(hamlet of Cementon), via horizontal direction drilling (HDD). The HVDC underwater cables would be located within the Hudson River for approximately 67 miles until reaching a point north of Haverstraw Bay. As part of the revised project route, the cables would then exit the Hudson River at the Town of Stony Point in Rockland County, NY, to allow for a 7.7 mile bypass of Haverstraw Bay; this portion of the route would include three HDD installations under the Stony Point State Historic Park Site and Rockland Lake State Park. After the HDD under the parks, the cables would enter the Hudson River via HDD and be buried in the river for approximately 20.7 miles to the Spuyten Duyvil, where it would now extend south-easterly within the Harlem River for approximately 6.6 miles before exiting the water to a location along an existing railroad ROW in the borough of the Bronx, NY. The cables would then continue along that ROW for approximately 1.1 miles.

At this point, the revised route would enter the East River via HDD, cross the East River and make land-fall at Astoria, Queens, NY. The cables would terminate at a new converter station proposed to be located near Layster Creek, north of 20th Avenue, for a total length of approximately 330 miles from the U.S. border with Canada. The converter station would be installed on properties owned by Con Edison located in an industrial zone in Astoria and is proposed to have a total footprint of approximately five acres. The converter station would interconnect via underground circuit with the NYPA substation near the site of the Charles Poletti Power Project in Queens, NY. The substation would be connected to Con Edison’s Rainey Substation, located in Astoria, via HVAC cables installed under New York City streets. A map of the proposed Champlain Hudson transmission line project route can be found at http://chpexpresseis.org.

Previous Public Scoping

A public scoping period for the CHPE EIS began with the publication of DOE’s NOI in the Federal Register on June 18, 2010. The 45-day public scoping period closed on August 2, 2010. DOE received scoping comments in the form of 22 written letters or emails from private citizens, government agencies, and nongovernmental organizations. DOE held public scoping meetings from July 8, through July 16, 2010, in Bridgeport, Connecticut and Manhattan, Yonkers, Kingston, Albany, Queensbury, and Plattsburg, NY. A total of 33 people gave verbal comments at the meetings, and their comments were transcribed by court stenographers.

Commenters requested that the EIS establish evidence that the Champlain Hudson project is necessary to meet electricity demands (either current or future) in the project region, as well as address concerns over the impact of construction on existing transmission infrastructure. Commenters expressed concerns with regard to sediment disturbance and the potential impacts of contaminants in the water column on humans and wildlife from burying the transmission line in Lake Champlain and the Hudson River. Commenters also requested that the EIS specifically analyze potential thermal effects and effects of electromagnetic fields on aquatic ecosystems, and noted concern over impacts to visually important resources from construction of the transmission line. Commenters noted potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts from a proposed electric converter station in Yonkers, NY. Finally, commenters identified additional alternatives that they believed should be analyzed in the EIS. A copy of the Scoping Summary Report (December 2010) is available at http://chpexpresseis.org. DOE will address these comments, to the extent they are still relevant, as well as those submitted during the public comment period for this Amended NOI, in the CHPE EIS.

Public Scoping for the Revised Applicant Proposal

Pursuant to the submittal of the Joint Proposal, the NY State Public Service Commission is holding six public statement hearings in April 2012 in a variety of locations along the revised Champlain Hudson project route, including the municipalities of Whitehall, Catskill, Ravena, Schenectady, Garnerville, and Astoria, NY. While DOE does not currently intend to hold further public scoping meetings, it recognizes that comments provided by the public during the Commission’s public statement hearings may be relevant to DOE’s NEPA process. Therefore, DOE intends to review the April public statement hearing transcripts, in addition to scoping comments submitted directly to DOE, and will consider them, to the extent matters relevant to the federal environmental review process arise, as scoping comments for purposes of the EIS.

Agency Purpose and Need, Proposed Action, and Alternatives

The purpose and need for DOE’s action is to decide whether to grant a Presidential permit for the Champlain Hudson project. The proposed Federal action is the granting of the Presidential permit for the construction, operation, maintenance, and connection of the proposed new electric transmission line across the U.S.-Canada border in northeastern New York State. The EIS will analyze potential environmental impacts from the proposed action and the No Action Alternative. Because the proposed action may involve actions in floodplains and wetlands, and in accordance with 10 CFR part 1022, Compliance with Floodplain and Wetland Environmental Review Requirements, the draft EIS will include a floodplain and wetland assessment as appropriate, and the final EIS or record of decision will include a floodplain statement of findings. If granted, the Presidential permit would authorize only that portion of the line that would be constructed, operated and maintained wholly within the U.S.

DOE is seeking comment on the scope of the alternatives proposed and potential environmental impacts for analyses in the EIS and currently proposes to analyze the following alternatives in detail: (1) the Champlain Hudson project, as proposed by the Applicant in the Joint Proposal filed with the New York Public Service Commission on February 24, 2012 and submitted to DOE on February 28, 2012 as an amended application for a Presidential permit, and (2) the No Action Alternative, which assumes that DOE would not grant a Presidential permit for the Champlain Hudson project and that the proposed line and associated facilities would not be constructed.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 24, 2012.

Brian Mills,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Permitting, Siting and Analysis, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.

[]FR Doc. 2012–10304 Filed 4–27–12; 8:45 am

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FR–9665–2]

Cross-Media Electronic Reporting: Authorized Program Revision Approval, State of Florida

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces EPA’s approval of the State of Florida’s request
to revise/modify certain of its EPA-authorized programs to allow electronic reporting.

DATES: EPA’s approval is effective May 30, 2012 for the State of Florida’s National Primary Drinking Water Regulations Implementation program, if no timely request for a public hearing is received and accepted by the Agency, and on April 30, 2012 for the State of Florida’s other authorized programs.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 13, 2005, the final Cross-Media Electronic Reporting Rule (CROMERR) was published in the Federal Register (70 FR 59848) and codified as part 3 of title 40 of the CFR. CROMERR establishes electronic reporting as an acceptable regulatory alternative to paper reporting and establishes requirements to assure that electronic documents are as legally dependable as their paper counterparts. Subpart D of CROMERR requires that state, tribal or local government agencies that receive, or wish to begin receiving, electronic reports under their EPA-authorized programs must apply to EPA for a revision or modification of those programs and obtain EPA approval. Subpart D provides standards for such approvals based on consideration of the electronic document receiving systems that the State, Tribe, or local government will use to implement the electronic reporting. Additionally, § 3.1000(b) through (e) of 40 CFR part 3, subpart D provides special procedures for program revisions and modifications to allow electronic reporting, to be used at the option of the State, Tribe or local government in place of procedures available under existing program-specific authorization regulations. An application submitted under the subpart D procedures must show that the state, tribe or local government has sufficient legal authority to implement the electronic reporting components of the programs covered by the application and will use electronic document receiving systems that meet the applicable subpart D requirements.

On February 22, 2011, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) submitted an application titled “e-Reporting System Electronic Document Receiving System” for revisions/modifications of its EPA-authorized programs under title 40 CFR. EPA reviewed FDEP’s request to revise/modify its EPA-authorized programs and, based on this review, EPA determined that the application met the standards for approval of authorized program revisions/modifications set out in 40 CFR part 3, subpart D. In accordance with 40 CFR 3.1000(d), this notice of EPA’s decision to approve Florida’s request to modify/revise its following EPA-authorized programs to allow electronic reporting under 40 CFR parts 51, 60, 70, 141, 144, 146, 257–258, 262–265, 268, and 270–271 is being published in the Federal Register:

Part 52—Approval and Promotion of State Implementation Plans;


Part 70—State Operating Permit Programs;

Part 142—National Primary Drinking Water Regulations Implementation; 

Part 147—State, Tribal, and EPA-Administered Underground Injection Control Programs; and

Part 272—Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Programs.

FDEP was notified of EPA’s determination to approve its application with respect to the authorized program listed above.

Also, in today’s notice, EPA is informing interested persons that they may request a public hearing on EPA’s action to approve the State of Florida’s request to revise its authorized public water system program under 40 CFR part 142, in accordance with 40 CFR 3.1000(f). Requests for a hearing must be submitted to EPA within 30 days of publication of today’s Federal Register notice. Such requests should include the following information:

(1) The name, address and telephone number of the individual, organization or other entity requesting a hearing;

(2) A brief statement of the requesting person’s interest in EPA’s determination, a brief explanation as to why EPA should hold a hearing, and any other information that the requesting person wants EPA to consider when determining whether to grant the request;

(3) The signature of the individual making the request, or, if the request is made on behalf of an organization or other entity, the signature of a responsible official of the organization or other entity.

In the event a hearing is requested and granted, EPA will provide notice of the hearing in the Federal Register not less than 15 days prior to the scheduled hearing date. Frivolous or insubstantial requests for hearing may be denied by EPA. Following such a public hearing, EPA will review the record of the hearing and issue an order either affirming today’s determination or rescinding such determination. If no timely request for a hearing is received and granted, EPA’s approval of the State of Florida’s request to revise its Part 142—National Primary Drinking Water Regulations Implementation program to allow electronic reporting will become effective 30 days after today’s notice is published, pursuant to CROMERR section 3.1000(f)(4).


Andrew Battin, 
Director, Office of Information Collection.
[FR Doc. 2012–10322 Filed 4–27–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY


Inquiry To Learn Whether Businesses Assert Business Confidentiality Claims Regarding Waste Import and Export

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; request for comment.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) receives from time to time Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests for documentation received or issued by EPA or data contained in EPA database systems pertaining to the export and import of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous waste from/to the United States, the export of cathode ray tubes (CRTs) and spent lead acid batteries (SLABs) from the United States, and the export and import of RCRA universal waste from/to the United States. These documents and data may identify or reference multiple parties, and describe transactions involving the movement of specified materials in which the parties propose to participate or have participated. The purpose of this notice is to inform “affected businesses” about the documents or data sought by these types of FOIA requests in order to provide the businesses with the opportunity to assert claims that any of the information sought that pertains to