CATEGORIES OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

Records involving either suspected or actual Counterintelligence (CI) issues detected in Personnel Security Investigations (PSI) or Industrial Security Administrative Inquires (AI). The database will include; Subject name, title, origin of the issue, type of action, type of issue, agent's name, company name, target technology, country of origin and miscellaneous agents notes and recommendations.

AUTHORITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM:

5 U.S.C. 301, Department of Regulations; E.O. 10450, Security Requirements for Government Employment; DOD Directive 5200.2, Department of Defense Personnel security Program; DOD Dir 5200.27 (Section IV A and B), Acquisition of information concerning Persons and organizations not affiliated with the DOD; DOD Dir 5220.28, Application of Special Eligibility and Clearance Requirements in the SIOP-ESI program for contractor employees.

PURPOSE(S):

Provides a central database to document, refer, track, monitor and evaluate CI indicators/issues surfaced during PSI and through AIs.

ROUTINE USES OF RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE SYSTEM, INCLUDING CATEGORIES OF USERS AND THE PURPOSES OF SUCH USES:

In addition to those disclosures generally permitted under 5 U.S.C. 552a(b) of the Privacy Act, these records or information contained therein may specifically be disclosed outside the DoD as a routine use pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(b)(3) as follows:

The 'Blanket Routine Uses' set forth at the beginning of OSD's compilation of systems of records notices apply to this system.

POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR STORING, RETRIEVING, ACCESSING, RETAINING, AND DISPOSING OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

STORAGE:

Computerized database, paper records, microfilm, diskettes, are maintained at the CIO.

RETRIEVABILITY:

Information in the automated system is retrieved through any entry in the data base to include name and file number.

Paper files are retrieved by name or file number.

SAFEGUARDS:

Paper records are contained and stored in regulation safes , filing cabinets and on magnetic tape which is located in a secure area with limited access. The database is maintained in secure office space with password entry to the system. Access is provided on a need to know basis only.

RETENTION AND DISPOSAL:

Automated records are maintained for 15 years. CI paper records relating to the automated system and not associated with a PSI will be retained for one year; Files developed on persons who are being considered for affiliation with the Department of Defense will be destroyed within one year if the affiliation is not completed.

Information within the purview of DOD Directive 5200.27 will be retained no longer than one year.

SYSTEM MANAGER(S) AND ADDRESS:

Defense Investigative Service, Deputy Director(s) (Industrial Security and Investigations), 1340 Braddock Place, Alexandria, VA. 22314–1651.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE:

Individuals seeking to determine whether information about themselves is contained in this system should address written inquiries to the Defense Investigative Service, Information and Public Affairs Office, 1340 Braddock Place, Alexandria VA 22314–1651.

Requesters should provide full name and any former names used, date and place of birth, and Social Security Number.

RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURES:

Individuals seeking access to information about themselves contained in this system of records should address written inquiries to Defense Investigative Service, Information and Public Affairs Office, Alexandria, VA 22314–1651.

CONTESTING RECORDS PROCEDURES:

The OSD's rules for accessing records, for contesting contents and appealing initial agency determinations are contained in DIS Regulation 01–13; 32 CFR part 321;or may be obtained from the Defense Investigative Service, Information and Public Affairs Office, 1340 Braddock Place, Alexandria, VA 22314–1651.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Federal, State and local law enforcement/intelligence agencies; Industrial Security Administrative inquiries and Personnel Security Investigations.

EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED FOR THE SYSTEM:

Portions of this system may be exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a (k) (1), (k)(2), (k)(3), and (k)(5), as applicable.

An exemption rule for this record system has been promulgated in accordance with the requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553(b) (1), (2), and (3), (c) and (e) and published in 32 CFR part 321. For additional information contact the system manager.

[FR Doc. 95–24472 Filed 10–2–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–F

Department of the Navy

Record of Decision for the Homeporting of Seawolf Class Submarines on the East Coast of the United States

Pursuant to section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA procedures (40 CFR 1500–1508), the Department of the Navy announces its decision to homeport the SEAWOLF class submarine at the Naval Submarine Base (SUBASE) New London, Groton, CT and to implement required dredging of the Thames River to provide safe access.

Up to three SEAWOLF class submarines will be homeported at the SUBASE replacing three existing homeported submarines resulting in no net increase in submarine or personnel loading at the SUBASE. Dredging will deepen the access channel from 35 ft to 39 ft below mean low water (MLW) in the Thames River from the Gold Star (I–95 Highway) Bridge to pier 17 at the SUBASE. Dredging will also occur from the channel to piers 8 and 10, which are designated as the SEAWOLF home port piers, and for access to pier 17 (located up-river from piers 8 and 10) to provide for submarine maintenance. Up to three berths at piers 8 and 10 will be deepened to 42 feet below MLW. The entire existing width of the navigation channel will be dredged from the I–95 bridge to the south end of the SUBASE. This area has been determined to contain marine sediments which are suitable for unconfined open water disposal. Dredging of the section of the river where sediments contain elevated levels of contaminates will be minimized by limiting the width of the channel to allow only a one way passage of the SEAWOLF class submarine for this short stretch. This 300 foot width will reduce significantly the volume of contaminated sediment being removed. Disposal of a total of 1.1 million cubic yards (CY) of dredged sediment will be at the New London Disposal Site (NLDS) in Long Island Sound.

In 1991, the Navy issued a draft environmental impact statement addressing a proposal to dredge the Thames River to allow access for the

lead SEAWOLF submarine (SSN 21) to conduct preacceptance trial operations from piers 32 and 33 at the SUBASE. At that time, no proposal was made concerning a home port for SEAWOLF Class submarines.

In 1994, President Clinton announced SUBASE New London as the preferred home port for SEAWOLF submarines. This preferred homeporting announcement modified the initial proposed action such that the NEPA process had to be re-initiated. A notice of intent was published in the Federal Register in June 1994, indicating the Navy would prepare a DEIS analyzing the impacts of homeporting SEAWOLF Class submarines at one of three alternative locations: SUBASE New London, Naval Submarine Base Kings Bay, GA, and Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Scoping meetings were held in August 1994 at each alternative home port location.

In February 1995, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for SEAWOLF Homeporting was distributed to federal, state, and local agencies and elected officials, special interest groups, and interested individuals. Public hearings were held in each alternative home port location in March 1995. Oral and written public comments and Navy responses to those comments were incorporated into a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) which was distributed to the public for a review period that ended on 25 September 1995.

The primary consequence of implementing the proposed homeporting action is the effect of the removal of approximately 1.1 million CY of sediment from the Thames River and disposal of that material at the NLDS. Some of the sediment (350,000 CY) within the material to be dredged is moderately contaminated with metals and polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). These sediments require covering with non-contaminated sediment.

Sediments within the project area were tested to determine suitability for open water disposal. Metals, PAHs, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and pesticides were tested. Test results indicate that there are varying amounts of metals and PAHs in the sediments. No PCBs or pesticides were detected in any of the sediment samples.

Bioaccumulation studies revealed that channel sediments from pier 17 south to the south end of the SUBASE caused statistically significant bioaccumulation of several PAH compounds, zinc, and lead. None of the sediments tested, however, were significantly toxic to sensitive organisms. These sediments are, therefore, suitable for open water disposal provided that adequate capping with clean sediment is done.

Channel sediments from the I–95 bridge to the south end of SUBASE did not exhibit any bioaccumulation or toxicity. Therefore, these sediments are suitable for unconfined open water disposal and will be used as capping material for the contaminated sediments of this project. There is more than enough clean sediment to cover the 350,000 CY of contaminated sediment to guarantee the 50 centimeter cap required by the Army Corps of Engineers and the CT Department of Environmental Protection.

Impacts to water quality, air quality, benthic organisms, and aquatic habitat will briefly occur during dredging and disposal activities. These impacts, however, are not considered significant within the context of the project location and with implementation of specific mitigation measures described herein.

Shore facilities and infrastructure impacts associated with SEAWOLF homeporting at the SUBASE will be minimal because the three SEAWOLF submarines will replace existing fast attack submarines as the older submarines are decommissioned. It is projected that by 1999 there will be 17 submarines homeported at the SUBASE, including 2 of the 3 SEAWOLF class submarines, compared to 24 submarines currently homeported there. Consequently, no change or addition in submarine support services, ordnance storage, supply facilities, magnetic signature measurement facilities, or intermediate maintenance facilities will be required at the SUBASE to support SEAWOLF homeporting. The declining submarine loading will allow SEAWOLF personnel and their dependents to occupy existing bachelor and family housing. Personnel support services are adequate to support the SEAWOLF crews. Training facilities already exist at SUBASE. Selection of another home port location would require replication of these facilities. Utility consumption is expected to decline corresponding to a reduction in the total number of submarines homeported at the SUBASE.

Considering all factors, the preferred and selected alternative is homeporting at SUBASE New London. In the narrower context of environmental factors only, the alternative that would incur marginally fewer impacts would be that of homeporting at Naval Station Norfolk where minimal dredging would be required and where dredged material disposal occurs at Craney Island. That alternative was not selected because it would cost substantially more and does not provide for the operational readiness, training, and synergy of compatible functions provided at SUBASE New London. This conclusion is also supported by the Navy's ability to mitigate impacts at New London to below the level of significance.

Comments Received on the FEIS

Ten comment letters were received following publication of the FEIS. Several of these letters simply indicated the writer's preferences. Others presented substantive comments dealing with mitigation measures, storm effects on the NLDS, and potential alternatives for either homeporting the SEAWOLF or for the disposal of the dredged sediment that the commenters believed had not been adequately addressed in the FEIS.

Studies of major storm events have been conducted at the NLDS. A comparison of bottom topography from 1985 to 1992, a period that included two hurricanes, demonstrated that little, if any, change in topography occurred at the NLDS.

Four alternatives for homeporting or disposal of dredged material were addressed in comment letters: (1) Use of the Naval Undersea Warfare Center (NUWC) New London for SEAWOLF homeporting; (2) in-channel ''borrow pit'' disposal of dredged sediment; (3) ''washing'' of dredged material to remove contaminates; and (4) sediment dewatering to reduce the overall volume of dredged material requiring disposal. All of these suggested alternatives were specifically addressed in the EIS, with the exception of in-channel borrow pit disposal. The latter is a variation of capping, a process that was thoroughly addressed in the EIS. While addressed in the EIS, none of these suggested alternatives were considered reasonable alternatives and therefore were not discussed in great detail. The comment letters did not identify any substantive environmental information concerning the proposed action or suggested alternatives that had not already been considered during the EIS process. Consequently, as discussed below, it was determined that none of the suggested alternatives warranted additional discussion in the EIS.

The NUWC alternative was discounted as a practicable long-term SEAWOLF home port because of incompatible existing functions and land use and because the facility has been considered for closure as part of the Base Closure and Realignment Act process. In fact, after careful analysis the Department of Defense recommended closure of the NUWC facility at New London except for existing piers. Although Congressional direction for

closure will not be final until 28 September 1995, there is no scheduled Congressional action that would reject the BRAC–95 Commission recommendations and such an action is extraordinarily remote. The Navy will retain the pier where the SEAWOLF submarine could be berthed. The necessary shore facilities including ordnance loading capability, public works, administration, security and personnel support, are not available on site nor will sufficient land be retained to construct them. None of the existing submarine maintenance facilities would be accessible unless the Thames River channel was dredged as proposed in the preferred alternative. Consequently, construction of new submarine maintenance facilities would also be required. Special legislation would be required to reopen the closed NUWC facility and to develop facilities and infrastructure to support homeporting. Locating the SEAWOLF home port at the NUWC facility would, therefore, require the Navy to maintain duplicate submarine support facilities within three miles of each other.

This duplication is not only inefficient but would result in increased environmental impacts. Duplicate facilities would increase air emissions, water discharges, and require another temporary storage facility for hazardous waste. The cost of providing these duplicate support facilities at NUWC and maintaining those facilities over the 30 year life of the SEAWOLF submarine would clearly be excessive. As described in the EIS, the use of NUWC as a home port is not a reasonable alternative.

The in-channel borrow pit alternative would require removing contaminated sediments from the Thames River channel and placement in a ''borrow pit'' dug in another section of the River. While this technique would eliminate the disposal of contaminated sediment at the NLDS, it would result in dredging of substantially more sediments and at a higher disposal cost. The dredging associated with the SEAWOLF project is designed to increase the depth of the Thames River channel and the areas adjacent to the piers. The channel would be dredged to a depth of 39 feet below MLW. A ''borrow pit'' of sufficient size and depth would have to be dug to accept the 350,000 CY of contaminated sediments plus the necessary cap and still allow a minimum depth of 39 feet below MLW. There are no existing borrow pits or depressions in the Thames River that could be used.

Based upon the Army Corps of Engineers Boston Harbor dredging, it is estimated that use of a borrow pit would increase the amount of dredging by 1 million cubic yards. While the borrow pit is being dug, the sediments that are removed must be stockpiled on land or on barges in the Thames River. As an average barge can hold approximately 4,000 CY of sediment, there is not enough space to accommodate the large number of barges that would be needed to hold contaminated sediments and the sediments removed from the borrow pit; nor is there an adequate land site nearby to use for stockpiling. Once a borrow pit is placed in the Thames River, it would preclude any future deepening of the channel for any use—federal, state, or private. This additional dredging requirement, commitment of a sizeable in-channel area to initial (versus maintenance) dredging, and the logistical problems associated with completing the entire dredging requirement within the four month dredging season, makes this approach impracticable. Additional impacts to water quality in the river would result from more disturbance of sediment. Cumulative impacts to fish and benthos would be magnified because dredging would occur from October-January in the multiple years necessary for project completion. Cost of this approach would be excessive. Assuming similar conditions to the Boston Harbor In-channel option, the increased volumes, handling, and open water disposal to create cells, import clean sand and place contaminated sediment, would escalate the total cost for the SEAWOLF dredging project from approximately $4 million to approximately $23 million. Finally, given that there is a permitted in-water disposal site available for this project, it is not likely that the required permits could be obtained from the CT Department of Environmental Protection to allow this project to proceed this year, if at all.

Soil washing utilizes a cleansing process to remove contaminants from dredge material. The comment letter asserts that the ''cleaned'' sediments could be placed in an upland facility or an open water site without the need for capping. While this technique eliminates the disposal of contaminated sediment at the NLDS, it involves the disposal of contaminants at upland sites. The contaminants would be concentrated as a result of the washing process, would be subject to regulation under RCRA, and may not be suitable for land disposal. Mechanical soil washing is a recognized process, but it has not been effective in removing petroleum-based contaminants such as polyaromatic hydrocarbons, especially those in fine sediments. Mechanical washing, enhanced by use of chemical agents, is a relatively new process. This enhanced soil washing technique has never been attempted on a project the size of the SEAWOLF project. Consequently, technical and timing difficulties must be anticipated which could make completing the required dredging within the four month dredging season impracticable. Chemically enhanced soil washing has been used only on smaller projects at a cost of $35–$45 per cubic yard, excluding the cost for transportation of treated sediment and landfill fees. As discussed in the EIS, costs associated with a project could approach $100 per cubic yard.

Sediment dewatering involves placing sediments in a barge or at an upland site and allowing water to run off, thereby reducing the overall volume of sediment. The EIS investigated this process and concluded that the volume of the sediments to be dredged precludes the use of barges for sediment dewatering. Time requirements to develop and permit a suitable near shore upland site to be used for sediment dewatering were estimated to take as long as three years. CT requires a minimum of 18 months of monitoring at a land site before any materials can be deposited there. The dredging process is also more time-consuming and could not be completed during the limited dredge window for the Thames River, making this alternative impracticable for the SEAWOLF project. Sediments are double or triple handled as the sediment is moved from dredge bucket, to barge, to truck, and finally to the land disposal site. All of these factors make the costs associated with dewatering significantly greater than disposal at the NLDS.

Mitigation

The Navy will employ the following mitigation measures to ensure minimization of environmental impacts associated with dredging and disposal operations: (1) Use of an enclosed clamshell dredge bucket to minimize spillage of dredge sediment from dredging operations, (2) adherence to the ''no barge overflow'' requirement, (3) capping of the contaminated dredged sediment with clean sediment in accordance with the Army Corps of Engineers permit requirements [The amount of capping material available in the project exceeds that necessary to ensure a 50 cm cap and should result in a thicker cap in most locations.], (4) observance of the seasonal restrictions on dredging in the Thames River, (5) implementing an intensive series of

hydrographic monitoring of the disposal site during and after disposal operations to ensure proper placement of sediments, (6) use of sediment profile (underwater) photography of the disposal mound to ensure proper placement of sediments, (7) use of precision navigation equipment and a taut wire buoy at the disposal site to accurately locate the barge discharge point at the disposal site, and (8) presence of a barge inspector, certified by the Army Corps of Engineers, on each and every barge that takes dredged materials to the disposal site.

With the above mitigation measures, the Navy believes impacts to the Thames River and Long Island Sound marine environments will be minimized to the maximum extent practicable.

In addition to the specific mitigation measures set out above, the Navy will: (1) Encourage the Army Corps of Engineers to select a discharge point where a depression in the bottom already exists; (2) encourage the Army Corps of Engineers to dispose of clean dredged materials from future area projects at the NLDS; (3) pursue development of a post-disposal monitoring program in cooperation with the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers; and (4) offer interested environmental groups the opportunity to cooperatively provide an independent observer on barges carrying dredged material for disposal.

In accordance with the Clean Air Act and General Conformity Rule requirements, an air quality review has been conducted for the proposed dredging. It has been determined that this action is in compliance with 40 CFR Part 63 (Determining Conformity of General Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans) and satisfies the requirements of Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (42 USC 7506). Accordingly, the proposed action in the Thames River conforms to the state implementation plan's purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the federal ambient air quality standards and achieving expeditious attainment of those standards.

Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) requires authorization from the Army Corps of Engineers for the discharge of dredged material into ''waters of the United States''. Section 404 regulations prohibit the use of any disposal site in open water when its use would result in adverse effects on water quality, shellfish beds, fisheries and wildlife, or recreational areas. The Navy has determined that the proposed dredging would not have significant impacts and has applied for a section 404 permit for this project.

Section 401 of the FWPCA requires that any party proposing to engage in an activity which may affect water quality must obtain state water quality certification. Certification will not be granted unless it has been determined that the proposed activity will not violate state water quality standards. The Navy has received the requisite Section 401 permit from the CT Department of Environmental Protection for SEAWOLF homeporting. The NLDS is partially located in the State of New York, but, under EPA regulations, a water quality certificate is only required from the state having jurisdiction over the location where the dredged materials will be discharged. Disposal of dredged material will take place wholly within waters of the state of Connecticut and there will be no direct discharge of dredged material into New York waters, therefore a New York Water Quality Certificate is not required for this project.

In accordance with the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Navy has requested and received concurrence with its determination of coastal zone consistency for the SEAWOLF homeporting project from the CT Department of Environmental Protection. Although the NLDS lies partially within the waters of the State of New York, the Navy has determined that the proposed action will not affect the coastal resources of the State of New York, and included a negative determination to that effect in the EIS.

Pursuant to Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, potential environmental and economic impacts on minority and low-income persons and communities were assessed. Any impacts caused by the SEAWOLF homeporting, particularly the dredging and disposal of dredged material, will be experienced equally by all groups within the overall regional population. Because no long-term negative environmental impacts are expected from the proposed action, no particular minority or low income segment of the population would be disproportionately affected. There is not anticipated to be any likelihood for minority or low income individuals to be subjected to adverse environmental or health risks.

In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, the Navy concluded that it is unlikely that there are any submerged ship wrecks in the area to be affected by the dredging or disposal operations. The State Historic Preservation Officer has concurred with this finding.

Questions regarding the Final Environmental Impact Statement prepared for this action may be directed to Mr. Robert Ostermueller, Head, Environmental Planning, Northern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command, 10 Industrial Highway, Lester PA 19113, telephone (610) 595–0759; fax (610) 595–0778.

Dated: September 27, 1995.

Duncan Holaday,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Facilities).

[FR Doc. 95–24502 Filed 10–2–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GT95–61–000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

September 27, 1995.

Take notice that on September 22, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, the following tariff sheets to be effective October 23, 1995:

Second Revised Volume No. 1
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 11
Original Volume No. 2
Fifteenth Revised Sheet No. 4E
First Revised Sheet No. 1400
First Revised Sheet No. 1412

Columbia states that these tariff sheets are being filed to cancel in their entirety Rate Schedules X–121 and X–122, which embody separate agreements between Columbia and Carnegie Natural Gas Company (Carnegie) as follows:

Rate Schedule X–121 for a transportation of natural gas agreement authorized under Docket No. CP84–217 (27 FERC 61,075 (1984));

Rate Schedule X–122 for a transportation of natural gas agreement authorized under Docket No. CP84–214 (27 FERC 61,075 (1984)).

Columbia states that a copy of this filing was served upon Carnegie and have been mailed to all holders of Columbia's FERC Gas Tariff.

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 Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before October 4, 1995. Protests will