

and have a public hearing held thereon (Petition).

A Request to Assign Petition Officer (Request) was issued by Region 5's Acting Regional Administrator on May 17, 2017, and served on Petitioners on May 30, 2017. In the Request, the Acting Regional Administrator stated that after considering the issues raised in the Petition, Complainant had decided not to withdraw the CAFO. Accordingly, the Acting Regional Administrator requested assignment of an Administrative Law Judge to consider and rule on the Petition pursuant to § 22.45(c)(4)(iii) of the Rules of Practice, 40 CFR 22.45(c)(4)(iii). By Order dated June 16, 2017, the undersigned was designated to preside over this matter, and Complainant was directed to file a response to the Petition. Complainant filed its Response to Petition to Set Aside Consent Agreement and Proposed Final Order (Response to Petition) on July 13, 2017.

III. Denial of Petitioners' Petition

On May 8, 2018, the undersigned issued an Order Denying Petition to Set Aside Consent Agreement and Proposed Final Order (Order). Therein, the undersigned denied the Petition without the need for a hearing on the basis that Petitioners had failed to present any relevant and material evidence that had not been adequately considered and responded to by Complainant.

Specifically, Petitioners raised four issues.² First, Petitioners argued that the alleged violations warranted a higher civil penalty than that assessed in the proposed CAFO and that the occurrence of the alleged violations in a region designated as an Area of Concern warranted an additional penalty of five million dollars. The undersigned determined that while Complainant did not provide a detailed explanation of how the civil penalty assessed in the proposed CAFO had been calculated, it had considered and responded to Petitioners' arguments in its Response to Comments and Response to Petition. The undersigned further found that Petitioners had produced no evidence to support their position or rebut Complainant's position that it had properly implemented the applicable policy governing its calculation and negotiation of the penalty assessed in the proposed CAFO. The undersigned concluded that Petitioners had not met

the burden of demonstrating that the matters they raised with respect to the assessment of a higher penalty constituted material and relevant evidence that Complainant failed to consider in agreeing to the proposed CAFO. Thus, Petitioners' claim in this regard was denied.

Second, Petitioners urged that a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) be incorporated into the proposed CAFO and that local residents be included in the distribution of funds for SEP projects. The undersigned found that as Complainant had stated in its Response to Comments and Response to Petition, EPA lacks the legal authority to demand a SEP or control the distribution of civil penalty funds. The undersigned concluded that given this lack of authority, the issues raised by Petitioners with regard to a SEP were immaterial to the issuance of the proposed CAFO. Thus, this claim was denied.

Third, Petitioners urged that an independent advisory committee and environmental monitoring program for Respondent's wastewater treatment plant be created. Petitioners then questioned Respondent's community outreach activities, which Complainant had referenced in its Response to Comments. The undersigned found that as argued by Complainant in its Response to Petition, EPA lacks the legal authority under section 309(g) of the CWA to establish advisory committees or environmental monitoring programs or compel Respondent to engage in outreach activities. The undersigned concluded that given the absence of any material and relevant issue not considered by Complainant with respect to the course of action requested by Petitioners, their claim in this regard was also denied.

Finally, Petitioners referred in their Comments and Petition to Respondent having a history of violations. While a violator's history of prior violations is a statutory penalty factor to be considered under section 309(g)(3) of the CWA, the undersigned found that Petitioners had presented no specific claims of violations that were related to those set forth in the proposed CAFO, and presented no argument supporting the notion that any prior, unspecified infraction, had it been considered, should have led to a penalty different than that agreed upon by the parties. The undersigned also noted that Complainant had addressed claims concerning Respondent's history of violations in its Response to Comments, which suggested that to the extent any prior violations would be relevant to the proposed CAFO, Complainant had

adequately considered them. Accordingly, any claim in this regard was denied.

Having found that Petitioners failed to present any relevant and material evidence that had not been adequately considered and responded to by Complainant in agreeing to the proposed CAFO, the undersigned then addressed Petitioners' requests for a public hearing in their Comments and Petition. Noting that Petitioners appeared to seek a public forum, at least in part, for the parties to explain the meaning of the proposed CAFO to the public, the undersigned observed that section 309(g) of the CWA and the Rules of Practice provide, not for a meeting of that nature, but rather a hearing at which evidence is presented for the purpose of determining whether Complainant met its burden of proving that Respondent committed the violations as alleged and that the proposed penalty is appropriate based on applicable law and policy. The undersigned noted that Petitioners did not specifically identify any testimonial or documentary evidence that they would present at any such hearing. The undersigned further noted that Petitioners did not offer in either their Comments or the Petition any relevant and material evidence or arguments that had not already been adequately addressed by Complainant. For these reasons, the undersigned found that resolution of the proceeding by the parties would be appropriate without a hearing.

The undersigned thus issued the Order Denying Petition to Set Aside Consent Agreement and Proposed Final Order.

Dated: May 8, 2018.

Susan L. Biro,

Chief Administrative Law Judge.

[FR Doc. 2018-10460 Filed 5-15-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

[Notice 2018-09]

Filing Dates for the Texas Special Election in the 27th Congressional District

AGENCY: Federal Election Commission.

ACTION: Notice of filing dates for special election.

SUMMARY: Texas has scheduled a special general election on June 30, 2018, to fill the U.S. House of Representatives seat in the 27th Congressional District vacated by Representative Blake Farenthold. There are two possible

² Petitioners described the arguments set forth in the Petition as additions to the Comments they had previously submitted to EPA in response to the public notice of EPA's intent to file the proposed CAFO. Accordingly, the undersigned considered the arguments raised by Petitioners in both the Petition and the Comments.

elections, but only one may be necessary. Under Texas law, all qualified candidates, regardless of party affiliation, will appear on the ballot. The majority winner of the special election is declared elected. Should no candidate achieve a majority vote, the Governor will then set the date for a Special Runoff Election that will include only the top two vote-getters.

Committees participating in the Texas special election are required to file pre- and post-election reports.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Elizabeth S. Kurland, Information Division, 1050 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20463; Telephone: (202) 694-1100; Toll Free (800) 424-9530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Principal Campaign Committees

All principal campaign committees of candidates who participate in the Texas Special General Election shall file a 12-day Pre-General Report on June 18, 2018. If there is a majority winner,

committees must also file a Post-General Report on July 30, 2018. (See chart below for the closing date for each report.)

Note that these reports are in addition to the campaign committee's regular quarterly filings. (See chart below for the closing date for each report).

Unauthorized Committees (PACs and Party Committees)

Political committees filing on a quarterly basis in 2018 are subject to special election reporting if they make previously undisclosed contributions or expenditures in connection with the Texas Special General Election by the close of books for the applicable report(s). (See chart below for the closing date for each report.)

Committees filing monthly that make contributions or expenditures in connection with the Texas Special General Election will continue to file according to the monthly reporting schedule.

Additional disclosure information in connection with the Texas Special

General Election may be found on the FEC website at <https://www.fec.gov/help-candidates-and-committees/dates-and-deadlines/>.

Possible Special Runoff Election

In the event that no candidate receives a majority of the votes in the Special General Election, a Special Runoff Election will be held. The Commission will publish a future notice giving the filing dates for that election if it becomes necessary.

Disclosure of Lobbyist Bundling Activity

Principal campaign committees, party committees and Leadership PACs that are otherwise required to file reports in connection with the special elections must simultaneously file FEC Form 3L if they receive two or more bundled contributions from lobbyists/registrants or lobbyist/registrant PACs that aggregate in excess of \$18,200 during the special election reporting periods. (See charts below for closing date of each period.) 11 CFR 104.22(a)(5)(v), (b).

CALENDAR OF REPORTING DATES FOR TEXAS SPECIAL GENERAL ELECTION

Report	Close of books ¹	Reg./cert. and overnight mailing deadline	Filing deadline
If Only the Special General is Held (06/30/18), Political Committees Involved Must File			
Pre-General	06/10/18	06/15/18	06/18/18
July Quarterly	06/30/18	07/15/18	² 07/15/18
Post-General	07/20/18	07/30/18	07/30/18
October Quarterly	09/30/18	10/15/18	² 10/15/18

If Two Elections Are Held, Political Committees Involved Only in the Special General (06/30/18) Must File

Pre-General	06/10/18	06/15/18	06/18/18
July Quarterly	06/30/18	07/15/18	² 07/15/18

¹ The reporting period always begins the day after the closing date of the last report filed. If the committee is new and has not previously filed a report, the first report must cover all activity that occurred before the committee registered as a political committee up through the close of books for the first report due.

² Notice that this filing deadline falls on a weekend or federal holiday. Filing deadlines are not extended when they fall on nonworking days. Accordingly, reports filed by methods other than registered, certified or overnight mail must be received by close of business on the last business day before the deadline.

Dated: May 1, 2018.

On behalf of the Commission.

Caroline C. Hunter,

Chair, Federal Election Commission.

[FR Doc. 2018-10386 Filed 5-15-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6715-01-P

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

[No. 2018-N-05]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Federal Housing Finance Agency.

ACTION: 60-Day notice of submission of information collection for approval from Office of Management and Budget.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork

Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA or the Agency) is seeking public comments concerning an information collection known as "Minimum Requirements for Appraisal Management Companies," which has been assigned control number 2590-0013 by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). FHFA intends to submit the information collection to OMB for review and approval of a three-year extension of the control number, which is due to expire on July 31, 2018.