

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON GENERAL DOE FLOODPLAIN/WETLANDS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS, CONTACT:**

Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance, EH-42, U. S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586-4600 or (800) 472-2756

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Project Description**

DOE proposes to improve its treatment of wastewater from HE research and development activities at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). The proposed HEWTF project would focus on greatly reducing the amount of HE-contaminated wastewater needing treatment prior to its discharge to the environment. This would entail extensive facility and process modifications, including installation of new equipment and improvements in existing systems. The thrust of these modifications would be to prevent hazardous chemicals and HE from entering the wastewater stream and to curtail water use in the HE operations. The result would be an approximately 90 percent decrease in wastewater volume from the current level of 5,539,700 L/mo (1,463,598 gal./mo) to 535,549 L/mo (138,206 gal./mo). LANL would use two vacuum trucks to transport wastewater from HE processing facilities to one new treatment building.

A new treatment plant would be built to handle all HE wastewater. The proposed location of the treatment plant is on a mesa top in Technical Area (TA) 16. The treated wastewater would be discharged into an existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitted outfall at TA-16. The number of NPDES outfalls for HE contaminated wastewater would be reduced from 16 to 1. All effluent would meet or exceed effluent quality standards in the recently revised NPDES permit, which took effect on August 1, 1994.

**II. Floodplain/Wetland Effects**

In 1990, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) mapped wetlands at LANL in accordance with the National Wetlands Inventory standards. The USFWS survey identified one wetland area in the project area. This is an engineered pond in TA-16 behind Building 90 and is classified as a "palustrine, unconsolidated shore, seasonally flooded, and diked/impounded (PUSCh) wetland area." The pond received liquid waste sometime between the 1940s and 1980s. It now

receives only seasonal rain and snowfall and may dry up for approximately four weeks each year.

In addition to the USFWS-described wetlands, there are 27 NPDES outfalls within the area, 15 of which are classified as HE-contaminated. Of these, eight (05A-052, 05A-053, 05A-054, 05A-058, 05A-061, 05A-069, 05A-071, and 05A-072) support hydrophytic vegetation. These are man-induced wetlands. A man-induced wetland is an area that has developed characteristics of naturally-occurring wetlands due to human activities.

Implementation of the HEWTF project would not involve construction within the boundaries of any wetlands. However, the HEWTF would stop the flow from over one-half of the outfalls in the area and inevitably eliminate some wetland areas. At the same time, it may enhance the wetland at the new treatment facility as a result of a four-fold increase in effluent volume. However, total discharge volume would be reduced.

Cañon del Valle and Water Canyon, both affected by HE wastewater outfalls, contain small floodplains. Floodplains in Los Alamos County have been mapped using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' computer-based Flood Hydrograph Package to define the 100-year frequency, 6-hour design storm events. None of the proposed HEWTF falls within this floodplain.

In accordance with DOE regulations for compliance with floodplain and wetlands environmental review requirements (10 CFR Part 1022), DOE will prepare a floodplain and wetlands assessment for this proposed DOE action.

The assessment will be included in the EA being prepared for the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. A floodplain statement of findings will be included in any finding of no significant impact that is issued following the completion of the EA or may be issued separately.

Issued in Los Alamos, New Mexico on August 14, 1995.

**Joseph C. Vozella,**

*Assistant Area Manager for Environment and Projects.*

[FR Doc. 95-21062 Filed 8-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

**Noncompetitive Financial Assistance**

**AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office,

announces that it intends to award a noncompetitive financial assistance grant to the Oregon Institute of Technology, Geo-Heat Center (OIT). The purpose of this grant is to provide continued services to state and federal agencies, engineering consultants, planners and developers who request assistance for the development of geothermal direct uses. The award of this noncompetitive assistance is justified under sub-paragraphs (A) and (B) of the DOE Financial Assistance Rules 10 CFR 600.7(b)(2)(i) as follows: (A) The activity to be funded is necessary for the satisfactory completion of research and the continuation of direct use assistance presently being funded by DOE under Grant No. DE-FG07-90ID13040, and for which competition for support would have a significant adverse effect on continuity of the activity; (B) The activity would be conducted by the applicant using its own resources or those donated or provided by third parties; however, DOE support of the activity would enhance the public benefits to be derived.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Carol Bruns, U.S. Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office, 850 Energy Drive, MS 1221, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401-1563, (208) 526-1534.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The statutory authority for the proposed award is Public Law 93-40, Geothermal Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974. The overall program objective is to obtain increased utilization of the large direct-heat resource base by providing users with: (1) direct-use geothermal project technical and development assistance, (2) research to aid in resource and technical development problems, and (3) information, educational materials and services to stimulate development. These activities will further advance the knowledge to meet the public need to help reduce dependence upon foreign energy sources and help reduce atmospheric pollution. The anticipated grant will cover an award period of five years with an estimated total cost of \$1,600,000.

**R. Jeffrey Hoyles,**

*Director, Procurement Services Division.*

[FR Doc. 95-21061 Filed 8-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. TM96-1-1-000]

**Alabama-Tennessee Natural Gas Company; Notice of Filing of Report of Refunds**

August 18, 1995.

Take notice that on August 15, 1995, Alabama-Tennessee Natural Gas Company (Alabama-Tennessee), tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheet with a proposed effective date of October 1, 1995:

Ninth Revised Sheet No. 4

Alabama-Tennessee states that the purpose of this filing is to reflect a \$0.0001 per dekatherm decrease in Alabama-Tennessee's rates under its Annual Charge Adjustment (ACA) clause that results from a corresponding decrease in its annual charge accessed Alabama-Tennessee by the Commission.

Alabama-Tennessee requests any waiver that may be required in order to accept and approve this filing as submitted.

Alabama-Tennessee states that copies of the tariff filing have been served upon the Company's affected customers and interested public bodies.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before August 25, 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. Any person wishing to become a party to the proceeding must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

**Lois D. Cashell,***Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-20972 Filed 8-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP95-656-000]

**Blue Lake Gas Storage Company; Notice of Application**

August 18, 1995.

Take notice that on August 7, 1995, Blue Lake Gas Storage Company (Blue Lake), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit,

Michigan 48423, filed in Docket No. CP95-656-000 an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for authorization to increase the maximum volume of natural gas stored in its Northern Michigan storage field, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Blue Lake proposes to increase the maximum volume of gas authorized to be stored from 50,236 MMcf to 54,119 MMcf. It is stated that the increase would raise the inventory from the volume authorized by the Commission in Docket No. CP91-2704-000 to a level supported by actual operating experience. It is asserted that the increase would allow Blue Lake greater operational flexibility by allowing it to use the maximum storage capacity of the storage field. Blue Lake states that the increase in capacity would not require additional pressure.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before September 8, 1995, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be

unnecessary for Blue Lake to appear or be represented at the hearing.

**Lois D. Cashell,***Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-20973 Filed 8-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP95-669-000]

**Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization**

August 18, 1995.

Take notice that on August 7, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E. Charleston, West Virginia 25314-1599, filed in Docket No. CP95-669-000 a request pursuant to § 157.205 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) for authorization to modify an existing point of delivery and reassign and reduce Maximum Daily Delivery Obligations (MDDO) at another existing point to Baltimore Gas & Electric Company (BG&E) for firm Part 284 transportation service to BG&E, in Cecil County, Maryland, under Columbia's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP6-240-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia states that the MDDO at the Conowingo delivery point would be increased from 1,249 Dth/day to 7,319 Dth/day. It is said that the increased deliveries to BG&E resulting from modifications and the reassignment of MDDO's are estimated to be 2,264 Dth/day and up to 826,360 Dth/annually.

Columbia states further that the estimated cost to modify the Conowingo delivery point would be approximately \$182,000 and that Columbia would pay for the cost of the modifications.

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 § 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