DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 14147–000]

Storage Development Partners, LLC;
Notice of Preliminary Permit Application Accepted for Filing and Soliciting Comments, Motions To intervene, and Competing Applications

On April 1, 2011, Storage Development Partners, LLC, filed an application for a preliminary permit, pursuant to section 4(f) of the Federal Power Act (FPA), proposing to study the feasibility of the Camp Pendleton Project (project) to be located at Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base, in San Diego County, California. The sole purpose of a preliminary permit, if issued, is to grant the permit holder priority to file a license application during the permit term. A preliminary permit does not authorize the permit holder to perform any land-disturbing activities or otherwise enter upon lands or waters owned by others without the owners’ express permission.

The proposed project would be a pumped storage project and consist of the following: (1) A new 30-foot-high earthen dam with a crest length of 3,881 feet; (2) an upper reservoir having a total storage capacity of 5,399 acre-feet at a normal maximum operating elevation of 1,700 feet mean sea level (msl); (3) five 10,500-foot-long, 25-foot-diameter steel lined penstocks extending between the upper reservoir’s inlet/outlet and the pump/turbines below; (4) a breakwater area within the Pacific Ocean, serving as the lower reservoir; (5) an underground powerhouse with approximate dimensions of 250-feet-long by 75-feet-wide by 100-feet-high and containing five reversible pump/turbine-motor/generator units with a rated capacity of 254,237 kW each; (6) an 1,000-foot-long, 800-foot-wide concrete lined tailrace connecting the pump/turbine draft tubes with the lower inlet/outlet; (7) a lower inlet/outlet structure 100-feet-below msl; (8) a 5-mile-long, 230-kilovolt (kV) transmission line extending from the powerhouse to an existing substation; and (9) appurtenant facilities. The estimated annual generation of the proposed Camp Pendleton Project would be 3,714 gigawatt-hours.

Applicant Contact: Mr. James Petruzzi, Managing Partner, Storage Development Partners, LLC, 4900 Woodway, Suite 745, Houston, Texas 77056; Telephone: 713–840–9994.
FERC Contact: Kenneth Hogan 202–502–8434.

Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene, competing applications (without notices of intent), or notices of intent to file competing applications: 60 days from the issuance of this notice. Competing applications and notices of intent must meet the requirements of 18 CFR 4.36. Comments, motions to intervene, notices of intent, and competing applications may be filed electronically via the Internet. See 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission’s Web site http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eFiling.asp. Commenters can submit brief comments up to 6,000 characters, without prior registration, using the eComment system at http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eComment.asp. You must include your name and contact information at the end of your comments. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FERCONLineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at 1–866–208–3676, or for TTY, (202) 502–8659. Although the Commission strongly encourages electronic filing, documents may also be paper-filed. To paper-file, mail an original and seven copies to: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

More information about this project, including a copy of the application, can be viewed or printed on the “eLibrary” link of Commission’s Web site at http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp. Enter the docket number (P–14147) in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support.

Dated: April 22, 2011.
Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

Summary: The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) announces the availability of the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Nuclear Facility Portion of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico (Draft CMRR–NF SEIS) (DOE/EIS–0350–S1), and the dates and locations for public hearings to receive comments on the Draft CMRR–NF SEIS. The Draft CMRR–NF SEIS analyzes the potential environmental impacts of alternatives for constructing and operating the nuclear facility (NF) portion of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement (CMRR) Project. The CMRR Project was first analyzed in the 2003 Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement Project at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM (the CMRR EIS) (DOE/EIS–0350), and NNSA issued a Record of Decision for the CMRR Project in February 2004 (68 FR 6420) announcing its decision to construct and operate a two building CMRR facility within Technical Area-55 (TA–55) at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) in order to meet its need to sustain mission-critical specialized nuclear chemistry and metallurgy capabilities at LANL in a safe, secure and environmentally sound manner. Since that time, NNSA has constructed one of the two buildings for the CMRR Project (the Radiological Laboratory/Utility/Office Building, also called the RLUOB), and has engaged in project planning and design processes for the second building, the CMRR–NF. The planning and design processes for the CMRR–NF have identified the need for various changes to the original design for the structure and additional project elements not envisioned in the 2003 NEPA analyses. These proposed changes, identified subsequent to the ROD, are the subject of the CMRR–NF SEIS analyses.

The Draft CMRR–NF SEIS considers a No Action Alternative (the 2004 CMRR–NF), and two action alternatives (the Modified CMRR–NF Alternative, and the Continued Use of CMRR Building Alternative). Under the No Action Alternative, NNSA analyzes construction and operation of the CMRR–NF as it was originally envisioned in 2004, although it has been determined that the structural design in this alternative would not meet current facility design requirements. Thus, this alternative no longer meets NNSA’s purpose and need.