

TABLE 1.—NUCLEAR MATERIALS AT THE SAVANNAH RIVER SITE—Continued
[From DOE/EIS-0220, "Interim Management of Nuclear Materials"]

Description	Quantity ^a	Location(s)
Failed TRR ^b and EBR-II ^c slugs.	82 canisters	RBOF.

^aQuantities of materials shown are approximate. Quantities of radioactive solutions stored in tanks fluctuate due to natural evaporation and the addition of materials (e.g., nitric acid) to maintain chemistry within established parameters.

^bTaiwan Research Reactor—81 canisters.

^cExperimental Breeder Reactor-II—1 canister.

TABLE 2.—ALTERNATIVES FOR THE INTERIM MANAGEMENT OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS AT THE SRS
[From DOE/EIS-0220, "Interim Management of Nuclear Materials"]

Material	Alternatives						
	Continuing storage (no action)	Processing to metal	Processing to oxide	Blending down to low enriched uranium	Processing and storage for vitrification (DWPf) ^a	Vitrification (F-canyon)	Improving storage
Stable	✓						
Plutonium-242	x	x	✓		x	x	
Americium and curium	✓ [±]		x		x	✓ ^c	
Neptunium	x		✓		x	x	
Plutonium-239 solutions	x	x	✓		x	x	
Highly enriched uranium solutions	x		x	✓	x		
Plutonium and uranium in vaults ^d	x	✓	✓		x	✓	✓
Mark-31 targets	x	✓	x		x	x	x
Mark-16 and Mark-22 fuels	✓		x	x	x		x
Other aluminum-clad targets	✓				x		x
Failed TRR fuel and EBR-II slugs ^e	x	✓	x		x	x	x

x=alternative evaluated.

✓=preferred alternative designated by DOE in Final EIS.

^aDWPf=Defense Waste Processing Facility.

^bTargets.

^cSolutions.

^dFor the plutonium and uranium stored in vaults, there were four preferred alternatives. DOE will base its choice of the applicable alternative for a particular solid upon inspection of the material.

^eTRR=Taiwan Research Reactor, EBR-II—Experimental Breeder Reactor-II.

[FR Doc. 95-30750 Filed 12-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P-M

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. QF86-896-007]

Piney Creek Limited Partnership; Notice of Application for Commission Recertification of Qualifying Status of a Small Power Production Facility

December 13, 1995.

On November 28, 1995, Piney Creek Limited Partnership (Piney Creek) of 25 West 3rd Street, Suite 803, Williamsport, Pennsylvania, 17701 submitted for filing an application for recertification of a facility as a qualifying small Power production facility pursuant to Section 292.207(b) of the Commission's Regulations. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

According to the applicant, the bituminous coal refuse-fueled small power production facility is located in

Clarion County, Pennsylvania. The Commission previously certified the capacity of the facility to be 29.9 MW. The facility consists of a fluidized bed boiler and an extraction/condensing steam turbine generator. The instant application for recertification was submitted to report a change in ownership of the facility and an increase in the maximum net electric power production capacity from 29.9 MW to 33 MW. In addition, applicant requests that the Commission certify certain proposed fuel sources as "waste".

Any person desiring to be heard or objecting to the granting of qualifying status should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street N.E. Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. All such motions or protests must be filed within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register and must be served on the applicant. 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. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-30715 Filed 12-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket Nos. CP66-111-003 and CP96-26-000]

Great Lakes Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed St. Clair River Crossing Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues

December 13, 1995.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an

environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the facilities proposed in the St. Clair River Crossing Project.¹ This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether an environmental impact statement is necessary and whether to approve the project.

Summary of the Proposed Project

Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership (Great Lakes) seeks authority to amend its Presidential Permit (under Docket No. CP66-111-003) and construct, connect, operate, and maintain (under Docket No. CP96-26-000) about 1,500 feet of 36-inch-diameter pipeline loop at the international border between the United States and Canada, in St. Clair County, Michigan.

Great Lakes states that the proposed border facilities would be used to provide 50,000 thousand cubic feet per day of winter firm transportation service to TransCanada Pipelines Limited (TransCanada). Great Lakes indicates that the facilities, along with additional facilities TransCanada would build on its system, would provide TransCanada with greater system security and reliability of service.

The proposed river crossing would be directionally drilled. Great Lakes proposes to operate the drill rig on the United States side of the river, on land owned by Great Lakes. The pipeline would be strung and staged on the Canadian side.

The general location of the project facilities is shown in appendix 1.²

Land Requirements for Construction

Construction of the proposed facilities would require a staging area about 150 feet by 250 feet. No additional permanent right-of-way would be required after construction. An existing cleared area north of Puttygut Road would be used as a contractor yard. This area was used for this purpose during construction of the RG&E III Project (Docket No. CP92-595-000).

¹ Great Lakes Transmission Limited Partnership's application was filed with the Commission under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, sections 153.10 through 153.12 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, and Executive Order 10485 (as amended by Executive Order 12038 and Secretary of Energy Delegation Order No. 0204-112).

² The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the Federal Register. Copies are available from the Commission's Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, or call (202) 208-1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

Permanent aboveground facilities would consist of a mainline valve and a "pig launcher" in the vicinity of Great lakes' existing mainline valve.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this "scoping". The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project under these general headings:

- Geology and soils.
- Water resources, fisheries, and wetlands.
- Land use.
- Cultural resources.
- Vegetation and wildlife.
- Endangered and threatened species.
- Air quality and noise.
- Hazardous waste.

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider all comments on the EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the project.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the

proposed facilities and the environmental information provided by Great Lakes. Keep in mind that this is a preliminary list:

- Noise generated during the continuous operation of the directional drill rig used to install the pipeline under the St. Clair River may significantly impact nearby residences.
- Drilling mud and fluids must be handled and disposed of properly or significant impact on the St. Clair River and nearby wetland could result.
- Construction activities may impact the wetland located near the proposed staging area.
- There may be visual impacts associated with the permanent aboveground facilities.

The list of issues may be added to, subtracted from, or changed based on your comments and our analysis.

Public Participation

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative locations), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please follow the instructions below to ensure that your comments are received and properly recorded:

- Address your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426;
- Reference Docket Nos. CP66-111-003 and CP96-26-000;
- Send a *copy* of your letter to: Mr. Howard Wheeler, EA Project Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., N.E., PR-11.2, Washington, D.C. 20426; and
- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, D.C. on or before January 19, 1996.

If you wish to receive a copy of the EA, you should request one from Mr. Wheeler at the above address.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceeding or become an "intervenor". Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of

Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2).

The date for filing of timely motions to intervene in this proceeding has passed. Therefore, parties now seeking to file late interventions must show good cause, as required by section 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention. You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Additional information about the proposed project is available from Mr. Howard Wheeler, EA Project Manager, at (202) 208-2299.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-30712 Filed 12-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP96-16-000]

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Sunbelt Expansion Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues

December 13, 1995.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or the Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the facilities proposed in the Sunbelt Expansion Project.¹ This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether an environmental impact statement is necessary and whether to approve the project.

Summary of the Proposed Project

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) wants to expand the capacity of its facilities in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina to transport an additional 145,666 thousand cubic feet per day of natural gas to nine local distribution companies and one electric cogeneration plant. Transco seeks authority to construct and operate:

- 14.9 miles of 42-inch-diameter pipeline loop (Loop D) from milepost (MP) 1222.66 to MP 1237.58 in Cherokee County, South Carolina;
- 15,000 horsepower (hp) of compression (gas turbine) at a new

station, to be known as Compressor Station 105 in Coosa County, Alabama;

- 15,000 hp of compression (gas turbine) at a new station to be known as Compressor Station 125 in Walton County, Georgia; and

- 15,000 hp of compression (gas turbine) at the existing Compressor Station 80 in Jones and Jasper Counties, Mississippi.

Transco also seeks to uprate:

- A compressor (gas turbine) from 14,100 hp to 15,000 hp at Compressor Station 100 in Chilton County, Alabama; and

- One compressor (gas turbine) from 12,600 hp to 15,000 hp at each of three stations: Compressor Station 110 in Randolph County, Alabama; Compressor Station 130 in Madison County, Georgia; and Compressor Station 140 in Spartanburg County, South Carolina.

The general location of the project facilities and specific locations for Loop D and the new compressor stations are shown in appendix 1.²

Land Requirements for Construction

Loop D would be constructed adjacent to Transco's existing right-of-way. Transco has proposed an 85-foot-wide construction right-of-way, which includes 35 feet of its existing right-of-way. Consequently, about 50 feet of new clearing would be required in most areas. Following construction, about 25 feet of the newly cleared right-of-way would be allowed to revert to former uses and 25 feet would be retained as new permanent right-of-way.

Additional work space would be required adjacent to the construction right-of-way at crossings of roads, railroads, streams, wetlands, and other utility lines. In addition, Transco proposes to use two off-right-of-way parcels of land for staging and pipe fabrication and storage. Construction of Loop D would require about 171.9 acres, including 63.3 acres of existing maintained right-of-way. Following construction, about 45.2 acres would be maintained as new permanent right-of-way. The remaining 126.7 acres would be allowed to revert to former land uses.

Transco currently owns the properties that would be developed for the two new compressor stations. Construction would require a total of about 28.0 acres of land, of which about 16.0 acres would be fenced for operation of the

new compressor stations. All additions and modifications at the other compressor stations would occur inside the fencelines on existing compressor station property.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this "scoping". The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project under these general headings:

- Geology and soils.
- Water resources, fisheries, and wetlands.
- Vegetation and wildlife.
- Endangered and threatened species.
- Land use.
- Cultural resources.
- Air quality and noise.
- Safety.

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed project or portions of the project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider all comments on the EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the project.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention

¹ Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation's application was filed with the Commission under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

² The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the Federal Register. Copies are available from the Commission's Public Reference Room, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, or call (202) 208-1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.