

provide supporting data for responses to these questions and for other comments on the chapters.

For the Carbon Adsorbers chapter:

(1) What is a reasonable estimate of equipment life (defined as design or operational life) for this control measure?

(2) Is the description of carbon adsorbers complete, up to date, and accurate, particularly with regard to control of VOC?

(3) Are the cost correlations, factors, and equations for carbon adsorbers accurate? If not, how should they be revised? Please provide data, if possible, to address inaccuracies.

(4) Are the estimates of VOC removal or control efficiency for carbon adsorbers accurate? If not, what are more accurate estimates? Please provide data, if possible, to address inaccuracies.

For the Flares chapter:

(1) What is a reasonable estimate of equipment life (defined as design or operational life) for this control measure?

(2) Is the description of flares technology complete, up to date, and accurate?

(3) Are the cost correlations, factors, and equations for flares accurate? If not, how should they be revised? Please provide data, if possible, to address inaccuracies.

(4) Are the estimates of flares VOC destruction efficiency accurate? If not, what are more accurate estimates? Please provide data, if possible, to address inaccuracies.

Dated: May 23, 2017.

Stephen Page,

Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.

[FR Doc. 2017-15344 Filed 7-20-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-9964-82-OAR]

EPA's Intent To Disclose Confidential Business Information (CBI) Contained in Vehicle Sales Data for Model Years 2015 to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) for Use in Modeling and Projecting Energy Demand in the Light-Duty Vehicle Sector

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On June 23, 2017, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) received a written request from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) for historical model year sales data for year 2015 by manufacturer and nameplate. This requested data may

contain confidential business information (CBI). The EPA may disclose business information to other Federal agencies that otherwise is not available to the public if certain requirements are met. The EPA intends to share certain information, detailed below, with EIA ten (10) days after publication of this notice. The information requested has been used to model and project energy demand in the light-duty vehicle sector and is critical to EIA's efforts to project energy demand, fuel efficiency, fuel consumption, and greenhouse gas emissions for the transportation sector. EIA has agreed to keep the data confidential and not disclose it further.

DATES: The sales data will be disclosed to EIA on or after July 31, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sara Zaremski, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Compliance Division, Environmental Protection Agency, 2000 Traverwood Drive, Ann Arbor, MI 48105; telephone number: 734-214-4362; fax number: 734-214-4053; email address: zaremski.sara@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

Entities potentially affected by this action are those involved with the production and sale of motor vehicles. Regulated categories include:

Category	NAICS ¹ Codes	SIC ² Codes	Examples of potentially regulated entities
Industry	336111, 336112	3711	Light-duty vehicle and light-duty truck manufacturers.

¹ North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

² Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system code.

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by the disclosure.

II. EIA's Request for Model Year Sales Data for Year 2015

In their June 23, 2017 request letter to EPA, EIA requested that EPA provide to EIA historical model year sales data for year 2015 by manufacturer and nameplate. As noted earlier in this document, EIA uses this information to model and project energy demand in the light-duty vehicle sector. Additionally, EIA noted that these data are critical to EIA's continued efforts to project energy demand, fuel efficiency, fuel consumption, and greenhouse gas emissions for the transportation sector. Previously, EIA had been unable to obtain official model year sales data for 2015 due to the fact that it contained

CBI. The specific data they requested includes all the data fields currently available in the Excel files provided on the [fueleconomy.gov](http://www.fueleconomy.gov) Web site (see the Download Fuel Economy Data page at <http://www.fueleconomy.gov/feg/download.shtml>).

Additionally, EIA requested the following data fields: model year sales, tank size, track width, wheelbase, curb weight, horsepower, interior volume, fleet (DP, IP, LT), and test weight. EIA indicated that they are aware that this information is subject to claims of confidential business information. EIA's letter states "We will take the necessary steps to ensure the data are secure and kept confidential. EIA routinely works with sensitive data and has strong data handling safeguards in place."

Pursuant to 40 CFR 2.209(c), EPA may disclose business information to another Federal agency if: (1) EPA receives a

written request for disclosure of the information from a duly authorized officer or employee of the other agency; (2) the request sets forth the official purpose for which the information is needed; (3) when the information has been claimed as confidential or has been determined to be confidential, the responsible EPA office provides notice to each affected business of the type of information to be disclosed and to whom it is to be disclosed, and such notice may be given by notice published in the **Federal Register** at least 10 days prior to disclosure; (4) EPA notifies the other agency of any unresolved business confidentiality claim covering the information and of any determination under this subpart that the information is entitled to confidential treatment, and that further disclosure of the information may be a violation of the Trade Secrets Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905; and

(5) the other agency agrees in writing that in accordance with the law, it will not disclose further any information designated as confidential.

In the case at hand, all of the required elements of 40 CFR 2.209(c) have been met upon publication of this notice.

III. Impact on Vehicle Manufacturers

Given that EIA is aware that the shared information is CBI or has been claimed as CBI, and intends to take the necessary steps to ensure that the data provided is kept secure and confidential, there is no impact on vehicle manufacturers to the release of this data.

Dated: July 5, 2017.

Byron Bunker,

Director, Compliance Division, Office of Transportation & Air Quality.

[FR Doc. 2017-15377 Filed 7-20-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA-HQ-OECA-2017-0206; FRL-9964-67-OECA]

Clean Water Act Class II: Proposed Administrative Settlement, Penalty Assessment and Opportunity To Comment Regarding JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has entered into a Consent Agreement with JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (JPMC or Respondent) to resolve violations of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Clean Air Act (CAA), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) and their implementing regulations.

The Administrator is hereby providing public notice of this Consent Agreement and proposed Final Order (CAFO), and providing an opportunity for interested persons to comment on the CAFO. Upon closure of the public comment period, the CAFO and any public comments will be forwarded to the Agency's Environmental Appeals Board (EAB).

DATES: Comments are due on or before August 21, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OECA-2017-0206, to the *Federal eRulemaking Portal*: <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online

instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or withdrawn. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the Web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Philip Milton, Waste and Chemical Enforcement Division (2249-A), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone: (202) 564-5029; fax: (202) 564-0010; email: milton.philip@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

This proposed settlement agreement is the result of voluntary disclosures of CWA, CAA, RCRA and EPCRA violations by JPMC to the EPA. JPMC and affiliated entities comprise one of the largest financial services firms in the United States, offering investment banking, financial services for consumers and small businesses, commercial banking, financial transaction processing and asset management, both domestically and internationally. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. is a national banking association with its main office located at 1111 Polaris Parkway, Columbus, Ohio 43240.

On August 6, 2014, EPA accepted JPMC's June 19, 2014 proposal to enter into an audit agreement to audit 133 facilities owned and/or operated by JPMC or affiliated entities for compliance with the CAA, CWA, EPCRA, and RCRA under EPA's *Incentives for Self-Policing: Discovery, Disclosure, Correction and Prevention of Violations* (Audit Policy), 65 FR 19618 (April 11, 2000). On December 19, 2014, JPMC provided its final report.

In follow-up to its 2014 Audit and JPMC's commitment to prevent

recurrence of noncompliance in the future, JPMC developed and implemented a compliance management system (CMS) that includes annual auditing. JPMC approached the design of this annual audit program with the same integrity and objectivity as used in the original 2014 Audit program. With the benefit of this expertise, JPMC conducted annual internal audits in 2015 (at 42 sites) and 2016 (at 39 sites) and disclosed additional potential noncompliance discovered through its 2015 and 2016 internal audits on November 20, 2015 and December 2, 2016, respectively.

All violations discovered and disclosed by the Respondent are listed in Attachments A and B to the CAFO.

Proposed Settlement

The EPA determined that Respondent satisfactorily completed its audit and has met all conditions set forth in the Audit Policy for the violations identified in Attachment A of the CAFO. Therefore, 100 percent of the gravity-based penalty calculated for the violations identified in Attachment A of the CAFO is being waived.

Attachment B of the CAFO identifies certain violations that did not meet all the conditions of the Audit Policy. For these violations, a gravity-based penalty of \$52,977 is assessed.

For all violations listed in Attachments A and B, EPA calculated an economic benefit of noncompliance of \$177,415. This number was calculated using specific cost information provided by Respondent and use of the Economic Benefit (BEN) computer model.

JPMC has agreed to pay a total civil penalty of \$230,392 for all the violations identified in Attachments A and B of the CAFO. Of this amount, \$177,415 is the economic benefit of noncompliance and \$52,977 is the gravity-based penalty for the violations listed in Attachment B of the CAFO.

Of this total amount, \$16,731 is attributable to the CAA violations, \$88,538 is attributable to the CWA SPCC violations, \$27,649 is attributable to the RCRA violations, and \$97,474 is attributable to the EPCRA violations.

The EPA and Respondent negotiated the Consent Agreement in accordance with the Consolidated Rules of Practice, 40 CFR part 22, specifically 40 CFR 22.13(b) and 22.18(b) (*In re: JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.*; enforcement settlement identifier numbers CAA-HQ-2017-6001, CWA-HQ-2017-6001; EPCRA-HQ-2017-6001; and RCRA-HQ-2017-6001). This Consent Agreement is subject to public notice and comment under Section