

Radiological Impacts—Total radiological releases would be significantly lower than either the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) limit or past annual releases from LANL. The resulting maximum concentrations for radionuclides measured at the location of the MEI for the demonstration is estimated to be less than two percent of the EPA limit. Radiological impacts associated with the proposed action could increase LANL total site impacts by a small percentage (1.0 percent for the MEI, 1.3 percent for the surrounding population, and 1.3 percent for the average individual).

Under the proposed action, the estimated annual average dose to pit disassembly workers would be 750 mrem. The annual dose received by the plutonium workers who would perform these activities would increase by 35 person-rem to 90 person-rem. Doses to individual workers would be kept to minimal levels by current administrative policies, exposure monitoring, and the as low as reasonably achievable program.

Accident Impacts—The spectrum of plausible accidents and abnormal events associated with the proposed action was evaluated to identify those with the highest radiological impacts. The consequences of the hydride-oxidation (HYDOX) process accidents are more severe and therefore envelope process accident consequences. The hydrogen deflagration in the reactor vessel was identified as having the highest potential consequences to the public. A mitigated accident, where credit is taken for the building's ventilation system including high-efficiency particulate air filters and other features, would result in a source term of 1.4×10^{-8} grams of plutonium and a MEI dose at the site boundary, near the Royal Crest Trailer Court, of 2.8×10^{-8} rem. The likelihood of this accident occurring was categorized as "unlikely." Workers in the room at the time of the deflagration may be injured by flying glass and other missiles depending on their proximity to the deflagration.

Waste Management Impacts—The proposed action would generate transuranic waste, low-level waste, mixed low-level waste, and hazardous waste, but the volume generated is expected to be small. Therefore, the projected increase in the total waste volume for each category would have little or no impact on current LANL waste management processes and procedures.

Transportation Impacts—Under the proposed action, plutonium in the form of pits, might be shipped to LANL from

RFETS or the Pantex Plant and in the form of metal from INEEL, SRS, or LLNL. Highly enriched uranium recovered from these pits would be shipped to ORR. The greatest risk to the public from these proposed shipments would be from a traffic accident involving the safe secure trailer (SST) or the escort vehicles and not from radiological exposure. If the demonstration is implemented, it is estimated that this proposed action would result in a risk to the public (either as a latent cancer or a traffic accident) of less than 5 chances in 1,000 of a fatality.

Socioeconomic Impacts—The proposed action would not affect employment at LANL because no additional personnel are anticipated to be required to support the demonstration. It is standard practice for workers at LANL to move from one project to another without any impact on the overall employment level. No significant socioeconomic effects, therefore, would be expected to result from the proposed action.

Environmental Justice Impacts—Implementation of the proposed action would pose no significant risk to the general population including minority and low-income populations. No disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income populations would result from implementation of the proposed action.

Other Environmental Impacts—The demonstration would be located within an existing building, Plutonium Facility-4. Therefore, there would not be any new construction that could affect floodplains, wetlands, biological resources, or cultural resources.

Cumulative Impacts—The *Draft Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement on the Continued Operation of the Los Alamos National Laboratory (Draft LANL Site-Wide EIS)*, which is incorporated by reference in the EA, discusses the cumulative impacts of the proposed demonstration, ongoing LANL operations, potential expanded LANL operations, and other activities in the LANL region. As explained in the *Draft LANL Site-Wide EIS*, expanded operations at LANL, including the proposed demonstration and other activities, would result in an additional latent cancer fatality risk of about .0002 over the lifetime of the MEI.

No Action Alternative Impacts—Under the No Action Alternative, an integrated pit disassembly and conversion line would not be demonstrated at LANL. There would, therefore, be no change in the current environmental or health effects associated with work done in Plutonium

Facility-4 and Technical Area-55, and these facilities would continue to operate as they do currently.

Transportation Risks Associated with the No Action Alternative—Under the No Action Alternative, pits or plutonium metal would not be shipped to LANL from INEEL, LLNL, RFETS, SRS or Pantex, and there would not be any highly enriched uranium recovered from these pits, so there would be no shipments of highly enriched uranium to ORR. However, DOE has committed to consolidate its inventory of weapons-grade plutonium, so the pits at RFETS would continue to be shipped to Pantex, where they would be stored pending a decision on their ultimate disposition in accordance with the ROD that would be issued after the SPD Final EIS is completed. The greatest risk to the public from this alternative would continue to be from a traffic accident involving the SST or its escort vehicles and not from radiological exposure.

Determination

Based on the analysis in the EA, and after considering the preapproval review comments, I conclude that the proposed action does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of NEPA. Therefore, an EIS for the proposed action is not required.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 14th day of August 1998.

Andre I. Cygelman,

Acting Director, Office of Fissile Materials Disposition, Department of Energy.

[FR Doc. 98-22524 Filed 8-20-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Bonneville Power Administration

Bonneville Power Administration/ Lower Valley Transmission Project

AGENCY: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of Availability of Record of Decision (ROD).

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of the ROD to implement the Agency Proposed Action as described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the BPA/Lower Valley Transmission Project; a joint project between BPA and Lower Valley Power and Light, Inc. (Lower Valley). The Agency Proposed Action will solve a voltage stability problem in the Jackson and Afton, Wyoming, areas. Lower

Valley buys electricity from BPA and then supplies it to the residences and businesses of these areas. Since the late 1980's, Lower Valley's electrical load has been growing and loads are expected to continue to grow. During winter, a transmission line outage could cause voltage on the transmission system to drop below acceptable levels causing brownouts or, under certain conditions, a blackout. The new 115-kilovolt transmission line proposed in the Agency Proposed Action will maintain voltage stability and accommodate load growth.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the ROD and Environmental Impact Statement may be obtained by calling BPA's toll-free document request line: 1-800-622-4520.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nancy Wittpenn—ECN-4, Bonneville Power Administration, P.O. Box 3621, Portland, Oregon 97208-3621, phone number (503) 230-3297, fax number (503) 230-5699.

Issued in Portland, Oregon, on August 13, 1998.

J.A. Johansen,

Administrator and Chief Executive Officer.
[FR Doc. 98-22523 Filed 8-20-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98-711-000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

August 17, 1998.

Take notice that on August 6, 1998, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 12801 Fair Lakes Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22030, filed in Docket No. CP98-711-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.211) for authorization to construct and operate a new point of delivery at the request of the City of Lancaster in Fairfield County, Ohio, under Columbia's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-76-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia states that the construction of the new delivery point has been requested by City of Lancaster for firm transportation service for residential, commercial and industrial service. City

of Lancaster has not requested an increase in its total firm entitlements in conjunction with this request. The estimated cost to construct the new point of delivery is \$23,164 and City of Lancaster will reimburse Columbia 100% for the cost. Columbia states that the estimated quantities of natural gas to be delivered at the new point of delivery is 15,000 Dth/day and 1,000,000 Mcf/annually. Interconnecting facilities will consist of a 6-inch tap and valve.

Columbia states that the new point of delivery will have no effect on peak day and annual deliveries, that its existing tariff does not prohibit addition of new delivery points and that deliveries will be accomplished without detriment of disadvantage to its other customers and that the total volumes delivered will not exceed total volumes authorized prior to this request.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-22500 Filed 8-20-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EC96-19-039, et al.]

California Independent System Operator Corporation, et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

August 14, 1998

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

1. California Independent System Operator Corporation

[Docket Nos. EC96-19-039 and ER96-1663-040]

On August 14, 1998, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (ISO), tendered for filing

Amendment No. 11 to the ISO Tariff modifying provisions of the ISO Tariff and Protocols governing the ISO's procurement of Regulation, Spinning Reserve, Non-Spinning Reserve and Replacement Reserve services.

The ISO states that this filing has been served on all parties with effective Scheduling Coordinator Agreements, the ISO's Board of Governors, the California Public Utilities Commission, the California Electricity Oversight Board and all parties listed on the official service list in the Docket Nos. EL96-19, et al.

Comment date: August 28, 1998, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

2. Champion International Corporation, Bucksport Energy L.L.C. vs. ISO-New England, Inc., New England Power Pool, Central Maine Power Company

[Docket No. EL98-69-000]

Take notice that on August 7, 1998, Champion International Corporation and Bucksport Energy L.L.C. tendered for filing a complaint against ISO-New England, Inc., New England Power Pool (NEPOOL) and Central Maine Power Company concerning the development of a new cogeneration facility and interconnection thereof to the NEPOOL system.

Complainants also request expedited consideration of the issues raised and Commission action by September 16, 1998.

Comment date: September 8, 1998, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice. Answers to the complaint are also due on or before September 8, 1998.

3. CMS Marketing Services & Trading NP Energy Inc.

[Docket No. ER96-2350-014, Docket No. ER97-1315-007]

Take notice that the following informational filings have been made with the Commission and are on file and available for public inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room:

On July 29, 1998, CMS Marketing Services & Trading filed certain information as required by the Commission's September 6, 1997, order in Docket No. ER96-2350-000.

On July 29, 1998, NP Energy Inc. filed certain information as required by the Commission's February 24, 1997, order in Docket No. ER97-1315-000.

4. Northeast Utilities Service Company

[Docket No. ER98-3940-000]

Take notice that on July 28, 1998, Northeast Utilities Service Company