

using the Monte Carlo analysis methodology developed for the RFS2 final rule.⁷² Figure II–1 and Figure II–2 show the results of our statistical uncertainty assessment. In analyzing both palm oil biofuel pathways, the midpoint results, and therefore the majority of the scenarios analyzed, fail to meet the 20% lifecycle GHG reduction requirement for non-grandfathered renewable fuels.

We have also identified areas of uncertainty that are not explicitly addressed in our Monte Carlo analysis due to time considerations. These areas of uncertainty have been assessed with sensitivity analysis and qualitative inspection. A majority of the areas of uncertainty considered could result in higher actual lifecycle GHG emissions than estimated in our midpoint results. These aspects of our analysis include uncertainties regarding: the total area of projected incremental palm oil expansion; the percent of palm oil expansion impacting tropical peat swamp forests; and indirect emissions related to peat soil drainage, such as from an increased risk of forest fires or collateral drainage of nearby uncultivated land. For these areas of uncertainty it is our judgment that our midpoint estimates likely underestimate the actual amount of lifecycle GHG emissions, but it is unlikely that they overestimate the actual emissions. We have also identified a smaller number of uncertainties which could result in less actual emissions. For example, increased adoption of methane capture/use technologies at palm oil mills and future government restrictions on peat soil development would likely result in less actual emissions than estimated in our midpoint results. Regarding methane capture and use projections, we conducted sensitivity analysis assuming that all mills use closed digester tanks with 90% methane capture efficiency, and convert the methane to electricity with 34% efficiency for export to the grid. In this sensitivity scenario, the mid-point results for palm oil biodiesel and renewable diesel are 42% and 36% reductions compared to the diesel baseline, respectively. Thus, even in this very optimistic scenario, neither of the palm oil biofuel pathways analyzed achieves a 50% GHG reduction. Our consideration of uncertainties in our lifecycle assessments is described further in a reference document available through the public docket.

Based on the weight of evidence considered, and putting the most weight

on our mid-point estimate results, the results of our analysis indicate that both palm oil based biofuels pathways would fail to qualify as meeting the minimum 20% GHG performance threshold for qualifying renewable fuel under the RFS program. This conclusion is supported by our midpoint estimates, our statistical assessment of land use change uncertainty, as well as our consideration of other areas of uncertainty. A majority of the areas of uncertainty that we have identified, and discussed above, would lead to higher actual lifecycle GHG emissions than estimated in our midpoint results. Some of these areas of uncertainty appear to be fairly likely to result in greater actual emissions and in some cases by a substantial amount. In comparison, we identified a smaller number of uncertainties which could result in less actual emissions, but these factors appear less likely to reduce emissions by an equivalent amount. Based on the results of our analysis and considering key areas of uncertainty, the minimum 20% lifecycle GHG reduction requirements for non-grandfathered fuels under the RFS program is not achieved for the palm oil biofuel pathways evaluated.

The docket for this NODA provides more details on all aspects of our analysis of palm oil biofuels. EPA invites comment on all aspects of its modeling of palm oil biodiesel and renewable diesel. We also invite comment on the consideration of uncertainty as it relates to making GHG threshold determinations.

Dated: December 14, 2011.

Margo T. Oge,

Director, Office of Transportation & Air Quality.

[FR Doc. 2012–1784 Filed 1–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–9001–3]

Environmental Impacts Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7146 or <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/>.

Weekly Receipt of Environmental Impact Statements

Filed 01/17/2012 Through 01/20/2012 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

Notice

Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act requires that EPA make public its

comments on EISs issued by other Federal agencies. EPA's comment letters on EIS are available at: <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/eisdata.html>.

EIS No. 20120013, Final EIS, USFS, ID, Clearwater National Forest Travel Planning Project, Proposes to Manage Motorized and Mechanized Travel, Clearwater National Forest, Idaho, Clearwater, Latah and Shoshone Counties, ID, Review Period Ends: 02/27/2012, Contact: Heather Berg (208) 476–4541.

EIS No. 20120014, Revised Draft EIS, USFS, MT, East Deer Lodge Valley Landscape Restoration Management Project, To Conduct Landscape Restoration Management Activities, Additional Information Including the Addition of Alternative 3, Pintler Ranger District, Beaverhead Deerlodge National Forest, Powell and Deerlodge Counties, MT, Comment Period Ends: 03/12/2012, Contact: Brent Lignell (406) 494–2147.

EIS No. 20120015, Draft EIS, FTA, WA, Mukilteo Multimodal Project, To Improve the Operations, Safety and Security of Facilities Serving the Mukilteo-Clinton Ferry Route, Funding, USACE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Snohomish County, WA, Comment Period Ends: 03/12/2012, Contact: Daniel Drais (206) 220–4465.

EIS No. 20120016, Draft EIS, BLM, NV, Hycroft Mine Expansion Project, Proposes to Expand Mining Activities on BLM Managed Public Land and Private Land, Approval, Humboldt and Pershing Counties, NV, Comment Period Ends: 03/12/2012, Contact: Kathleen Rehberg (775) 623–1500.

EIS No. 20120017, Draft EIS, FHWA, NY, Tappan Zee Hudson River Crossing Project, To Provide an Improved Hudson River Crossing between Rockland and Westchester Counties Funding, USACE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Rockland and Westchester Counties, NY, Comment Period Ends: 03/15/2012, Contact: Jonathan D. McDade (518) 431–4125.

EIS No. 20120018, Final EIS, FHWA, CA, State Route 76 South Mission Road to Interstate 15 Highway Improvement Project, Widening and Realignment Including Interchange Improvements, USACE Section 404 Permit, San Diego County, CA, Review Period Ends: 02/27/2012, Contact: Manuel E. Sanchez (619) 699–7336.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 20110350, Draft EIS, USFS, AZ, Rosemont Copper Project, Proposed Construction, Operation with Concurrent Reclamation and Closure of an Open-Pit Copper Mine,

⁷² The Monte Carlo analysis is described in EPA (2010a), Section 2.4.4.2.8.

Coronado National Forest, Pima County, AZ, Comment Period Ends: 01/31/2012, Contact: Bev Everson (520) 388-8300. This document is available on the Internet at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/coronado/RosemontDEISmain.htm>. Revision to FR Publication 10/21/2011; Extending Comment Period from 1/18/2012 to 1/31/2012.

EIS No. 20110420, Draft Supplement, USACE, TX, Clear Creek Reevaluation Study Project, Flood Risk Management and Ecosystem Restoration, Brazoria, Fort Bend, Galveston and Harris Counties, TX, Comment Period Ends: 01/30/2012, Contact: Andrea Catanzaro (409) 766-6346. Revision to FR Notice Published 12/16/2012; Extending Comment Period from 01/30/2012 to 02/14/2012.

Dated: January 24, 2012.

Cliff Rader,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 2012-1814 Filed 1-26-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-9623-6]

Notification of Two Public Teleconferences of the Science Advisory Board Ecological Processes and Effects Committee

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency) Science Advisory Board (SAB) Staff Office announces two public teleconferences of the SAB Ecological Processes and Effects Committee (EPEC). The SAB EPEC will provide advice on the EPA Risk Assessment Forum (RAF) document, "Integrating Ecological Assessment and Decision-Making at EPA, 2011 RAF Ecological Assessment Action Plan (August, 11, 2011)."

DATES: The SAB Ecological Processes and Effects Committee will conduct public teleconferences on February 22, 2012 and February 23, 2012. The teleconferences will begin at 12:00 noon and end at 4 p.m. (Eastern Time) on each day.

ADDRESSES: The public teleconferences will be conducted by telephone only.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Any member of the public wishing further information regarding the public teleconferences may contact Dr. Thomas

Armitage, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), SAB Staff Office, by telephone/voice mail at (202) 564-2155 or via email at armitage.thomas@epa.gov. General information concerning the EPA Science Advisory Board can be found at the EPA SAB Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/sab>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background: The SAB was established pursuant to the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act (ERDAA) codified at 42 U.S.C. 4365, to provide independent scientific and technical peer review, advice, consultation and recommendations to the EPA Administrator on the technical basis for EPA actions. As a Federal Advisory Committee, the SAB conducts business in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) (5 U.S.C. App. 2) and related regulations. Pursuant to FACA and EPA policy, notice is hereby given that the SAB EPEC, augmented with other experts, will hold two public teleconferences to provide advice through the chartered SAB on the EPA Risk Assessment Forum (RAF) document, "Integrating Ecological Assessment and Decision-Making at EPA, 2011 RAF Ecological Assessment Action Plan (August, 11, 2011)." The SAB Committee will comply with the provisions of FACA and all appropriate SAB Staff Office procedural policies.

In response to recommendations in a 2007 SAB Report, "Advice to EPA on Advancing the Science and Application of Ecological Risk Assessment in Environmental Decision-Making" (EPA-SAB-08-002), the EPA Risk Assessment Forum in the Office of the Science Advisor held an EPA ecological assessment colloquium and developed an action plan titled, "Integrating Ecological Assessment and Decision-Making at EPA, 2011 RAF Ecological Assessment Action Plan (August, 11, 2011)." The action plan proposes initiatives to improve the quality, scope, and application of the EPA's ecological assessments. Initiatives outlined in the action plan address high priority recommendations in the EPA colloquium report, "Integrating Ecological Assessment and Decision-Making at EPA: A Path Forward" (EPA/100/R-10/004). EPA's Office of the Science Advisor has requested that the SAB Ecological Processes and Effects Committee review the Agency's ecological assessment action plan and related background documents, and provide advice on the technical merit and implementation of proposed initiatives. The SAB EPEC will be

augmented with experts who participated in the SAB 2007 review.

Availability of the review materials:

The agenda and material in support of this meeting will be available on the SAB Web site at <http://www.epa.gov/sab>. For technical questions and information concerning EPA's review document, "Integrating Ecological Assessment and Decision-Making at EPA, 2011 RAF Ecological Assessment Action Plan (August, 11, 2011)," please contact Mr. Lawrence Martin of EPA's Risk Assessment Forum by phone (202) 564-6497 or via email at martin.lawrence@epa.gov.

Procedures for Providing Public Input:

Public comment for consideration by EPA's federal advisory committees and panels has a different purpose from public comment provided to EPA program offices. Therefore, the process for submitting comments to a federal advisory committee is different from the process used to submit comments to an EPA program office. Federal advisory committees and panels, including scientific advisory committees, provide independent advice to EPA. Members of the public can submit relevant comments pertaining to EPA's charge, meeting materials and/or the group conducting the activity. Input from the public to the SAB will have the most impact if it consists of comments that provide specific scientific or technical information or analysis for the SAB Committee to consider or if it relates to the clarity or accuracy of the technical information. Members of the public wishing to provide comment on the February 22, 2012 public teleconference should contact the Designated Federal Officer for the relevant advisory committee directly. **Oral Statements:** In general, individuals or groups requesting an oral presentation will be limited to five minutes per speaker. Interested parties should contact Dr. Thomas Armitage, DFO, in writing (preferably via email), at the contact information noted above, by February 15, 2012 to be placed on the list of public speakers for February 22, 2012. **Written Statements:** Written statements should be received in the SAB Staff Office by February 15, 2012 so that the information may be made available to the SAB Committee for their consideration. Written statements should be supplied to the DFO in electronic format via email (acceptable file formats: Adobe Acrobat PDF, WordPerfect, MS Word, MS PowerPoint, or Rich Text files in IBM-PC/Windows 98/2000/XP format). It is the SAB Staff Office general policy to post written comments on the Web page for the advisory meeting or teleconference.