and the IAEA that entered into force on December 9, 1980.

The application of safeguards in Argentina and Brazil pursuant to the Safeguards Transfer Agreements will be suspended while the Quadripartite Agreement is in force and safeguards specified therein are being applied by the IAEA. The application of safeguards in the United States pursuant to the Safeguards Transfer Agreement is suspended while the Voluntary Offer Agreement between the IAEA and the United States, and the protocol thereto, is in force and safeguards specified therein are being applied by the IAEA. These protocols shall enter into force on the date on which the IAEA receives from Argentina, Brazil and the United States written notification of the fulfillment of their respective internal procedures.

In accordance with Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, it has been determined that this subsequent arrangement will not be inimical to the common defense and security.

This subsequent arrangement will take effect no sooner than fifteen days after the date of publication of this notice.

Dated: August 26, 1996.

For the Department of Energy.

Edward T. Fei,

Deputy Director International Policy and Analysis Division, Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

[FR Doc. 96–22189 Filed 8–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Hanford Site Tank Waste Remediation System, Richland, WA

AGENCY: Department of Energy and Washington State Department of Ecology.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) announce the availability of a Final EIS entitled ''Tank Waste Remediation System at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington'' (DOE/EIS–0189). DOE and Ecology co-prepared the EIS. DOE and Ecology revised the information in the Draft EIS in response to public comments and to reflect new environmental information that became available after the Draft EIS was issued in April 1996.

The EIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts of DOE's proposed action as well as reasonable alternatives for management and disposal of mixed, radioactive, and hazardous waste currently or projected to be stored in 177 underground storage tanks and in approximately 60 active and inactive miscellaneous underground storage tanks that were associated with Hanford's tank farm operations. In addition, the EIS evaluates the management and potential disposal of approximately 1,930 cesium and strontium capsules currently on loan or stored at the Hanford Site.

ADDRESSES: Requests for copies of the Final EIS and for further information on the Final EIS should be directed to Ms. Carolyn Haass, DOE TWRS EIS NEPA Document Manager, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, P.O. Box 1249, Richland, WA 99352. Requests for copies of the Draft EIS also can be made via the Internet at TWRSEIS@ken01.JACOBS.com or by calling Ecology's Hanford Information Line at 1–800–321–2008. Addresses of locations where the Final EIS will be available for public review are listed in this notice under ''DOE Reading Rooms and Information Repositories.'' The Final EIS is also available for review on the Internet at www.hanford.gov.

General information on the DOE National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process may be requested from Ms. Carol Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (EH–42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585. Ms. Borgstrom may be contacted by telephone at (202) 586–4600 or by leaving a message at 1–800–472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

DOE and Ecology issued a Draft EIS for public comment and published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on April 15, 1996 (61 FR 16471). EPA published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on April 12, 1996 (61 FR 16248). Public hearings on the Draft EIS were held in Pasco, Washington on May 2, 1996; Portland, Oregon on May 9, 1996; Arlington, Virginia on May 7, 1996; Spokane, Washington on May 15, 1996; and Seattle, Washington on May 22, 1996. All written and oral comments on the Draft EIS received during the 45 day public comment period were assessed and considered by DOE and Ecology both individually and collectively. Comment letters, transcripts of oral comments, and transcripts of public hearings and meetings are available for review at locations listed in this notice under ''DOE Reading Rooms and Information Repositories.''

DOE requested the National Academy of Science to review and comment on the TWRS Draft EIS. DOE will carefully consider all comments provided by the National Academy of Science and the public in the Record of Decision.

DOE and Ecology revised the information in the Draft EIS in response to public comments and to reflect new environmental information that became available after the Draft EIS was issued. Appendix L contains oral and written comments and DOE and Ecology's responses to the comments. Responses to comments included appropriate revisions of the EIS, answers to questions, explanations of technical issues, references to information in other DOE environmental impact statements, references to information provided in the Draft EIS, explanations of the relationship of this EIS to other related DOE NEPA documents, statements of government policy, or indications that the comment was outside the scope of this EIS.

The Final EIS has been filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and has also been distributed to Federal, State, and local officials, Tribal Nations, as well as agencies, organizations, and individuals who may be interested or affected. The Final EIS and supporting technical reports also are available for public review in DOE reading rooms and designated information repository locations identified in this notice. DOE plans to issue a Record of Decision on the EIS no sooner than 30 days after publication of EPA's notice of availability of the Final EIS in the Federal Register (i.e., no sooner than September 30, 1996).

Alternatives Considered

The Final EIS evaluates ten tank waste alternatives in detail:

- No Action—perform minimum activities required for safe and secure management of Hanford's tank wastes with the current tank farm configuration;
- Long-Term Management—perform minimum activities required for safe and secure management of Hanford's tank waste including upgrades to tank farms with the current single-shell tank farm configuration and the replacement of the double-shell tanks twice during a 100-year period;
- In Situ Fill and Cap—retrieve and evaporate liquid waste from the double-shell tanks, then fill all tanks with gravel and cover the tank farms with an earthen surface barrier, disposing of all tank waste onsite;
- In Situ Vitrification—retrieve and evaporate liquid waste from the double-shell tanks, then vitrify all of the tank

farms and cover the tank farms with an earthen surface barrier, disposing of all tank waste onsite;

• Ex Situ No Separations—retrieve all tank farm waste practicable (assumed to be 99 percent), then either vitrify or calcine the waste and package the treated waste form for onsite storage and eventual offsite disposal at a geologic repository;

• Ex Situ Intermediate Separations—retrieve all tank farm waste (99 percent) and separate the high-level and low-activity waste streams using sludge washing and ion exchange, then vitrify the waste streams in separate facilities and package the treated waste form for onsite disposal of immobilized low-activity waste and offsite disposal of the immobilized high-level waste at a geologic repository;

• Ex Situ Extensive Separations—retrieve all tank farm waste (99 percent) and separate into high-level and low-activity waste streams using sludge wash, ion exchange, caustic leach and acid dissolution, then vitrify the waste streams in separate facilities and package the treated waste form for onsite disposal of the immobilized low-activity waste and onsite storage and eventual offsite disposal of the immobilized high-level waste at a geologic repository;

• Ex Situ/In Situ Combination 1—retrieve waste from 70 tanks based on the potential long-term risks to human health or the environment, separate the retrieved waste into high-level and low-activity waste streams using sludge washing and ion exchange, then vitrify the waste streams in separate facilities and package the treated waste form for onsite disposal of the immobilized low-activity waste and onsite storage and eventual offsite disposal of the immobilized high-level waste at a geologic repository. Fill all tanks, including those with waste that had not been retrieved, with gravel, and cover the tanks with a barrier, permanently disposing of the waste in-place;

• Ex Situ/In Situ Combination 2—retrieve waste from 25 tanks based on the potential long-term risks to human health or the environment, separate the retrieved waste into high-level and low-activity waste streams using sludge washing and ion exchange, then vitrify the waste streams in separate facilities and package the treated waste form for onsite disposal of the immobilized low-activity waste and onsite storage and eventual offsite disposal of the immobilized high-level waste at a geologic repository. Fill all tanks, including those with waste that had not been retrieved, with gravel, and cover the tanks with a barrier, permanently disposing of the waste in-place; and

• Phased Implementation—for Phase 1, construct commercial demonstration-scale facilities that would include one low-activity waste separations and vitrification demonstration plant and one low-activity and high-level waste vitrification demonstration plant to operate for up to 10 years. These facilities could treat up to 30 percent of the tank waste by volume during the 10-year operating period. For Phase 2, construct larger capacity separations and vitrification plants, retrieve the remaining waste, separate the waste into low-activity and high-level waste streams, vitrify the waste in separate facilities, package the waste, and dispose of the low-activity waste onsite in near-surface vaults and the high-level waste offsite at a geologic repository.

The cesium and strontium capsules are currently classified as waste by-product and are therefore available for beneficial uses. If beneficial uses cannot be found, the capsules would be subject to management and disposal actions as high-level waste. As in the Draft EIS, cesium and strontium capsule alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS are:

• No Action—Continue existing operations and maintenance in the Hanford Site Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility for 10 years;

• Onsite Disposal—overpack the cesium and strontium in canisters and store onsite indefinitely in a newly constructed dry-well storage facility;

• Overpack and Ship—overpack the cesium and strontium into canisters, which would then be overpacked into Multi-Purpose Canisters, and dispose of offsite at the proposed national high-level waste repository; and

• Vitrify with Tank Waste—remove capsule contents and vitrify with the high-level tank waste, place in Multi-Purpose Canisters, and dispose of offsite at a geologic repository.

Preferred Alternatives

DOE and Ecology's preferred tank waste alternative in the EIS is the Phased Implementation alternative. DOE and Ecology's preferred alternative for the Hanford Site's cesium and strontium capsules is the No Action alternative.

Availability of Copies of the Final EIS

Copies of the Final EIS are being distributed to Federal, State, and local officials and agencies; to organizations and individuals known to be interested in the EIS; and to persons and agencies that commented on the Draft EIS. Additional copies may be obtained by contacting Ms. Carolyn Haass, DOE TWRS EIS NEPA Document Manager, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, P.O. Box 1249, Richland, Washington 99352. Requests for copies also can be made via the Internet at:

TWRSEIS@ken01.JACOBS.com or by calling Ecology's Hanford Information Line at 1–800– 321–2008. Addresses of DOE Public Reading Rooms and Information Repositories where the EIS and reference documents will be available for public review are listed below:

Summary of the EIS

Summary:
- Summary of the alternatives and analysis presented in the EIS

Volume One:
- Main Text of the Tank Waste Remediation System EIS

Volume Two:
- Appendices Supporting Volume One
- Appendix A. Waste Inventory
- Appendix B. Description of Alternatives
- Appendix C. Alternatives Rejected from Analysis

Volume Three:
- Appendix Supporting Volume One
- Appendix D. Anticipated Health and Ecological Risks

Volume Four:
- Appendices Supporting Volume One
- Appendix E. Accident Risks
- Appendix F. Groundwater Modeling

Volume Five:
- Appendices Supporting Volume One
- Appendix G. Air Quality Modeling
- Appendix H. Socioeconomic Impact Modeling
- Appendix I. Affected Environment
- Appendix J. Consultation Letters
- Appendix K. Uncertainties Analysis

Volume Six:
- Appendix Containing Comments and DOE and Ecology Responses and Supporting Changes to the Summary and Volumes One through Six made in Response to Comments
- Appendix L. Comments and Agency Responses

The Summary of the EIS is available for those who do not wish to receive the entire Final EIS. When requesting copies of the Final EIS, please indicate whether you wish to receive only the Summary (50 pages), the Summary and Volume One (620 pages), or the entire EIS, including the appendices (3,100 pages).

DOE Public Reading Rooms and Information Repositories

University of Washington, Suzzallo Library, Government Publications

Room, Seattle, WA 98185. (206) 685–9855, Monday–Thursday 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Friday and Saturday 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Gonzaga University, Foley Center, E. 502 Boone, Spokane, WA 99258. (509) 328–4220 ext. 3829, Monday–Thursday 8:00 a.m. to midnight, Friday 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Saturday 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Sunday 11:00 a.m. to midnight.

U.S. Department of Energy Reading Room, Washington State University, Tri-Cities Campus, 100 Sprout Road, Room 130W, Richland, WA 99352, (509) 376–8583, Monday–Friday 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Portland State University, Bradford Price Millar Library, Science and Engineering Floor, S.W. Harrison and Park, Portland, OR 97207, (503) 725–3690, Monday–Friday 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Saturday 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Sunday 11:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

U.S. Department of Energy, Headquarters, Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, 1E–190 Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586–6020, Monday–Friday 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Issued in Washington, D.C., this day August 26, 1996.

Stephen P. Cowan,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste Management.

[FR Doc. 96–22186 Filed 8–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP96–735–000]

Northern Natural Gas Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

August 26, 1996.

Take notice that on August 21, 1996, Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), 1111 South 103rd Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68124–1000, filed in Docket No. CP96–735–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.212) for authorization to install and operate a new delivery point to accommodate natural gas deliveries to Western Gas Utilities, Inc. (WGU) for delivery to the proposed Darwin town border station (TBS), located in Meeker County, Minnesota, under Northern's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–401–000 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.

Northern states that it requests authority to install and operate the proposed delivery point to accommodate natural gas deliveries to WGU under Northern's currently effective throughput service agreements. Northern asserts that WGU has requested the proposed delivery point to accommodate service due to expansion of its distribution system into new areas. The estimated volumes proposed to be delivered to WGU at the Darwin TBS are 350 MMBtu on a peak day and 53,550 MMBtu on an annual basis. Northern states that the estimated cost to install the delivery point is $50,000, and that WGU will reimburse Northern for the cost to install the proposed delivery point.

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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–22164 Filed 8–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. OA96–219–000]

Vermont Marble Power Division of OMYA, Inc.; Notice of Filing

August 26, 1996.

Take notice that on August 1, 1996, Vermont Marble Power Division of OMYA, Inc. (VMPD), submitted for filing pursuant to Section 35.28(d) of the Commission's Regulations, 18 CFR 35.28(d), a request that the Commission grant it a waiver from the requirements of §§ 35.28(c), 37.4(c) and § 37.5 of the Commission's Regulations, to file open access transmission service tariffs, to prepare and file written procedures to implement the standards of conduct set forth in § 37.4 of the Commission's Regulations, and to maintain information system.

VMPD has served its Request for Waiver on the Vermont Department of Public Service, the Vermont Public Service Board, and certain of the Vermont distribution and transmission utilities with which it conducts business.

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, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214 and the Commission's ''Order Clarifying Order Nos. 888 and 889 Compliance Matters,'' issued in Docket No. RM95–8–000 et al. on July 2, 1996. All such motions or protests 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 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. 96–22167 Filed 8–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. ER96–1733–000, et al.]

Wisconsin Power & Light Company, et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

August 23, 1996.

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

1. Wisconsin Power and Light Company

[Docket No. ER96–1733–000]

Take notice that on August 15, 1996, Wisconsin Power and Light Company (WP&L) tendered for filing an amendment in its May 6, 1996, filing in this docket.

WP&L requests an effective date of May 7, 1996, and accordingly seeks waiver of the Commission's notice requirements.

Copies of this filing have been served upon MG&E and the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin.

Comment date: September 6, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.