

flare stack, smokeless tips, and ignition system(s) and scrubbers would be provided to safely burn all vented gas.

- The West Delta LNG loading platform and marine berthing facilities will contain a loading arm system located on the LNG loading platform that would be used to load LNG onto a single LNG trading carrier. The loading and marine berth would be capable of handling LNG trading carriers with nominal capacities ranging from 30,000 m³ up to 180,000 m³. The West Delta LNG deepwater port would include six (6) mooring dolphins and four (4) breasting dolphins. Breasting dolphins and mooring dolphins are marine structures used for berthing and mooring of vessels.

- The support facilities will contain an accommodation platform for West Delta LNG personnel and shall include living quarters for up to 36 people, a control station, helideck, and an auxiliary command room. All main power and essential power, other than the dedicated emergency generator located on the accommodations platform would be created and distributed from the utilities platform.

- The loading platform is connected to offshore liquefied natural gas tankers with a 180,000 m³ nominal capacity for loading by two (2) 16-inch (40.6-centimeter) diameter standard liquid arms; one (1) hybrid (liquid/vapor) 16-inch diameter arm; and one (1) 16-inch diameter standard vapor arm. Depending on manifold restrictions, two (2) liquid arms and one (1) vapor arm would be used to load the 30,000 m³ nominal capacity LNG trading carriers.

Onshore Components of the Deepwater Port

The West Delta LNG deepwater port onshore components would consist of the proposed Venice Pretreatment Plant, which would be located in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana within the grounds of an existing 121-acre onshore natural gas processing facility known as the Venice Gas Complex. The onshore components are as follows:

- The Venice Pretreatment Plant would receive natural gas from offshore Gulf of Mexico midstream pipelines and/or interstate pipeline feed gas from pipelines already interconnected with the Venice Gas Complex. The natural gas would be pre-treated to meet liquefaction specifications, compressed onshore, and sent to the West Delta LNG offshore deepwater port.

- The proposed Venice Pretreatment Plant would contain the following major components for the pre-treatment and processing of sourced natural gas: Cryogenic trains to process offshore-

sourced gas, natural gas compressors, gas pretreatment packages, power generation units driven by gas turbines, waste heat recovery units, utilities to support the new gas pretreatment and compression equipment and a flare to combust waste gas from the pretreatment process.

The onshore components connect to the offshore components by a single pipeline. This pipeline would be constructed to transfer the liquefaction-ready gas from the proposed onshore Venice Pretreatment Plant to the West Delta LNG deepwater port. The proposed pipeline's outgoing onshore assembly is a 4.3 statute mile 30-inch diameter connection from the Venice Pretreatment Plant (measured from the proposed pig launcher to the high water mark) where this pipeline becomes the subsea pipeline supplying the offshore deepwater port. At this point, the pipeline continues, extending 15.5 statute miles beyond the high water mark to terminate at the proposed West Delta LNG offshore deepwater port.

Privacy Act

The electronic form of all comments received into the Federal Docket Management System can be searched by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). The DOT Privacy Act Statement can be viewed in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70, pages 19477–78) or by visiting www.regulations.gov.

(Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1501, *et seq.*; 49 CFR 1.93(h))

Dated: September 23, 2019.

By Order of the Maritime Administrator.

T. Mitchell Hudson, Jr.,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 2019-20929 Filed 9-25-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-81-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA-2016-0163; PDA-39(R)]

Hazardous Materials: Oregon Hazardous Waste Management Regulation

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice of rejection of application for an administrative determination of preemption.

SUMMARY: NORA, An Association of Responsible Recyclers, has petitioned for an administrative determination that the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA) preempts an Oregon hazardous waste regulation to the extent that Oregon interprets the regulation as imposing a strict liability standard on transporters of hazardous waste. Because the HMTA's preemption provisions—including the provision granting the Department the authority to make administrative preemption determinations—expressly do not apply to a “mental state . . . utilized by a State . . . to enforce a requirement applicable to the transportation of hazardous material,” PHMSA lacks authority to act on NORA's petition. PHMSA therefore rejects the petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vincent Lopez, Office of Chief Counsel (PHC-10), Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590; telephone No. 202-366-4400; facsimile No. 202-366-7041.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

NORA, An Association of Responsible Recyclers (NORA) has applied to PHMSA for a determination that the federal Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA), 49 U.S.C. 5101 *et seq.*, preempts Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 340-100-0002(1), as applied to transporters of hazardous waste. Specifically, NORA states that the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission (OEQC) interprets the Oregon regulation—which adopts certain regulations of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), including EPA's regulation requiring transporters to receive a manifest before transporting hazardous waste, 40 CFR 263.20(a)(1)—as imposing a strict liability standard on transporters of hazardous waste. According to NORA, under Oregon law, “the transporter exercising reasonable care may not rely on the information provided by the generator and instead must be held to a strict liability standard” (emphasis omitted). PHMSA invited public comment on NORA's application on January 24, 2017, *see* 82 FR 8257. For the reasons set forth below, PHMSA has concluded that it lacks authority with respect to NORA's application, and therefore rejects it.

II. Oregon Law

The legal framework that governs hazardous waste consists of overlapping federal and state authority. At the federal level, EPA, under authority granted by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 42 U.S.C. 321 *et seq.*, has promulgated regulations to control hazardous waste. This includes the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste. Any state may seek EPA authorization to administer and enforce a hazardous waste program. In Oregon, EPA has authorized the state to administer its own hazardous waste program, which it does through the Department of Environmental Quality and the OEQC.

The relevant Oregon regulation, OAR 340–100–0002 Adoption of United States Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Used Oil Management Regulations, states in part, “[e]xcept as otherwise modified or specified by OAR 340, divisions 100 to 106, 109, 111, 113, 120, 124 and 142, the Commission adopts by reference, and requires every person subject to ORS 466.005 to 466.080 and 466.090 to 466.215, to comply with the rules and regulations governing the management of hazardous waste, including its generation, transportation, treatment, storage, recycling and disposal, as the United States Environmental Protection Agency prescribes in 40 CFR parts 260 to 268, 270, 273 and Subpart A and Subpart B of Part 124,” OAR 340–100–0002(1).

The EPA manifest requirement, 40 CFR 263.20(a)(1), which is one of the regulations that Oregon has adopted, reads in part, “[a] transporter may not accept hazardous waste from a generator unless the transporter is also provided with a manifest . . . signed in accordance with the requirement of § 263.23” 40 CFR 263.20(a)(1).

As noted above, NORA states that under OEQC’s interpretation of this requirement, a “transporter exercising reasonable care may not rely on the information provided by the generator and instead must be held to a strict liability standard.” The Oregon Supreme Court has recently upheld OEQC’s interpretation. See *Oil Refining Co. v. Env’tl. Quality Comm’n*, 388 P.3d 1071 (Or. 2017).

III. Federal Preemption

PHMSA has the authority under the HMTA to preempt state law. Generally, the HMTA preemption standards preclude non-federal governments from imposing requirements applicable to hazardous materials transportation if (1)

complying with the non-Federal requirement and the Federal requirement is not possible; or (2) the non-Federal requirement, as applied and enforced, is an obstacle to accomplishing and carrying out the Federal requirement.

Furthermore, unless it is authorized by another federal law or a waiver of preemption from the Secretary of Transportation, a non-federal requirement applicable to any one of several specified covered subjects is preempted if it is not substantively the same as the HMTA, the HMR, or a hazardous materials transportation security regulation or directive issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security. The five subject areas include: The designation, description, and classification of hazardous material; the packing, repacking, handling, labeling, marking, and placarding of hazardous material; the preparation, execution, and use of shipping documents related to hazardous material and requirements related to the number, contents, and placement of those documents; the written notification, recording, and reporting of the unintentional release in transportation of hazardous material and other written hazardous materials transportation incident reporting involving State or local emergency responders in the initial response to the incident; and the designing, manufacturing, fabricating, inspecting, marking, maintaining, reconditioning, repairing, or testing a package, container, or packaging component that is represented, marked, certified, or sold as qualified for use in transporting hazardous material in commerce. See 49 U.S.C. 5125(a) and (b).

To be “substantively the same,” the non-Federal requirement must conform “in every significant respect to the Federal requirement. Editorial and other similar *de minimis* changes are permitted.” 49 CFR 107.202(d).

Notwithstanding these preemption standards, Congress limited the applicability of HMTA preemption with respect to non-federal enforcement standards. For the purposes of this proceeding, the relevant portion of the statute is 49 U.S.C. 5125(h), and it reads as follows: “Non-Federal enforcement standards.—This section does not apply to any procedure, penalty, required mental state, or other standard utilized by a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe to enforce a requirement applicable to the transportation of hazardous material.” 49 U.S.C. 5125(h).

IV. NORA’s Application

NORA contends that OEQC’s “strict liability” interpretation of the Oregon regulation conflicts with 49 CFR 171.2(f), a provision of the HMR providing that “[e]ach carrier who transports a hazardous material in commerce may rely on information provided by the offeror of the hazardous material or a prior carrier, unless the carrier knows or, a reasonable person, acting in the circumstances and exercising reasonable care, would have knowledge that the information provided by the offeror or prior carrier is incorrect.” NORA presents three specific arguments. First, NORA contends that it is not possible to comply with both the Oregon rule and the federal regulation because the “HMTA regulation requires the transporter to exercise reasonable care” while Oregon’s strict liability interpretation does not. Next, NORA argues that Oregon’s strict liability standard creates an obstacle to carrying out the federal regulation, since it discourages the exercise of reasonable care. Furthermore, NORA opines that the State’s inconsistent strict liability standard will encourage the misclassification of hazardous material. Finally, NORA states that “a strict liability standard is not ‘substantively the same’ as a reasonable care liability standard.” NORA notes that “under Oregon’s interpretation, a transporter who satisfies the reasonable care standard in section 171.2(f) would nonetheless be strictly liable for the generator’s waste mischaracterization.”

V. Decision

As noted above, 49 U.S.C. 5125 sets out standards for determining whether state and local laws are preempted, and authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to make administrative preemption determinations. Section 5125, however, expressly “does not apply to any procedure, penalty, required mental state, or other standard utilized by a State . . . to enforce a requirement applicable to the transportation of hazardous material.” 49 U.S.C. 5125(h); see also H.R. Rep. No. 109–203, at 1083 (2005) (noting that the amendment “clarifies that the Secretary’s preemption authority does not apply to a procedure, penalty, required mental state, or other standard used by a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe to enforce hazardous material transportation requirements.”). H.R. Rep. No. 109–203, at 1083 (2005).

NORA’s application argues that Oregon’s imposition of a “strict

liability” standard—a “required mental state”—is preempted by the HMTA. 49 U.S.C. 5125(h) expressly specifies that the HMTA’s preemption provision does not apply to such a claim, and that PHMSA lacks authority to make a determination with respect to such a claim. PHMSA therefore rejects NORA’s application.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 20, 2019.

Paul J. Roberti,

Chief Counsel, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.

[FR Doc. 2019–20880 Filed 9–25–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Notice of OFAC Sanctions Action

AGENCY: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of three entities that have been placed on OFAC’s Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List based on OFAC’s determination that one or more applicable legal criteria were satisfied. All property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of these persons are blocked, and U.S. persons are generally prohibited from engaging in transactions with them.

DATES: See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for applicable date(s).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

OFAC: Associate Director for Global Targeting, tel.: 202–622–2420; Assistant Director for Sanctions Compliance & Evaluation, tel.: 202–622–2490; Assistant Director for Licensing, tel.: 202–622–2480; Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, tel.: 202–622–4855.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Availability

The Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List and additional information concerning OFAC sanctions programs are available on OFAC’s website (www.treasury.gov/ofac).

Notice of OFAC Action(s)

On September 20, 2019, OFAC determined that the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of the following three entities are blocked under the relevant sanctions authority listed below.

BILLING CODE 4810–AL–P