determine whether mitigation of rate impact is needed and how the mitigation will be done. Some argued that no mitigation is needed when the benefits are proportionate to the rate impact, while others argued mitigation should apply in every instance when the rate impact exceeds 5%.

Finally, the parties raised questions about the procedures for addressing rate design questions in certificate proceedings. They requested clarification as to the role of shippers in the certificate proceedings, such as whether the shippers will be able to present evidence opposing the pipelines' proposed rate design. They also raised questions about how the declaratory order will be applied in subsequent rate cases under section 4 of the Natural Gas Act when pipelines propose rolled-in pricing.

Discussion

The purpose of the Policy Statement was to provide the industry with guidance on the criteria the Commission would apply when evaluating rate design for new pipeline construction and to establish the procedures for making this analysis. In the Policy Statement, the Commission contemplated that the resolution of pricing methodology would take place in individual proceedings based on the facts and circumstances of the project at issue.[3] The Commission finds that the issues raised in the rehearing requests generally are not susceptible to a generic resolution, but need to be considered in the context of a specific filing. Indeed, since issuing the Policy Statement, the Commission has addressed some of these issues in individual cases.[4] Accordingly, the Commission declines to consider the issues raised in the requests for rehearing and/or clarification in this docket, but will consider such issues and arguments in the specific cases in which they apply.

By the Commission.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–11047 Filed 5–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[3] 71 FERC at 61,915.

[4] *See, e.g.*, CNG Transmission Company, 74 FERC ¶ 61,073 (1996); Paiute Pipeline Company, 74 FERC ¶ 61,049 (1996); Northwest Pipeline Company, 73 FERC ¶ 61,353 (1995), *reh'g denied*, 75 FERC ¶ 61,008 (1996); El Paso Natural Gas Company, 73 FERC ¶ 61,352 (1995); Southern Natural Gas Company, 73 FERC ¶ 61,085 (1995); Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, 73 FERC ¶ 61,012 (1995).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5469–1]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR (202) 564–7153.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed April 22, 1996 through April 26, 1996 pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 960190, DRAFT EIS, FHW, WI, Burlington Bypass State Trunk Highway Project, Construction, from WI–36, WI–11 and WI–83, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, City of Burlington, Racine and Walworth Counties, WI, Due: June 24, 1996, Contact: Richard Madrzak (608) 829–7510.

EIS No. 960191, FINAL EIS, BLM, CA, Clear Creek Management Area, Land and Resource Management Plan Amendment, Implementation, San Benito and Fresno Counties, CA, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Meg Pearson (408) 637–8183.

EIS No. 960192, FINAL EIS, FAA, NY, Syracuse Hancock International Airport, Land Acquisition and Construction of Runway 10 L–28R, Funding and Airport Layout Plan Approval, Onondaga County, NY, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Frank Squeglia (718) 553–3325.

EIS No. 960193, DRAFT EIS, COE, NJ, Absecon Island Interim Feasibility Study, Storm Damage Reduction, Brigantic Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Atlantic County, NJ, Due: June 25, 1996, Contact: Ltc. Robert Magnifico (215) 656–6555.

EIS No. 960194, DRAFT EIS, FHW, FL, Port of Miami Tunnel and Access Improvements, I–395 via MacArthur Causeway Bridge, Dade County, FL, Due: June 17, 1996, Contact: J. R. Skinner (904) 942–9582.

EIS No. 960195, FINAL SUPPLEMENT, COE, CA, Richmond Harbor Deep Draft Navigation Improvements, Updated and Additional Information, to Improve Navigation Efficiency into the Potrero, San Francisco Bay, Contra Costa County, CA, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Linda Ngim (415) 744–3341.

EIS No. 960196, DRAFT EIS, USN, United States Navy Shipboard Solid Waste Disposal, Implementation, MARPOL Special Areas: Designation Baltic Sea, North Sea, Wilder Caribbean, Antarctic Ocean, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea and Red Sea, Gulf Regions: Persian Gulf and Gulf of Oman, Due: June 17, 1996, Contact: Robert K. Ostermueller (610) 595–0759.

EIS No. 960197, FINAL SUPPLEMENT, IBR, NM, CO, Animas-La Plata Project, Additional Information concerning Agricultural, Municipal and Industrial Water Supplies, Animas and La Plata Rivers, San Juan County, NM and La Plata and Montezuma Counties, CO, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Ken Beck (970) 385–6558.

EIS No. 960198, FINAL EIS, DOE, NM, Medical Isotopes Production Project (MIPP), Establishment and Production of a Continuous Supply of Molybdenum-99 and Related Isotopes, Bernalillo County, NM, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Wade Carroll (301) 903–7731.

EIS No. 960199, FINAL EIS, USN, WA, Disposal of Decommissioned, Defueled Cruiser, Ohio Class and Los Angeles Class Naval Reactor Plants, Site Selection, U.S. Department of Energy's Hanford Site, Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties or Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, WA, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: John Gordon (360) 476–7111.

EIS No. 960200, FINAL EIS, DOE, WA, Adoption—Disposal of Decommissioned, Defueled Cruiser, Ohio Class and Los Angeles Class Naval Reactor Plants, Site Selection, U.S. Department of Energy's Hanford Site, Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties or Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, WA, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Paul F.X. Dunigan (509) 376–6667.

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), has adopted the U.S. Department of the Navy's FEIS #960199, filed with the Environmental Protection Agency on 04–26–96. DOE is a cooperating agency on this project. Recirculation of the document is not necessary under Section 1506.3(c) of the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 960007, DRAFT EIS, GSA, DC, Central and West Heating Plants (CHP/WHP) Construction and Operation, Air Quality Improvement Project, District Heating System (DHS), City of Washington, DC, Due: May 24, 1996, Contact: Frank L. Thomas (202) 708–5334. Published FR 01–19–96—Review Period Extended.

EIS No. 960115, DRAFT EIS, FHW, RI, Rhode Island Northeast Corridor Freight Rail Improvement Project, Major Investment Study, Implementation, Boston Switch in Central Falls to the Quonset Point/Davisville Industrial Park in North Kingtown, Funding, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Providence County, RI, Due: May 13, 1996, Contact: K. Robert Sikora (401) 528–4541.

Published FR 03–15–96—Review Period Extended.

EIS No. 960159, FINAL EIS, FAA, WI, Dane County Regional Airport, Air Carrier Runway 3–21 Construction and Operation and Associated Actions, Airport Layout Plan Approval and Funding, Dane County, WI, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: John Dougherty (612) 725–4362. Published FR 04–12–96—Review Period Extended.

Dated: April 30, 1996.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 96–11131 Filed 5–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[ER–FRL–5469–2]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared April 15, 1996 Through April 19, 1996 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 260–5076.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 05, 1996 (61 FR 15251).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–COE–D39036–DE Rating EC2, Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island Feasbility Study, Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach Project, Storm Damage Reduction, Sussex County, DE.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the need for updated information on the biological recovery of the borrow areas and the criteria used in selection of the preferred plan of beach restoration for storm damage.

ERP No. D–COE–E36174–FL Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Florida's Everglades, Stormwater Treatment Areas Construction Project, NPDES and COE Section 404 Permits, Implementation, Lake Okeechobee, Palm Beach and Hendry Counties, FL.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over the performance capabilities of the proposed stormwater treatment areas, and requested additional information concerning impacts to wetlands and water quality.

ERP No. D–COE–E40764–00 Rating LO/EC2 Fort Campbell Rail Connector, Construction between the Government-Owned Line Railroad and CSX Line, Hopkinsville and Clarkville, Christian Co., KY and Montgomery and Stewart Counties, TN.

Summary: EPA had no objection to Alternative 3, but expressed concerns with the other alternatives presented in the draft EIS. In particular, EPA was concerned how their implementation would affect wetland/wildlife habitat, and requested additional information.

ERP No. D–COE–G39029–LA Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Marsh Management Project, Hydrologic Manipulation, COE Section 10 and 404 Permit Issuance, Coastal Wetland of Louisiana a part of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) River Basins, LA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over the proposal and requested additional information. Information needed in the Final EIS include: 1) the development and full consideration of the document's objectives, 2) clarification in the development of future scenarios of marsh management projects, and 3) consideration of cumulative and secondary impacts.

ERP No. D–FRC–C02000–PR Rating EC2, Eco Ele'ctrica Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Import Terminal and Electric Cogeneration Project Construction and Operation, Permits and Approvals, Guayanilla Bay, PR.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the project's potential impacts to water quality, aquatic resources, public safety, and existing site contamination. EPA also requested that additional information be provided in the final EIS to address these issues.

ERP No. D–FRC–E05047–GA Rating EC2, North Georgia Hydroelectric Project, (FERC. No. 2354–018) Issuance of Relicensing, Savannah River Basin, Tallulah, Tugalo and Chattooga Rivers, GA and SC.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the proposed project, and requested additional information.

ERP No. D–IBR–K39039–NV Rating EC2, Southern Nevada Water Authority Treatment and Transmission Facility, Construction and Operation, Issuance of Permits, Right-of-Way Grants and Modification of existing Water Delivery/Service Contracts, Clark County, NV.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding impacts of wastwater return flows on water quality in Las Vegas Bay and Lake Mead and on wetlands habitat in Las Vegas Wash. EPA requested additional consideration of water conservation measures.

ERP No. D–SCS–K36115–HI Rating EC2, Upcountry Maui Watershed, Implementation, To Address Agricultural Water Shortage, COE Section 404 Permit, Makawao District, Island of Maui, Maui County, HI.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over potential impacts to wildlife and riparian habitat due to construction of new reservoirs to provide new irrigation. EPA recommended that the FEIS include a more complete description of the environmental impacts of the action, mitigation measures and alternatives.

ERP No. DS–COE–C36062–00 Rating EC2, Passaic River Basin Flood Control Plan, Implementation, Updated Information to extend tunnel outlet from Upstream Terminus to Newark Bay, Passaic, Bergen, Morris, Essex and Hudson Counties, NJ and Rockland and Orange Counties, NY.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the feasibility of the proposed wetland mitigation, construction related water quality impacts, as well as local economic impacts. EPA has requested that additional information be provided in the final supplemental EIS to address these issues.

FINAL EISs

ERP No. FS–COE–G32051–TX Galveston Bay Area Navigation Improvements, Houston Ship and Galveston Channels, Additional Information, Funding and Implementation, Galveston and Harris Counties, TX.

Summary: EPA had no objections to the recommended plan.

Dated: April 30, 1996.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 96–11132 Filed 5–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[FRL–5466–8]

Science Advisory Board; Notice of Public Meetings

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that various committees and subcommittees of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on the dates and times described below. All times noted are Eastern Time. All meetings are open to the public. Due to limited space, seating at meetings will be on a first-come basis. For further information concerning specific