The Commission continues to encourage electronic filing, and comments may be paper-filed. To paper-file, mail an original and seven copies to: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

More information about this project, including a copy of the application, can be viewed or printed on the “eLibrary” link of the Office’s Web site at http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp. Enter the docket number (P–14363–000) in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support.


Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012–10220 Filed 4–26–12; 8:45 am]
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Revision to Transmission Vegetation Management Reliability Standard; Notice Inviting Comments on Report

The Commission is posting and inviting comment upon a report prepared by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) on “Applicability of the ‘Gallet Equation’ to the Vegetation Clearances of NERC Reliability Standard FAC–003–2” (PNNL Report). The Report was commissioned by the Commission’s Office of Electric Reliability, for the purpose of obtaining an independent analysis of certain technical questions raised by the Minimum Vegetation Clearance Distances as proposed in the North American Electric Reliability Corporation’s Reliability Standard FAC–003–2 (Transmission Vegetation Management). Specifically, PNNL was commissioned to prepare a report addressing the following:

The overall scope of this project shall include analysis of the mathematics and documentation of the technical justification behind the application of the Gallet equation and the assumptions used in the technical reference paper [Exh. A of NERC’s filing]. To put the analysis into perspective, are the assumptions made in the development of the Gallet Equation and their application in NERC-approved Reliability Standard FAC–003–2 reasonable to address the minimum distance requirements needed to avoid sustained vegetation-related outages? What variations in Gallet distance may occur when comparing the original testing (use of switching impulses and corona free electrodes) against the variety of impulses a line may be subject to and the concentrations of coronal effects when using vegetation instead of corona-free electrodes? Do the equations adequately address the limiting conditions (i.e., the expected extremes in prevailing ambient conditions including temperatures, humidity, conductor position, amplification of any coronal effects and wind speed) that are important to the insulation performance of a line to prevent flashover to nearby vegetation during real-time operating conditions? The limiting conditions will be identified, outlined, and applied in the analysis.

This analysis shall also include a discussion of the appropriateness of using one clearance for all lines with the same operating voltage as opposed to linking the clearance to “as built” and design conditions. Finally, the analysis shall identify if the proposed clearance will provide the minimum clearance needed to avoid a flashover with regard to vegetation. (Footnotes omitted.)


Comments on the PNNL Report should be filed with the Commission within 30 days of the issuance of this Notice. The Commission encourages electronic submission of comments in lieu of paper using the “eFiling” link at http://www.ferc.gov. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 14 copies of the comment to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

All filings in this docket are accessible on-line at http://www.ferc.gov, using the “eLibrary” link and will be available for review in the Commission’s Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an “eSubscription” link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket. For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email FERCONlineSupport@ferc.gov, or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Questions regarding this Notice should be directed to: David O’Connor, Office of Electric Reliability, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, 202–502–6695, David.OConnor@ferc.gov.


Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012–10221 Filed 4–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY


Adequacy Status of the Eagle River, Alaska Particulate Matter Limited Maintenance Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of adequacy determination.

SUMMARY: In this action, EPA is notifying the public of its finding that the Eagle River, Alaska, Particulate Matter (PM10) Limited Maintenance Plan, submitted by the State of Alaska on September 20, 2011, is adequate for conformity purposes. EPA made this finding pursuant to the adequacy process established at 40 CFR 93.118(f)(1). As a result of our adequacy finding, conformity requirements will be reduced.

DATES: This finding is effective May 14, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The finding will be available at EPA’s conformity Web site: http://www.epa.gov/otaq/statesources/transcon/adequacy.htm. You may also contact Wayne Elson, U.S. EPA, Region 10 (OAWT–107), 1200 Sixth Ave, Suite 900, Seattle WA 98101; (206) 553–1463 or elson.wayne@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This action provides notice of EPA’s adequacy finding regarding the PM10 Limited Maintenance Plan for Eagle River, Alaska. EPA’s finding was made pursuant to the adequacy review process for implementation plan submissions delineated at 40 CFR 93.118(f)(1) under which EPA reviews the adequacy of an state implementation plan (SIP) submission prior to EPA’s final action on the implementation plan. On September 20, 2011, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation submitted a PM10 maintenance plan revision to EPA. Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.118(f)(1), EPA notified the public of its receipt of this plan that would be reviewed for an adequacy determination on EPA’s Web site and requested public comment by no later than February 27, 2012. EPA received no comments on the plan during that comment period. As part of our review, we also reviewed comments submitted to the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation on the Limited Maintenance Plan during the public hearing process. There were no adverse comments submitted during the State hearing process regarding the new
Plan. EPA Region 10 sent a letter to the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation on April 2, 2012, subsequent to the close of the comment period stating EPA found the Eagle River PM2.5 Limited Maintenance Plan to be adequate for use in transportation conformity.

Because limited maintenance plans do not contain budgets, as provided in 40 CFR 93.109(l), the adequacy review period for these maintenance plans serves to allow the public to comment on whether limited maintenance is appropriate for these areas. As a result of this adequacy finding, the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities, and the U.S. Department of Transportation are no longer required to conduct a regional emissions analysis for conformity. However, other conformity requirements still remain such as consultation (40 CFR 93.112), transportation control measures (40 CFR 93.113), and project level analysis (40 CFR 93.116).

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. EPA’s conformity rule requires transportation plans, programs, and projects to conform to SIPs and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do. 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 minimum criteria by which we determine whether a SIP is adequate for conformity purposes are specified at 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). EPA’s analysis of how the state’s submission satisfies these criteria is found in the Technical Support Document. EPA’s adequacy review is separate from EPA’s SIP completeness review and it also should not be used to prejudice EPA’s ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find the SIP adequate for conformity purposes, the SIP could later be disapproved.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.


**Dennis J. McLerran,**
Regional Administrator, Region 10.

**BILLING CODE** 6560–50–P