the criteria of the Clean Air Act. Accordingly, this action merely proposes to approve state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a “significant regulatory action” subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4);
- Does not have Federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001); and
- Is not subject to requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Act; and
- Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). In addition, this rule does not have tribal implications as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because the SIP is not approved to apply in Indian country located in the state, and EPA notes that it will not impose substantial direct costs on tribal governments or preempt tribal law.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.

Dated: November 7, 2011.

Al Armendariz,
Regional Administrator, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 2011–29638 Filed 11–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52


Extension of Public Comment Period for Proposed Action on Arkansas Regional Haze State Implementation Plan and Interstate Transport State Implementation Plan To Address Pollution Affecting Visibility and Regional Haze

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On October 17, 2011, EPA published in the Federal Register a proposed rule proposing to partially approve and partially disapprove the Arkansas Regional Haze (RH) State Implementation Plan (SIP) and to partially approve and partially disapprove Arkansas’ Interstate Transport SIP to address pollution affecting visibility, and requested comment by November 16, 2011. EPA is extending the public comment period for the proposed rule until December 22, 2011.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 22, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket No. EPA–R06–OAR–2008–0727, by one of the following methods:

- Email: Mr. Guy Donaldson at donaldson.guy@epa.gov. Please also send a copy by email to the person listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Dayana Medina, Air Planning Section (6PD–L), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document wherever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean the EPA. On October 17, 2011, we published in the Federal Register a proposed rule proposing to partially approve and partially disapprove the Arkansas RH SIP and to partially approve and partially disapprove

The EPA is extending the comment period due to public requests that have been made stating that additional time is needed in order to fully evaluate our proposed rule and provide substantive comment. We are extending the comment period for our proposed rule until December 22, 2011.

Dated: November 9, 2011.

Carl E. Edlund,
Multimedia Planning and Permitting Division Director, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 2011–29724 Filed 11–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 192
[Docket ID PHMSA–2011–0023]
RIN 2137–AE72

Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Transmission Pipelines

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

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On August 25, 2011, (76 FR 53086) PHMSA published in the Federal Register an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) titled: “Safety of Gas Transmission Pipelines” seeking comments on the need for changes to the regulations covering gas transmission pipelines. PHMSA has received requests to extend the comment period in order to have more time to evaluate the ANPRM. PHMSA is extending the comment period from December 2, 2011, to January 20, 2012.

DATES: The closing date for filing comments is extended from December 2, 2011, until January 20, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Comments should reference Docket No. PHMSA–2011–0023 and may be submitted in the following ways:

• E-Gov Web Site: http://www.Regulations.gov. This site allows the public to enter comments on any

Federal Register notice issued by any agency.

• Fax: 1 (202) 493–2251.


Hand Delivery: U.S. DOT Docket Management System: West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590–0001 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: You should identify the Docket No. PHMSA–2011–0023 at the beginning of your comments. If you submit your comments by mail, submit two copies. To receive confirmation that PHMSA received your comments, include a self-addressed stamped postcard. Internet users may submit comments at http://www.regulations.gov.

Note: Comments are posted without changes or edits to http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. There is a privacy statement published on http://www.regulations.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information contact Mike Israni at (202) 366–4566 or by email at mike.israni@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 25, 2011, (76 FR 53086), PHMSA published an ANPRM seeking comments on the need for changes to the regulations covering gas transmission pipelines. Within this ANPRM, PHMSA is seeking public comment on 15 specific topic areas in two broad categories (integrity management (IM) and Non-IM requirements). In particular, PHMSA is interested in knowing whether IM requirements should be changed, more prescriptive language added in some areas, and non-IM requirements strengthened or expanded. Among the specific issues PHMSA is considering concerning IM requirements is whether the definition of a high-consequence area should be revised, and whether additional restrictions should be placed on the use of specific pipeline assessment methods. With respect to non-IM requirements, PHMSA is considering whether revised requirements are needed on new construction or existing pipelines concerning mainline valves, whether requirements for corrosion control of steel pipelines should be strengthened, and whether new regulations are needed to govern the safety of gathering lines and underground gas storage facilities.

On September 9, 2011, the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) and the American Gas Association (AGA) requested that PHMSA extend the comment period of the ANPRM by 90 days. INGAA and AGA supported their request stating that the ANPRM poses a large number of multi-part questions that cover 15 separate topic areas. They stated that to thoughtfully and thoroughly address the issues, significant effort on the part of all stakeholders is required, and may include industry-wide surveys. They stated that questions regarding cost implications and various other impacts will entail an integrated effort within the industry to provide a quality, validated, and vetted answer. Also, they stated that timing supports their request because they are currently in the initial phases of implementing the Control Room Management regulations, and completing and verifying their 2011 projects and conducting maintenance, budget and planning activities that will directly impact their pipeline safety compliance efforts this year and next. In addition, they stated that PHMSA granted an extension of time allowing parties four months to comment on the hazardous liquid ANPRM and, therefore, a 90-day extension of the comment period is further justified by the depth and scope of the issues addressed in the natural gas ANPRM.

Through this ANPRM, PHMSA has raised several important and complex public safety issues, many of which, if implemented, could impose significant cost on the pipeline industry. PHMSA needs very thorough responses to the questions we have posed in the ANPRM in order to facilitate PHMSA’s decision making on these very important and complex issues. Based on the reasons given by INGAA and AGA in their request to extend the comment period, and PHMSA’s need to have the best data possible to facilitate its decisions relative to these issues, PHMSA believes that extension of the comment period is warranted. Therefore, PHMSA has extended the comment period from December 2, 2011, to January 20, 2012.

Issued in Washington, DC, on November 3, 2011.

Jeffrey D. Wiese,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.
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