Accesion Number: 20160617–5075.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 6/29/16.
Applicants: Guardian Pipeline, L.L.C.
Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: Update Non-Conforming and Negotiated Rate Agreements to be effective 7/18/2016.
Filed Date: 6/17/16.
Accession Number: 20160617–5087.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 6/29/16.
Docket Numbers: RP16–1037–000.
Filed Date: 6/17/16.
Accession Number: 20160617–5123.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 6/24/16.
Applicants: Dominion Carolina Gas Transmission, LLC.
Description: § 4(d) Rate Filing: DCGT—System Map URL to be effective 7/17/2016.
Filed Date: 6/17/16.
Accession Number: 20160617–5148.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 6/29/16.
Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission’s Regulations (18 CFR 385.211) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified date(s). Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

Filingst in Existing Proceedings
Applicants: Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP.
Description: Compliance filing 2nd Compliance Filing in RP16–131–000 to be effective 4/1/2016.
Filed Date: 5/20/16.
Accession Number: 20160520–5034.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 6/23/16.
Applicants: Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company.
Description: Tariff Amendment: Virtual Measurement Points—CORRECTION to be effective 7/16/2016.
Filed Date: 6/15/16.
Accession Number: 20160615–5105.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 6/27/16.
Applicants: Alliance Pipeline L.P.
Description: Compliance filing Reinstate AOS Revised to be effective 12/1/2015.
Filed Date: 6/17/16.
Accession Number: 20160617–5091.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 6/29/16.
Description: Tariff Amendment: Amendment to RP16–981–000 to be effective 6/27/2016.
Filed Date: 6/17/16.
Accession Number: 20160617–5130.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 6/29/16.
Any person desiring to protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission’s Regulations (18 CFR 385.211) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. The filings are accessible in the Commission’s eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eFilingReq.pdf. For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated June 20, 2016.
Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–15274 Filed 6–28–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
[FRL–9948–52–Region 6]
Adequacy Status of the Baton Rouge, Louisiana Maintenance Plan 8-Hour Ozone Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for Transportation Conformity Purposes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of adequacy.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is notifying the public that it has found that the motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) in the Baton Rouge, Louisiana 2008 8-hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) Maintenance Plan State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision, submitted on May 2, 2016 by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) are adequate for transportation conformity purposes. As a result of EPA’s finding, the Baton Rouge area must use these budgets for future conformity determinations.

DATES: These budgets are effective July 14, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The essential information in this notice will be available at EPA’s conformity Web site: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateregions/transconf/adequacy.htm. You may also contact Mr. Jeffrey Riley, Air Planning Section (6MM–AA), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, telephone (214) 665–8542, Email address: Riley.Jeffrey@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Throughout this document “we,” “us,” and “our” refers to EPA. The word “budget(s)” refers to the mobile source emissions budget for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and the mobile source emissions budget for nitrogen oxides (NOx).

On May 2, 2016, we received a SIP revision from the LDEQ. This revision consisted of a 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS redesignation request and maintenance plan SIP for the Baton Rouge area. This submission established MVEBs for the Baton Rouge area for the years 2022 and 2027. The MVEB is the amount of emissions allowed in the state implementation plan for on-road motor vehicles; it establishes an emissions ceiling for the regional transportation network. The MVEBs are provided in Table 1:

| TABLE 1—BATON ROUGE MAINTENANCE PLAN NOx AND VOC MVEBS |
|-----------------|-------|-------|
|                 | 2022  | 2027  |
| NOx             | 14.37 | 10.95 |
| VOC             | 13.19 | 11.55 |

On May 6, 2016, EPA posted the availability of the Baton Rouge area MVEBs on EPA’s Web site for the purpose of soliciting public comments, as part of the adequacy process pursuant to 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). The comment period closed on June 6, 2016, and we received no comments. Today’s notice is simply an announcement of a finding that EPA has already made. EPA Region 6 sent a letter to LDEQ on June 13, 2016, finding that the MVEBs in the Baton Rouge Maintenance Plan SIP, submitted on May 2, 2016 are adequate and must be used for transportation conformity determinations in the Baton Rouge area. This finding has also been announced on EPA’s conformity Web site: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateregions/transconf/adequacy.htm.

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA’s conformity rule, 40 Code of...
Federal Regulations (CFR) part 93, requires that transportation plans, programs and projects conform to state air quality implementation plans and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do so. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which EPA determines whether a SIP’s MVEB is adequate for transportation conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). We have also described the process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in our July 1, 2004, final rulemaking entitled, “Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the New 8-hour Ozone and PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Miscellaneous Revisions for Existing Areas; Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments: Response to Court Decision and Additional Rule Changes” (69 FR 40004). Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA’s completeness review, and it should not be used to prejudge EPA’s ultimate approval of the Baton Rouge Maintenance Plan SIP revision submittal. Even if EPA finds the budgets adequate, the Baton Rouge Maintenance Plan SIP revision submittal could later be disapproved.

These new MVEBs are effective July 14, 2016. Within 24 months from the effective date of this notice, the Baton Rouge area transportation partners, such as the Capital Region Planning Commission, will need to demonstrate conformity to the new MVEBs if the demonstration has not already been made, pursuant to 40 CFR 93.104(e). See 73 FR 4419 (January 24, 2008).

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.
Dated: June 17, 2016.

Ron Curry,
Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 2016–15408 Filed 6–28–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Proposed Consent Decree, Clean Air Act Citizen Suit

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed consent decree; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (“CAA” or the “Act”), notice is hereby given of a proposed consent decree to address a lawsuit filed by the Sierra Club (“Plaintiff”) in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California: Sierra Club v. Gina McCarthy, No. 3:15–cv–04328–JD (N.D. Cal.). On September 22, 2015, Plaintiffs file this matter against Gina McCarthy, in her official capacity as Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”). On February 9, 2016, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint alleging that, with respect to the 2008 ozone national ambient air quality standards (“NAAQS”), EPA has failed to perform non-discretionary duties (1) to take final action on portions of state implementation plan (“SIP”) submissions from Louisiana, Montana, New Jersey, New York, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming intended to address various interstate transport requirements, and (2) to promulgate a federal implementation plan (“FIP”) for certain SIP elements for California and Kentucky. The proposed consent decree would establish a deadline for EPA to take certain specified actions.

DATES: Written comments on the proposed consent decree must be received by July 29, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID number EPA–HQ–OGC–2016–0364, online at www.regulations.gov (EPA’s preferred method); by email to oei.docket@epa.gov; by mail to EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode: 2822T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; or by hand delivery or courier to EPA Docket Center, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC, between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. Comments on a disk or CD–ROM should be formatted in Word or ASCII file, avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption, and may be mailed to the mailing address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zachary Pilchen, Air and Radiation Law Office (2344A), Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone: (202) 564–2812; fax number (202) 564–5603; email address: pilchen.zach@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Additional Information About the Proposed Consent Decree

This proposed consent decree would resolve a lawsuit filed by Plaintiffs seeking to compel the Administrator to take action under CAA section 110(k)(2)–(4). Plaintiffs allege that the Administrator has failed to perform a non-discretionary duty to take final action on the portion of Louisiana’s SIP submission intended to address the requirements of 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, EPA would agree to take certain specified actions by August 1, 2016, and by October 3, 2016, and by December 15, 2017 to resolve those claims. See the proposed consent decree for more details.

Plaintiffs also allege that the Administrator has failed to perform a non-discretionary duty to take final action on the portion of Wisconsin’s SIP submission intended to address requirements of 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, EPA would agree to take certain specified actions by August 15, 2016 and by November 1, 2016 to resolve those claims. See the proposed consent decree for more details.

Plaintiffs also allege that the Administrator has failed to perform a non-discretionary duty to take final action on the portion of New York’s SIP submission intended to address requirements of 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, EPA would agree to take certain specified actions by August 15, 2016 and by November 1, 2016 to resolve those claims. See the proposed consent decree for more details.

Plaintiffs also allege that the Administrator has failed to perform a non-discretionary duty to take final action on the portion of Louisiana’s SIP submission intended to address certain requirements of 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, EPA would agree to take certain specified actions by August 1, 2016, and by October 3, 2016, and by December 15, 2017 to resolve those claims. See the proposed consent decree for more details.

Plaintiffs also allege that the Administrator has failed to perform a non-discretionary duty to take final action on the portion of Wisconsin’s SIP submission intended to address certain requirements of 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, EPA would agree to take certain specified actions by August 15, 2016 and by November 1, 2016 to resolve those claims. See the proposed consent decree for more details.

Plaintiffs also allege that the Administrator has failed to perform a non-discretionary duty to take final action on the portion of Wisconsin’s SIP submission intended to address certain requirements of 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2)(D)(i) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. Under the terms of the proposed consent decree, EPA would agree to take certain specified actions by August 15, 2016 and by November 1, 2016 to resolve those claims. See the proposed consent decree for more details.