

Corps of Engineers

Notice of Availability of Surplus Land and Buildings in Accordance With Public Law 103-421 Located at Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, PA

AGENCY: Corps of Engineers, DOD.

ACTION: Public notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army, in accordance with the Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act of 1994, announces that approximately 77.5 acres containing the buildings listed below, at the Defense Personnel Support Center have been determined surplus. The Center is located in south Philadelphia in the block bordered by Oregon Avenue on the North, 20th Street on the East, and Schuylkill Expressway on the South and West. The property is scheduled for closure by July 2, 1999. State and local governments, representatives of the homeless, and other interested parties should be aware that the outreach screening process whereby McKinney Homeless providers and state and local governmental agencies express their interest in the property will be conducted by Lori Flynn of the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation, Office of Defense Conversion, 2600 Centre Square West, 1500 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102, telephone: 215-496-8167. The screening process will commence upon the publishing of notices in local newspapers, currently scheduled for early 1996.

4 Office Buildings—Totaling 808,200 SF
7 Storage Buildings—Totaling 1,561,000 SF

9 Other Type Buildings—Totaling 294,100 SF

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Ms. Lori Flynn at the above address and phone number.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-29434 Filed 12-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-41-M

Intent To Prepare A Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for A Multiuser Disposal Site Program for Contaminated Sediments in Puget Sound, WA

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare a draft EIS.

SUMMARY: The following are joint lead agencies for the combined Federal and State Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): Federal (NEPA):

Seattle District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense; State (SEPA): Washington Department of Ecology and Washington Department of Natural Resources.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Washington Department of Ecology, and the Washington Department of Natural Resources, intend to prepare a joint federal-state Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The EIS will evaluate disposal alternatives for contaminated sediments from Puget Sound. Disposal alternatives that will be evaluated include: (1) Level bottom capping and confined aquatic disposal, (2) nearshore confined disposal, (3) upland disposal, (4) disposal in solid waste landfills, and (5) multiuser access to larger fill projects.

The need for disposal of contaminated sediments comes from (1) dredging of federal and non-federal navigation channels, (2) waterfront development projects, (3) environmental cleanup projects directed through federal or state enforcement actions, and (4) projects with restoration of aquatic habitat as their primary purpose. Preliminary investigations estimate there are currently about 20-30 million cubic yards of contaminated sediment in Puget Sound, primarily in the urbanized bays.

The current practice of resolving contaminated dredged material issues is on a project-by-project basis, resulting in a greater number of smaller confined disposal sites that must be monitored and accounted for, rather than a few large sites. Because of difficulties with disposal, the discovery of contaminated sediments often forces project proponents to redesign or abandon a project to avoid dredging. This avoidance does not resolve the ongoing adverse effects of the contaminated sediments remaining in the environment, and it limits the potential economic development of the contaminated waterfront site.

Development of an effective solution for the safe disposal and containment of contaminated sediments from multiple sources in Puget Sound is needed. A process to establish, implement, and operate a system of multiuser confined disposal sites, and criteria to site the facilities, will be developed as part of the EIS. Siting criteria will include biological and physical factors, as well as proximity to existing sources of contamination. Using siting criteria and the evaluation of feasible disposal alternatives, zones of siting feasibility in Puget Sound, where multiuser confined

disposal sites could be located, will be identified in the EIS. Once zones of feasible sites are determined, site-specific NEPA/SEPA compliance evaluations for all potential sites will be tiered from the completed programmatic EIS.

DATES: The lead and cooperating agencies invite and encourage agencies and the public to provide written comments on the proposed programmatic EIS throughout the scoping process to ensure that all relevant environmental issues are considered. Persons or organizations wishing to submit scoping comments should do so no later than January 21, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the proposed action and DEIS can be answered by: Mr. Steve Babcock, Seattle District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Planning Branch, 4735 E. Marginal Way S., Seattle, Washington 98124-3755, Telephone (206) 764-3651 or Mr. Keith Phillips, Washington Department of Ecology, Environmental Investigation and Lab Service Program, P.O. Box 47710, Olympia, Washington 98504-7710 Telephone (360) 407-6699 or Mr. Timothy Goodman, Aquatic Resources Division, Washington Department of Natural Resources, P.O. Box 47000, Olympia, Washington 98504, Telephone (360) 902-1057.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Proposed Action

The proposed action is to evaluate alternatives for siting one or more contaminated sediment disposal facilities in Puget Sound, Washington. This evaluation will be part of an effort to develop a federal/state program to establish one or more multiuser disposal siting processes.

Puget Sound is an estuary of 2,500 square miles. There are 34 public port districts along Puget Sound, 54 miles of federal navigation channels, 10 miles of port terminal ship berths along these channels, and more than 200 small boat harbors that require periodic dredging. There is currently a lack of capacity for disposal of contaminated sediments derived from (1) dredging of federal and non-federal navigation channels, (2) waterfront development projects, (3) environmental cleanup projects directed through federal or state enforcement actions, and (4) projects with restoration of aquatic habitat as their primary purpose. The lack of suitable disposal alternatives is a major obstacle to effective improvement and maintenance of navigation and the most substantial impediment to the progress of

environmental cleanup and habitat restoration programs. The lack of predictable and cost-effective disposal options for contaminated sediments leads to cancellation or delay of waterfront development projects, resulting in adverse economic effects.

Based on preliminary investigations of 20 percent of Puget Sound, Ecology estimates that the areal extent of known sediment contamination is nearly 88 million square feet. Assuming all of the material is dredged to a depth of four feet, this area represents roughly 20–30 million cubic yards of contaminated dredged material. Over the next 20 years, an estimated 35 million cubic yards will be dredged for navigation purposes by the Corps and Navy, port districts and the private sector, of which as much as 10 million cubic yards may require confined disposal. In addition to navigation dredging projects, a large volume of contaminated sediment may be generated by future cleanup actions under the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), and state Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). A preliminary estimate of future contaminated sediment volumes from these cleanup actions in Puget Sound is in the range of 20 to 30 million cubic yards.

2. Alternatives

The alternatives which will be evaluated in the EIS are:

- a. No action;
 - b. Level bottom capping and confined aquatic disposal;
 - c. Nearshore confined disposal;
 - d. Upland disposal;
 - e. Disposal in solid waste landfills;
- and
- f. Multiuser access to larger fill projects.

These are preliminary alternatives; during the scoping process, the public may provide additional alternatives to be considered.

No action—This alternative would continue the practice of resolving contaminated dredged material issues on a project-by-project basis. This practice is time-consuming, unpredictable, and expensive for the regulated community, the regulatory agencies, and the public. It also results in a greater number of smaller confined disposal sites that must be monitored and accounted for rather than a few large sites. Because of difficulties with disposal, the discovery of contaminated sediments will often force project proponents to redesign or abandon a project to avoid dredging. This avoidance does not resolve the ongoing adverse effects of the contaminated

sediments on the environment, and it limits the potential economic development of the contaminated waterfront site.

Level bottom capping and confined aquatic disposal—Both of these disposal options involve consolidating contaminated sediments from numerous dredging projects at one location and then covering them with a cap layer of clean material. The clean cap layer isolates the marine environment from the chemicals of concern in the contaminated sediment. Level bottom capping is the placement of contaminated sediment in a mounded configuration with the clean cap layer on top. Confined aquatic disposal uses natural or excavated depressions for placement of the contaminated material, or places the material behind constructed submerged dikes for containment. In both cases, the contaminated material is covered with a clean cap layer.

Nearshore confined disposal—A nearshore confined disposal facility is a diked disposal site adjacent to land in the intertidal and/or subtidal zone. The confinement dikes enclose the disposal site from adjacent water surfaces and isolate dredged material from adjacent waters during placement. Contaminated material would be added to a diked cell to a specific elevation and then capped with clean material. The site would likely be developed in phases, and cells would be filled and capped in stages over the life of the facility. Nearshore sites are either finished to grade to allow beneficial use of the site after completion, or the finished grade of the clean cap layer is located in the intertidal zone to allow planting of aquatic vegetation and habitat restoration.

Upland disposal—This alternative includes the placement of contaminated material in an area not influenced by tidal waters. The upland site would be diked to confine the dredged material and capped with a layer of clean material at completion of the fill. The site would be developed in stages and would be filled and closed serially over the life of the facility. Design standards for an upland site would include liners, monitoring of leachate seeping into soils, groundwater monitoring, and a leachate collection and treatment system.

Disposal in solid waste landfills—Potential disposal of contaminated sediments in solid waste landfills would be evaluated under this alternative. Municipal landfills are short on capacity and subject to water content restrictions. Demolition debris landfills have been used in the past for disposal

of contaminated sediments, but this practice is ending as these sites are closed or subject to additional environmental controls. An initial State survey of landfill agencies concluded that use of contaminated material as landfill cover would not address the needed capacity, and the facilities were not planned to accommodate the volume or substantial regulatory, technical, or cost issues associated with managing contaminated sediments.

Multiuser access to larger fill projects—This alternative examines the option of providing multiuser access to large fill sites constructed and/or maintained by proponents of waterfront activities. Proponents of larger fill projects have been reluctant to provide multiuser access to their sites because of lost capacity for their own projects, extended timeframes for site development and closure, and inherited liability.

3. Scoping and Public Involvement

Public involvement will be sought during the scoping process and throughout the course of the project in accordance with NEPA/SEPA procedures. A public involvement plan will be developed in early 1996. As part of the scoping process, all affected Federal, state, and local agencies, Indian Tribes, general public, and other interested private organizations, including environmental interest groups, are invited to comment on the scope of the EIS.

To date, the following areas have been identified for analysis in the programmatic EIS:

1. Water quality.
2. Sediment quality.
3. Fish and wildlife habitat.
4. Shoreline and land use.
5. Recreation.
6. Transportation.
7. Human Health.

Two scoping meetings are scheduled: December 13, 1995, at the World Trade Center in Tacoma from 7 to 9 p.m.; and December 14, 1995, at the Port of Everett Commissioner Hearing Room 7 to 9 p.m. Public workshops are tentatively scheduled to precede these scoping meetings from 6 to 7 p.m. Ongoing communication with agencies, Native American tribes, public interest groups, and interested citizens will take place throughout the project through the use of public workshops, newsletters, and mailings.

4. Schedule

The scoping summary document is scheduled to be available in June 1996, and the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement is

tentatively scheduled to be available for review in 1997.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-29433 Filed 12-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-ER-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. TM96-2-20-001]

Algonquin Gas Transmission company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

November 28, 1995.

Take notice that on November 21, 1995, Algonquin Gas Transmission Company (Algonquin) tendered the instant filing in compliance with the Commission's letter order issued in Docket No. TM96-2-20-000 on November 9, 1995.

Algonquin states that the purpose of this filing is to provide an explanation and workpaper to support the estimated throughput figures shown in Appendix C of Algonquin's October 12, 1995, filing in Docket No. TM96-2-20-000. The October 12, 1995, filing revised Algonquin's fuel reimbursement percentages and the annual calculation of the fuel reimbursement quantity deferral allocation.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with 18 CFR Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Under Section 154.209, all such protests should be filed on or before December 4, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-29397 Filed 12-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP96-5-001]

Carnegie Interstate Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Change in FERC Gas Tariff

November 28, 1995.

Take notice that on November 17, 1995, Carnegie Interstate Pipeline

Company (CIPCO) tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1, the following revised tariff sheet, to become effective on November 1, 1995:

Fourth Revised Sheet No. 7

CIPCO states that this filing revises its Annual Transportation Cost Rate (TCR) filing made on October 2, 1995, which the Commission accepted and suspended, effective November 1, 1995, in a letter order issued October 26, 1995. In this filing, CIPCO has recalculated its TCR to reflect its recent settlement of litigation with its customer, New Jersey Natural Gas Company as a result of that settlement the unrecovered TCR costs attributable to New Jersey Natural Gas Company are restored to CIPCO's Unrecovered Transportation Cost subaccount. In addition CIPCO has recalculated its TCR to utilize the actual billing determinants in effect as of November 1, 1995, as required by its tariff. The filing reflects a TCR of \$1.1162, compared to the TCR of \$1.5249 set forth in the October 2, 1995 filing.

CIPCO states that copies of its filing were served on all jurisdictional customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. Under Section 154.209, all such protests should be filed on or before November 29, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the public reference room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-29399 Filed 12-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-173-007]

Koch Gateway Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

November 28, 1995.

Take notice that on November 21, 1995, Koch Gateway Pipeline Company (Koch Gateway) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Fifth Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets effective September 1, 1995:

2nd Sub First Revised Sheet No. 1901

Koch Gateway states that the above referenced tariff sheet is submitted in compliance with the November 9, 1995, Commission's order in this proceeding. Pursuant to the Commission's order, Koch Gateway's revised tariff language states that, if Koch Gateway has received prior authorization from a shipper, the shipper signature is not required for Predetermined Allocation Agreements submitted after gas flow.

Koch Gateway also states that the tariff sheets are being mailed to all parties on the official service list created by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street NE., Room 1A, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Under Section 154.209, all such protests should be filed on or before December 4, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-29403 Filed 12-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP94-301-004]

Stingray Pipeline Company; Notice of Compliance Filing

November 28, 1995.

Take notice that on November 22, 1995, Stingray Pipeline Company (Stingray) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1 (Tariff), revised tariff sheets to be effective December 1, 1995.

Stingray states that the purpose of the filing is to comply with Article VII of the Stipulation and Agreement (Settlement) approved by Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) letter order issued October 11, 1995 in Docket Nos. RP94-301-000 and RP94-301-003. The filed tariff sheets reflect the rates as set out on Appendix A of the Settlement to be effective December 1, 1995, and revisions to Sections 10 and 11 of the General Terms and Conditions of Stingray's Tariff as set forth in Article V of the Settlement. Stingray has also made conforming changes to its Tariff to reflect a thermal billing basis consistent with the thermal content which underlies the settlement rates.