to these persons must also be included with the comment. (The following format is suggested: I certify that copies of this comment have been sent to Mr. Stenehjem and Mr. Fox at the addresses specified in the **Federal Register**.)

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the

comment (or signing a comment submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477-78), or you may visit <http://www.regulations.gov>.

A subject matter index of hazardous materials preemption cases, including a listing of all inconsistency rulings and preemption determinations, is available through PHMSA's home page at <http://phmsa.dot.gov>. From the home page, click on "Hazardous Materials Safety," then on "Standards & Rulemaking," then on "Preemption Determinations" located on the right side of the page. A paper copy of the index will be provided at no cost upon request to Mr. Lopez, at the address and telephone number set forth in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vincent Lopez, Office of Chief Counsel (PHC-10), Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590; telephone No. 202-366-4400; facsimile No. 202-366-7041.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Application for a Preemption Determination

The State of North Dakota and the State of Montana have applied to PHMSA for a determination whether Federal hazardous material transportation law (HMTA), 49 U.S.C. 5101 *et seq.*, preempts the State of Washington's Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5579, Crude Oil By Rail—Vapor Pressure. Specifically, North Dakota and Montana allege the law, which purports to regulate the volatility of crude oil transported in Washington state for loading and unloading, amounts to a de facto ban on Bakken¹ crude.

North Dakota and Montana present two main arguments for why they believe Washington's law should be preempted. First, North Dakota and Montana contend that the law's prohibition on the loading or unloading of crude oil with more than 9 psi vapor pressure poses obstacles to the HMTA because compliance with the law can only be accomplished by (1) pretreating the crude oil prior to loading the tank car; (2) selecting an alternate mode of

¹ According to the applicants, North Dakota and Montana are home to the Bakken Shale Formation, a subsurface formation within the Williston Basin. It is one of the top oil-producing regions in the country and one of the largest oil producers in the world.

transportation; or (3) redirecting the crude oil to facilities outside Washington state. Accordingly, North Dakota and Montana say these avenues for complying with the law impose obstacles to accomplishing the purposes of the HMTA. Similarly, they contend that the law's pre-notification requirements are an obstacle. Last, North Dakota and Montana contend that Washington's law is preempted because aspects of the law are not substantively the same as the federal requirements for the classification and handling of this type of hazardous material.

In summary, North Dakota and Montana contend the State of Washington's Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5579, Crude Oil By Rail—Vapor Pressure, should be preempted because:

- It is an obstacle to the federal hazardous material transportation legal and regulatory regime; and
- It is not substantively the same as the federal regulations governing the classification and handling of crude oil in transportation.

II. Federal Preemption

Section 5125 of 49 U.S.C. contains express preemption provisions relevant to this proceeding. As amended by Section 1711(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–296, 116 Stat. 2319), 49 U.S.C. 5125(a) provides that a requirement of a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe is preempted—unless the non-Federal requirement is authorized by another Federal law or DOT grants a waiver of preemption under section 5125(e)—if (1) complying with the non-Federal requirement and the Federal requirement is not possible; or (2) the non-Federal requirement, as applied and enforced, is an obstacle to accomplishing and carrying out the Federal requirement.

These two sentences set forth the “dual compliance” and “obstacle” criteria that PHMSA's predecessor agency, the Research and Special Programs Administration, had applied in issuing inconsistency rulings prior to 1990, under the original preemption provision in the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA). Public Law 93–633 § 112(a), 88 Stat. 2161 (1975). The dual compliance and obstacle criteria are based on U.S. Supreme Court decisions on preemption. *Hines v. Davidowitz*, 312 U.S. 52 (1941); *Florida Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul*, 373 U.S. 132 (1963); *Ray v. Atlantic Richfield, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 151 (1978).

Subsection (b)(1) of 49 U.S.C. 5125 provides that a non-Federal requirement concerning any of the following subjects

is preempted—unless authorized by another Federal law or DOT grants a waiver of preemption—when the non-Federal requirement is not “substantively the same as” a provision of Federal hazardous material transportation law, a regulation prescribed under that law, or a hazardous materials security regulation or directive issued by the Department of Homeland Security. The five subject areas include: the designation, description, and classification of hazardous material; the packing, repacking, handling, labeling, marking, and placarding of hazardous material; the preparation, execution, and use of shipping documents related to hazardous material and requirements related to the number, contents, and placement of those documents; the written notification, recording, and reporting of the unintentional release in transportation of hazardous material and other written hazardous materials transportation incident reporting involving State or local emergency responders in the initial response to the incident; and the designing, manufacturing, fabricating, inspecting, marking, maintaining, reconditioning, repairing, or testing a package, container, or packaging component that is represented, marked, certified, or sold as qualified for use in transporting hazardous material in commerce.

To be “substantively the same,” the non-Federal requirement must conform “in every significant respect to the Federal requirement. Editorial and other similar *de minimis* changes are permitted.” 49 CFR 107.202(d).²

The 2002 amendments and 2005 reenactment of the preemption provisions in 49 U.S.C. 5125 reaffirmed Congress's long-standing view that a single body of uniform Federal regulations promotes safety (including security) in the transportation of hazardous materials. More than thirty years ago, when it was considering the HMTA, the Senate Commerce Committee “endorse[d] the principle of preemption in order to preclude a multiplicity of State and local regulations and the potential for varying as well as conflicting regulations in the area of hazardous materials transportation.” S. Rep. No. 1102, 93rd Cong. 2nd Sess. 37 (1974). When

² Additional standards apply to preemption of non-Federal requirements on highway routes over which hazardous materials may or may not be transported and fees related to transporting hazardous material. See 49 U.S.C. 5125(c) and (f). See also 49 CFR 171.1(f) which explains that a “facility at which functions regulated under the HMR are performed may be subject to applicable laws and regulations of state and local governments and Indian tribes.”

Congress expanded the preemption provisions in 1990, it specifically found that many States and localities have enacted laws and regulations which vary from Federal laws and regulations pertaining to the transportation of hazardous materials, thereby creating the potential for unreasonable hazards in other jurisdictions and confounding shippers and carriers which attempt to comply with multiple and conflicting registration, permitting, routing, notification, and other regulatory requirements. And because of the potential risks to life, property, and the environment posed by unintentional releases of hazardous materials, consistency in laws and regulations governing the transportation of hazardous materials is necessary and desirable. Therefore, in order to achieve greater uniformity and to promote the public health, welfare, and safety at all levels, Federal standards for regulating the transportation of hazardous materials in intrastate, interstate, and foreign commerce are necessary and desirable.³

A United States Court of Appeals has found uniformity was the “linchpin” in the design of the Federal laws governing the transportation of hazardous materials. *Colorado Pub. Util. Comm'n v. Harmon*, 951 F.2d 1571, 1575 (10th Cir. 1991).

III. Preemption Determinations

Under 49 U.S.C. 5125(d)(1), any person (including a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe) directly affected by a requirement of a State, political subdivision or tribe may apply to the Secretary of Transportation for a determination whether the requirement is preempted. The Secretary of Transportation has delegated authority to PHMSA to make determinations of preemption, except for those concerning highway routing (which have been delegated to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration). 49 CFR 1.97(b).

Section 5125(d)(1) requires notice of an application for a preemption determination to be published in the **Federal Register**. Following the receipt and consideration of written comments, PHMSA publishes its determination in the **Federal Register**. See 49 CFR 107.209(c). A short period of time is allowed for filing of petitions for reconsideration. 49 CFR 107.211. A petition for judicial review of a final preemption determination must be filed

³ Public Law 101–615 § 2, 104 Stat. 3244. (In 1994, Congress revised, codified and enacted the HMTA “without substantive change,” at 49 U.S.C. Chapter 51. Public Law 103–272, 108 Stat. 745 (July 5, 1994).)

in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or in the Court of Appeals for the United States for the circuit in which the petitioner resides or has its principal place of business, within 60 days after the determination becomes final. 49 U.S.C. 5127(a).

Preemption determinations do not address issues of preemption arising under the Commerce Clause, the Fifth Amendment or other provisions of the Constitution, or statutes other than the Federal hazardous material transportation law unless it is necessary to do so in order to determine whether a requirement is authorized by another Federal law, or whether a fee is "fair" within the meaning of 49 U.S.C. 5125(f)(1). A State, local or Indian tribe requirement is not authorized by another Federal law merely because it is not preempted by another Federal statute. *Colorado Pub. Util. Comm'n v. Harmon*, above, 951 F.2d at 1581 n.10.

In making preemption determinations under 49 U.S.C. 5125(d), PHMSA is guided by the principles and policies set forth in Executive Order No. 13132, entitled "Federalism" (64 FR 43255 (Aug. 10, 1999)), and the President's May 20, 2009 memorandum on "Preemption" (74 FR 24693 (May 22, 2009)). Section 4(a) of that Executive Order authorizes preemption of State laws only when a statute contains an express preemption provision, there is other clear evidence Congress intended to preempt State law, or the exercise of State authority directly conflicts with the exercise of Federal authority. The President's May 20, 2009 memorandum sets forth the policy "that preemption of State law by executive departments and agencies should be undertaken only with full consideration of the legitimate prerogatives of the States and with a sufficient legal basis for preemption." Section 5125 contains express preemption provisions, which PHMSA has implemented through its regulations.

IV. Public Comments

All comments should be directed to whether 49 U.S.C. 5125 preempts the State of Washington's rules relating to the volatility of crude oil received in the state. Comments should specifically address the preemption criteria discussed in Part II above.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 18, 2019.

Paul J. Roberti,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2019-15675 Filed 7-23-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4909-60-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Form 4506-T and 4506-C

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Internal Revenue Service, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning Form 4506-T, Request for Transcript of Return and 4506-C, IVES Request for Transcript of Tax Return.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before September 23, 2019 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Laurie Brimmer, Internal Revenue Service, Room 6526, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the form and instructions should be directed to Laurie Brimmer, at Internal Revenue Service, Room 6526, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20224, or at 202 317 5756, or through the internet, at Laurie.E.Brimmer@irs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Request for Transcript of Tax Return and IVES Request for Transcript of Tax Return.

OMB Number: 1545-1872.

Form Number: Form 4506-T and 4506-C.

Abstract: Internal Revenue Code section 7513 allows taxpayers to request a copy of a tax return or related products. Form 4506-T is used to request all products except copies of returns. The information provided will be used to search the taxpayers account and provide the requested information and to ensure that the requestor is the taxpayer or someone authorized by the taxpayer to obtain the documents requested. Form 4506-C is used to permit the cleared and vetted Income Verification Express Service (IVES) participants to request tax return information on the behalf of the authorizing taxpayer.

Current Actions: Previously the Form 4506-T (or 4506-TEZ-OMB number 1545-2154) was used by both the Return

and Income Verification system (RAIVS) respondents and IVES Income Verification Express Service (IVES) respondents to order a tax transcript. In effort to protect taxpayer information, IRS implemented a policy change for the Form 4506 series to no longer mail tax transcripts to third parties that have not been vetted through the agency and as a result eliminating line 5a from Form 4506-T.

Since the IVES customer base are third party clients that are fully vetted to receive Taxpayer transcripts, and could no longer use Form 4506-T, IRS implemented a separate f4506-C to service this customer base. The new 4506-C will permit the cleared and vetted IVES clients to request tax return information on the behalf of the authorizing taxpayer.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations, individuals or households, farms, and Federal, state, local, or tribal governments.

Form 4506-T

Estimated Number of Respondents: 263,857.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 46 minutes (.77 hours).

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 203,169.

Form 4506-C

Estimated Number of Respondents: 18,000,000.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 42 minutes (.70 hours).

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 12,600,000.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice:

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility;