Vermont Castings states that its manually controlled heaters utilize a gas control with a variable pressure regulator control that allows the user to select various fuel input rates by varying the range of pressures of the heaters, and request that it be allowed to determine steady state efficiency and weighted average steady state efficiency in the calculation of AFUE at a minimum fuel input rate of no greater than two-thirds of the maximum fuel input rate instead of the specified ±5 percent of 50 percent of the maximum fuel input rate. Also, previous Petitions for Waiver to exclude the pilot light energy input term in the calculation of AFUE for home heating equipment with a manual transient pilot control and allowance to determine steady state efficiency and weighted average steady state efficiency used in the calculation of AFUE at a minimum fuel input rate of 65.3 percent of the maximum fuel input rate have been granted by DOE to Appalachian Stove and Fabricators, Inc., 56 FR 51711, October 15, 1991, and Valor Inc., 56 FR 51714, October 15, 1991.

Based on DOE having granted similar waivers in the past to heaters utilizing a variable pressure regulator control that allows a user to set various fuel input rates, DOE agrees that a waiver should be granted to allow the determination of steady state efficiency and weighted average steady state efficiency used in the calculation of AFUE at a minimum fuel input rate of no greater than two-thirds of the maximum fuel input rate instead of the specified ±5 percent of 50 percent of the maximum fuel input rate for Vermont Castings models DV25 and DH20 manually controlled vented heaters.

It is therefore, ordered that:

(1) The ''Petition for Waiver'' filed by Vermont Castings, Inc. (Case No. DH–003) is hereby granted as set forth in paragraph (2) below, subject to the provisions of paragraphs (3), (4), and (5).

(2) Notwithstanding any contrary provisions of Appendix O of Title 10 CFR Part 430, Subpart B, Vermont Castings, Inc. shall be permitted to test its models DV25 and DH20 manually controlled vented heaters on the basis of the test procedure specified in Title 10 CFR Part 430, with modifications set forth below:

(i) Delete paragraph 3.5 of Appendix O.

(ii) The last paragraph of 3.1.1 of Appendix O is revised to read as follows:

3.1.1 (a) For manually controlled gas fueled vented heaters, with various input rates determine the steady-state efficiency at:

(1) A fuel input rate within ±5 percent of 50 percent of the maximum fuel input rate or,

(2) The minimum fuel input rate if the design of the heater is such that ±5 percent of 50 percent of the maximum fuel input rate can not be set, provided this minimum input rate is no greater than two-thirds of the maximum input rate of the heater.

(b) If the heater is designed to use a control that precludes operation at other than maximum output (single firing rate) determine the steady state efficiency at the maximum input rate only.

(iii) Delete paragraph 4.2.4 of Appendix O and replace with the following paragraph:

4.2.4 Weighted Average Steady-State Efficiency. (a) For manually controlled heaters with various input rates, the weighted average steady-state efficiency (SS–WT) is:

(1) At ±5 percent of 50 percent of the maximum fuel input rate as measured in either section 3.1.1 to this appendix for manually controlled gas vented heaters or section 3.1.2 to this appendix for manually controlled oil vented heaters, or

(2) At the minimum fuel input rate as measured in either section 3.1.1 to this appendix for manually controlled gas vented heaters or section 3.1.2 to this appendix for manually controlled oil vented heaters if the design of the heater is such that ±5 percent of 50 percent of the maximum fuel input rate can not be set, provided the tested input rate is no greater than two-thirds of maximum input rate of the heater.

(b) For manually controlled heater with one single firing rate, the weighted average steady-state efficiency is the steady-state efficiency measured at the single firing rate.

(iv) Delete paragraph 4.2.6 of Appendix O and replace with the following paragraph:

4.2.6 Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency. For manually controlled vented heaters, calculate the Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency (AFUE) as a percent and defined as:

$$AFUE = \eta_u$$

Where:

η_u = as defined in section 4.2.5 of this appendix.

(v) With the exception of the modification set forth above, Vermont Castings, Inc. shall comply in all respects with the test procedures specified in Appendix O of Title 10 CFR Part 430, Subpart B.

(3) The Waiver shall remain in effect from the date of issuance of this Order until DOE prescribes final test procedures appropriate to models DV25 and DH20 manually controlled vented heaters manufactured by Vermont Castings, Inc.

(4) This Waiver is based upon the presumed validity of statements, allegations, and documentary materials submitted by the petitioner. This Waiver may be revoked or modified at any time upon a determination that a factual basis underlying the Petition is incorrect.

(5) Effective April 4, 1996, this Waiver supersedes the Interim Waiver granted Vermont Castings, Inc. on December 21, 1995. 60 FR 67130, December 28, 1995. (Case No. DH–003).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on April 4, 1996.

Christine A. Ervin,

Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 96–9682 Filed 4–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

[Docket No. EE–RM–6450–01–P]

Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Efficiency and Information for Office Equipment; Notice of Determination

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of preliminary determination.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to set forth DOE's preliminary determination as to whether a voluntary national testing and information program being developed for commercial office equipment will be consistent with the objectives of Section 125 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Anthony T. Balducci, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Forrestal Building, Mail Station EE–431, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20585–0121, (202) 586–8459

Edward Levy, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of General Counsel, Forrestal Building, Mail Station GC–72, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20585–0103, (202) 586–2928

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction
A. Authority
B. Background
II. General Discussion
III. Department's Determination

I. Introduction

A. Authority

Section 125 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAct), Public Law 102–486, requires that the Department of Energy, after consulting with the Computer and Business Equipment Manufacturers Association (CBEMA) and other interested organizations, provide financial and technical assistance to support a voluntary national testing and information program for those types of commercial office equipment that are widely used and for which there is a potential for significant energy savings as a result of such program. The EPAct directs that such voluntary program ''shall be developed by an appropriate organization (composed of interested parties) according to commonly accepted procedures for the development of national testing procedures and labeling programs.'' EPAct, Section 125(a)(3). The voluntary program shall: ''(A) determine the commercial office equipment to be covered; (B) include specifications for testing procedures that will enable purchasers of such commercial office equipment to make more informed decisions about energy efficiency and costs of alternative products; and (C) include information, which may be disseminated through catalogs, trade publications, labels, or other mechanisms, that will allow consumers to assess the energy consumption and potential cost savings of alternative products.'' EPAct, Section 125(a)(2).

EPAct also requires that the Department monitor and evaluate the efforts to develop the program, and make a determination, not later than three years after enactment, as to whether such program is consistent with the objectives of the legislation. EPAct, Section 125(b). If the program does not meet the objectives, then the Department is required, after consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, to develop test procedures and prescribe labeling rules for commercial office equipment. EPAct, Section 125(c)(1–2).

B. Background

Since the passage of EPAct, the Department of Energy has monitored the efforts of the commercial office equipment industry to develop a testing and information program through the Council on Office Products Energy Efficiency (COPEE), a membership organization composed of office equipment manufacturers, with an advisory group representing environmental organizations, designers, national laboratories, state and Federal agencies, and office equipment professionals. COPEE was set up by The Information Technology Industries Council (ITI, formerly CBEMA).

In the initial phase of the program development, COPEE identified five types of office equipment that are widely used and offer significant potential for energy savings. The types of commercial office equipment to be included in the program are: (1) Micro computers; (2) Page printers (ink jet and laser); (3) Low-speed, plain paper copiers (1–24 copies per minute); (4) Medium-speed, plain paper copiers (25–39 copies per minute); and (5) Facsimile equipment. Category (1) also includes computer monitors, whether sold separately or with a micro computer system. COPEE set up five subcommittees to develop energy testing methods for the types of equipment mentioned above and a subcommittee to conduct a market study to assess buyers' present understanding of energy use by office equipment and develop an information program. DOE contracted with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) to assist COPEE in the development of the test procedures. The test procedures for each of the products were drafted and revised through an iterative process.

On May 26, 1994, DOE held a public meeting, at which interested persons were invited to offer suggestions concerning methods of evaluating the voluntary program, and to provide updates on the progress of the voluntary program. A transcript of the meeting was made available to the public, and subsequent comments were invited through June 15, 1994. Workshop comments centered on the need for the verification of coverage of the program, data collection as to energy efficiency of office products, and the ability to evaluate whether the new energy efficiency information is reaching its target audiences. COPEE also provided a schedule for the program's development.

In the subsequent months COPEE continued in the development of the test procedures for the five products. To assist in developing the information program, COPEE contracted with American Opinion Research, Inc. to conduct quantitative and qualitative research of office equipment decision makers. Only those people having a significant role in the decision of which types of electronic equipment to purchase in their companies were surveyed. The study was conducted primarily to determine: (1) The interest in purchasing electronic office equipment which is more energy efficient; (2) the factors most important in the decision to buy office equipment; (3) the importance of energy efficient office equipment; (4) the messages that are most effective in ''convincing'' decision makers to buy or recommend energy efficient equipment; (5) the means through which decision makers prefer to receive those messages. The research was completed and presented to COPEE in November 1994. The results indicated that a significant number of respondents would purchase energy efficient office equipment over other types of equipment, provided that there was neither an increase in cost nor any loss of performance. The study also found that the information presented to buyers about energy efficient equipment should include the cost savings achieved through energy efficiency, should link energy conservation to the environment, and must be simple and easy to understand. The COPEE study also identified very low levels of buyer awareness (under 10 percent) of the Energy Star program and logo, which is described below.

While developing the test procedures for the five products, COPEE pointed out the difficulty in developing test procedures for computers. The test procedures being developed would not provide buyers with simple and relevant information on the energy usage of the machines due to the multiple functions of the Central Processing Unit and the various configurations and designs of the computers to be tested for energy consumption. The subcommittee also identified problems with replicating and verifying the energy usage during the active or working mode. The subcommittee recommended to COPEE that test procedures for computers only address the stand-by or ''sleep'' mode, using the Energy Star program methods. In subsequent meetings, COPEE proposed separate test procedures for computers and monitors. Efforts were focused on completing the test procedures for monitors, printers, both types of copiers, and facsimile equipment and developing an information dissemination plan. The test procedures for these four products have developed at different paces. The only test procedure that has been finalized is for copiers, which updates an energy test method first issued by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) in 1982. ASTM has published this revised test procedure and has designated it: F757–94, ''Standard Test Method for Determining Energy Consumption of Copier and Copier-Duplicating Equipment.''

Based on progress as of early 1995, DOE developed evaluation criteria for the program, disseminated the draft

criteria and held a public meeting on March 28, 1995, to discuss the evaluation criteria for the office equipment program. Comments were received through April 14, 1995. ITI urged at the public meeting and in its letter dated April 14, 1995, that the Department of Energy should make a determination that the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Energy Star Program meets the requirements of Section 125 of EPAct, and that any additional voluntary program would be redundant. ITI states that the Energy Star Program is a voluntary Federal energy conservation program, and has been successfully applied to commercial office equipment.

In 1992 EPA established a voluntary energy efficiency program for personal computers and monitors, called the Energy Star Computers Program. The program is a partnership effort between EPA and individual members of the information technology industry to promote the manufacturing and marketing of energy-efficient equipment. The program was expanded in 1993 to include printers, in 1994 to include facsimile machines and, in 1995 to include copiers.

Currently, there are over 400 manufacturers of computers, monitors, printers, facsimile machines, copiers and controlling devices (hardware or software that enable the equipment to enter a sleep mode) participating in the program and producing over 2,000 Energy Star compliant products. In April 1993, President Clinton signed Executive Order 12845 requiring all Federal agencies to purchase Energy Star computers, monitors, and printers where commercially available.

Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) are signed between the EPA and manufacturers of office equipment. These firms are referred to as ''partners'' in the Energy Star Program. Each MOU specifies the partner's responsibilities, the product qualification requirements, and the EPA's responsibilities.

The EPA establishes a power threshold for each product type, computers, monitors, printers, facsimile machines and copiers. Products qualify for the program if they ''sleep'' at or below their corresponding threshold level. For example, Energy Star monitors that use 30 watts or less in the ''sleep'' mode qualify. Additionally, equipment qualifies if it maintains a level of power consumption at or below the threshold when in the active mode. For example, monitors that operate at or below 30 watts qualify. In the case of copiers another energy-saving feature (default duplexing—routine production of two sided rather than one sided copies—for certain sizes) is also required to qualify for the program.

EPA has developed an Energy Star Logo to help identify Energy Star equipment. The logo may be used as a product label to designate specific models of equipment that qualify for the program. Partners shall consider placing the Energy Star logo on all qualifying products, as well as on their associated shipping cartons, brochures, data sheets and advertisements.

In addition to setting power thresholds, EPA also provides testing protocols that should be followed when measuring power in the ''sleep'' mode for the Energy Star Products. The Energy Star Program does not provide testing procedures for measuring power consumption in the active mode.

Additionally, the program accepts test data and other product data, including ''sleep'' mode values on products that qualify. The data is then compiled in an Energy Star Compliant Product Database. The database is available to interested parties in two versions. The first is a complete version that contains the full product description and other information such as power consumption in the ''sleep'' mode, network compatibility and monitor control protocol. This version is available from the EPA as a hard copy or on disk. The second version is an abbreviated version that contains a listing of compliant products by type and by manufacturer without further product description. This version is available from EPA by facsimile. Additionally, both versions of the database are available on the World Wide Web.

Energy Star partners agree to introduce Energy Star compliant equipment, perform tests to determine if products comply with the EPA specifications, and provide general information to users/purchasers regarding the Energy Star features of the equipment. This information might include a description of the Energy Star program, a discussion of the savings associated with using power-management features, and the method for changing the time before the equipment goes into a ''sleep'' mode. Partners may determine the best manner through which to disseminate this general information to users. Energy Star partners also agree to provide information about the Energy Star Program to all of its employees whose jobs are relevant to the development, marketing, sales, and service of Energy Star products. Since October 1995, computer partners have been required to ship their products with the energy savings features enabled. Printer, facsimile machine and copier manufacturers have been shipping their products enabled since the inception of their individual programs. The energy savings features can be disabled by the user.

EPA commits, in the Energy Star MOUs, to encourage acceptance of products bearing the Energy Star logo, to promote energy efficient equipment and to inform consumers about the Energy Star Program by writing articles and/or cooperating with news media by sharing information. EPA also agrees to provide partners with recognition for public service in protecting the environment and to work with partners, independently or in conjunction with other partners, to coordinate the placement of advertisements to promote energy efficient equipment, and educate consumers about the program.

The American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE), through its written comments, dated April 17, 1995, stated that the EPA Energy Star program does not meet the requirements of Section 125 of EPAct. ACEEE argued that the EPA Energy Star program does not include '''specifications for test procedures that will enable purchasers of such commercial office equipment to make more informed decisions about energy efficiency and costs of alternative products' and 'information, which may be disseminated through catalogs, trade publications, labels, or other mechanisms, that will allow consumers to assess the energy consumption and potential cost savings of alternative products''' as required by EPAct.

On September 26, 1995, ITI submitted a letter to the Department of Energy as a supplement to its April 14, 1995, letter. The letter encloses materials that cite the member companies' commitment to the Energy Star program as well as other voluntary efforts to disclose information about energy consumption to their customers. ITI also states in the letter, ''In addition to the enclosed documentation of the ongoing energy conservation efforts of computer manufacturers, individual member companies which manufacture other business equipment with significant peak power requirements will voluntarily undertake to provide energy consumption information along with sales literature that is given to institutional consumers.''

II. Discussion

Since the enactment of the EPAct, DOE has consulted with ITI and other interested organizations, and provided financial and technical assistance to support a voluntary national testing and information program for commercial

office equipment. DOE contracted with MIT and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory to help COPEE develop test procedures and information dissemination strategies. While the COPEE program was developing, the EPA Energy Star program was growing in participating partners and in covered products. The program has been expanded to include all of the products identified by COPEE to be included in its program. During the development of the testing procedures for office equipment, industry noted that the majority of the energy savings for office equipment could be achieved by having the products enter a ''sleep'' mode. The Energy Star program provides manufacturers with testing conditions and protocols to be followed when measuring power in the ''sleep'' mode. The Energy Star Logo lets the consumer know that the particular office equipment product qualifies for the Energy Star Program. If the product qualifies for the program and the energy saving features are enabled, the product will consume less energy than a similar model that does not qualify for the program (based on average usage patterns).

ITI commented in its letter dated April 14, 1995, that the Department of Energy ''should conclude that: (1) The Energy Star Program of the Environmental Protection Agency qualifies as a voluntary national energy efficiency testing and information program; (2) Efforts to develop an energy efficiency program, mandatory or voluntary, for commercial office equipment should be discontinued in light of the relatively insignificant energy savings as a result of such DOE program and the substantial energy savings achieved under the * * * Energy Star program; and (3) The Secretary of Energy, under Section 125(a) of EPAct, has sufficient authority to make such a determination.'' On January 5, 1996, ITI further commented ''that the program would be the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Energy Star program, not an ITI program.''

Additionally, COPEE's manufacturer members tested a sample of computers using the draft test procedures developed by the technical task groups. The results were then submitted to ITI. ITI reported that the testing of several manufacturers' products indicates that Non-Energy Star computers cost between $16.43 and $9.86 to operate annually, averaging $13.52 total usage costs per year. When power management is properly enabled (excluding energy use of the monitor), Energy Star computers cost between $9.45 and $3.95 to operate annually, averaging $6.53 per year. ITI further concluded that the tests do not show significant potential for greater energy savings through a separate consumer information program.

The American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE), through its written comments, dated April 17, 1995, stated that the ITI proposal to adopt the EPA Energy Star program does not meet the requirements of Section 125 of EPAct. ACEEE indicated that it ''do[es] not believe that it is within the current scope of the EPA Energy Star program to develop robust testing procedures for office equipment as specified in Section 125.'' ACEEE also challenged ''the ITI notion that the energy use differences between Energy Star and Non-Energy Star equipment types are significant while the differences within these ''categories' [are] insignificant.''

ACEEE further disagreed with ITI's proposal that the EPA Energy Star program fulfills the requirements of Section 125(a) of EPAct for a voluntary information program for consumers on office equipment energy use. ACEEE commented that ''it is not clear from the ITI proposal that DOE could be assured of manufacturers' increased, sustained support of Energy Star which would, in our opinion, be required to have Energy Star fully meet the intent of this provision of Section 125.'' ACEEE also stated that ''the brevity of the EPA [testing] guidelines may make comparisons between various manufacturers energy use figures inaccurate.'' ACEEE opposed the proposal from ITI that DOE accept the Energy Star program as fulfilling the requirements of Section 125 of EPAct.

ITI argues that industry, through Energy Star, is meeting the objectives of Section 125 of EPAct, and that there would be little additional benefit to either consumers or to the environment from a redundant program. ITI stated that consumers can rely on the Energy Star logo as a simple, easy-to-understand method of ensuring that they are purchasing energy efficient products.

DOE has monitored the efforts and progress of the COPEE program and the Energy Star program. The two programs, although created for different reasons, have become very similar in nature and form.

DOE acknowledges that although the Energy Star Program is not an ''industry based'' program, the commercial office equipment industry appears to be actively supporting and participating in the program. The Energy Star test procedures recommended by EPA appear to be generally used by industry to determine if products qualify for the Energy Star Program and Logo. However, the Energy Star Program, although comprehensive, does not provide consumers with the ability to determine and compare the annual energy consumption and potential cost savings of competing products. DOE believes that this increases the need for manufacturers, EPA and DOE to educate consumers about the Energy Star program, the advantages of power management, and the use of the Energy Star Logo to distinguish Energy Star compliant products from non-Energy Star products. DOE also believes there is a need for continued commitment by industry to manufacture Energy Star products.

III. Department's Determination

Based on the Department's evaluation of COPEE/ITI's efforts and the EPA Energy Star program, the Department believes that critical elements of a voluntary national testing and information program for commercial office equipment are operational or under development, and that the program can mature to a level consistent with the objectives of EPAct within three years. The critical elements now operational include the successful development and industry support of the EPA Energy Star program for computers, monitors, printers, facsimile machines and copiers, and the commitment by manufacturers to participate in the Energy Star Program and to voluntarily provide energy consumption information along with sales literature that is given to institutional consumers for monitors, printers, facsimile machines and copiers. As the program develops and matures, DOE expects that the current shortcomings of the program will be addressed by providing consumers with more information that enables comparison of the potential cost savings of alternative products; educating consumers about the program; and disseminating more broadly the information on ''sleep'' mode values gathered by the EPA. Ultimately, manufacturer participation in, and information dissemination associated with, the program need to be sufficient to ensure that a substantial majority of the purchasers of covered products have ready access to the types of information on energy use envisioned by Section 125 of EPAct.

Because ITI and its member manufacturers appear generally committed to these objectives, the Department has made a provisional determination that a voluntary labeling and information program built upon the

EPA Energy Star program for office equipment will likely meet the requirements of Section 125 of EPAct if it is fully developed and implemented. The Department will continue to monitor, evaluate and provide periodic assessments of the progress in developing the voluntary testing and labeling program for office equipment. DOE will also work with the industry and with EPA to encourage ongoing efforts to monitor energy use, savings, operating practices, and user satisfaction with energy-efficient office equipment in actual use.

In order for the Department to evaluate progress in these areas, close collaboration among ITI, the Department and EPA should be maintained to facilitate exchange of information and program updates. No later than July 15, 1998, the Department must receive data and documentation on the achievements of industry efforts in this area, including information as to whether the above objectives have been met, so that DOE can make its final determination. The Department expects to make a final determination within three years.

Issued in Washington, DC, April 11, 1996.

Christine A. Ervin,

Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 96–9566 Filed 4–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5415–7]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared April 1, 1996 Through April 5, 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) 564–7167.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 5, 1996 (61 FR 15251).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–L65256–ID Rating, NC, Salmon River Corridor, Implementation, Sawtooth National Recreation Area (SNRA), Sawtooth Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (FLRMP), Custer County, ID.

Summary: Due to the Federal Furlough of December 18, 1995, through January 5, 1996, the Environmental Protection Agency did not review/rate this EIS.

ERP No. D–FHW–E40767–FL Rating EC2, Tampa Interstate Project, Funding, I–275 to just north of Cypress Street and I–275 from the Howard Frankland Bridge/Kennedy Boulevard ramps north to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard and I–4 from I–275, Hillsborough County, FL.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns that the noise analysis included in the documentation is insufficient and that wetlands mitigation plans should be better described in the final EIS. Also, the additional noise and wetland impacts and mitigation information requested above should be included in the final EIS.

ERP No. D–FHW–K40216–AZ Rating LO, AZ-260 Transportation Improvements, between Payson and Heber, Funding, NPDES and COE Section 404 Permits, Gila, Coconino and Navajo Counties, AZ.

Summary: EPA expressed a lack of objection to the project as proposed.

ERP No. D–USN–C10003–00 Rating EC2, Relocatable Over The Horizon Radar (ROTHR) System Construction and Operation, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and Chesapeake, VA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding potential impacts to wetlands, to a natural resource conservation zone, as well as impacts from radiofrequency exposure. EPA requested that a ''no action'' alternative be addressed in the final EIS, and that a preferred location be identified for the proposed receiver facility.

ERP No. D–USN–L11029–WA Rating LO, Disposal of Decommissioned, Defueled Cruiser, Ohio Class and Los Angeles Class Naval Reactor Plants, Site Selection, Hanford Site, Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed a lack of objection to this document.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–AFS–L60099–ID Upper Swiftwater Timber Sale and Road Construction, Implementation, Selway Rangers District, Nez Perce National Forest, Idaho County, ID.

Summary: Due to the Federal Furlough of December 18, 1995, through January 5, 1996, the Environmental Protection Agency did not review/rate this EIS.

ERP No. F–AFS–L65233–OR Sandy River Delta Plan, Implementation, Special Management Area (SMA), Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area (NSA), Several Permits for Approval, US Coast Guard Bridge Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Multnomah County, OR.

Summary: Due to the Federal Furlough of December 18, 1995, through January 5, 1996, the Environmental Protection Agency did not review/rate this EIS.

ERP No. F–BLM–J60016–WY Kenetech/PacifiCorp Windpower Development Project, Construction of a 500–MW Windplant and 230-kV Transmission Line between Arlington and Hanna, Right-of-Way Grant, COE Section 404 Permit and Special-Use-Permit Issuance, Carbon County, WY.

Summary: EPA had no further comments or questions.

ERP No. F–FHW–E40332–FL FL–312 Extension Project, Construction, FL–207 to US 1/FL–5 north of the City of St. Augustine, Funding, Right-of-Way Permit, COE Section 404 and NPDES Permits, St. John County, FL.

Summary: EPA expressed continued environmental concerns regarding wetland impacts. A detailed wetland mitigation plan is still needed.

ERP No. F–FHW–K40188–CA CA–180 Freeway and Expressway Construction, Chestnut Avenue to Temperance Avenue, Funding and Possible COE Section 404 Permit, Fresno County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed continued concerns regarding air quality impacts. FHWA satisfactorily addressed other environmental concerns in the draft EIS.

ERP No. F–FHW–K50005–CA Twin Bridges Replacement across Chorro Creek, South Bay Boulevard, Funding and 404 Permit, City of Morro Bay, San Luis Obispo County, CA.

Summary: EPA requested that FHWA's Record of Decision reflect the conditions in the Army Corps' Section 404 permit for the project.

ERP No. F–TVA–E09801–00 Programmatic EIS—Energy Vision 2020, Integrated Resource Plan, Implementation of Long-Term Plan and Short-Term Action, TN, AL, KY, GA, MS, NC and VA.

Summary: EPA requested additional information regarding hydroelectric power, human health, water quality and global warming.

ERP No. F–UAF–C11011–NY Griffis Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Oneida County, NY.

Summary: EPA had no objection to the final EIS.

ERP No. F–UAF–C11019–NY Plattsburgh Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Clinton County, NY.