their own behalf. An individual may register a group of commenters, but such groups will be scheduled to speak last, and only to the extent time is available after individuals have commented. Persons who have not registered in advance may register to comment when they arrive at the hearing to the extent time is available.

Speakers should confirm their scheduled time at the registration desk the day of the hearing. Persons presenting oral comments at the hearing are requested to provide DOE with written copies of their comments at the hearing, if possible.

More details are available in the public involvement plan. To obtain a copy of that plan call 1–800–336–9477.

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 25th day of November, 1996.

Alvin L. Alm,

Assistant Secretary, Environmental Management.

[FR Doc. 96–30460 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Disposal of the S1C Prototype Reactor Plant

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Naval Reactors (Naval Reactors) has completed and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency the Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Disposal of the S1C Prototype Reactor Plant. The Final Environmental Impact Statement was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969; Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508); and DOE NEPA Implementing Procedures (10 CFR Part 1021). The Final Environmental Impact Statement and its supporting references will be available to the public at the Windsor, Connecticut Public Library. The Final Environmental Impact Statement is also available by mail upon request.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The S1C Prototype reactor plant is located on the 10.8 acre Windsor Site in Windsor, Connecticut, approximately 5 miles north of Hartford. The S1C Prototype reactor plant first started operation in 1959 and served for more than 30 years as both a facility for testing reactor plant components and equipment and for training Naval personnel. As a result of the end of the Cold War and the downsizing of the Navy, the S1C Prototype reactor plant was shut down in 1993. Since then, the S1C Prototype reactor plant has been defueled, drained, and placed in a stable protective storage condition.

Alternatives Considered

1. Prompt Dismantlement—Preferred Alternative

This alternative would involve the prompt dismantlement of the reactor plant. All structures would be removed from the Windsor Site, and the Windsor Site would be released for unrestricted use. To the extent practicable, the resulting low-level radioactive metals would be recycled at existing commercial facilities that recycle radioactive metals. The remaining low-level radioactive waste would be disposed of at the DOE Savannah River Site in South Carolina. The Savannah River Site currently receives low-level radioactive waste from Naval Reactors sites in the eastern United States. Both the volume and radioactive content of the S1C Prototype reactor plant low-level waste fall within the projections of Naval Reactor waste provided to the Savannah River Site, which are included in the Savannah River Site Waste Management Final Environmental Impact Statement dated July 1995.

2. Deferred Dismantlement

This alternative would involve keeping the defueled S1C Prototype reactor plant in protective storage for 30 years before dismantling it. Deferring dismantlement for 30 years would allow nearly all of the cobalt-60 radioactivity to decay away. Nearly all of the gamma radiation within the reactor plant comes from cobalt-60.

3. No Action

This alternative would involve keeping the defueled S1C Prototype reactor plant in protective storage indefinitely. Since there is some residual radioactivity with very long half lives such as nickel-59 in the defueled reactor plant, this alternative would leave this radioactivity at the Windsor Site indefinitely.

4. Other Alternatives Considered

These alternatives include permanent on-site disposal. Such on-site disposal could involve building an entombment structure over the S1C Prototype reactor plant or developing a below ground disposal area at the Windsor Site. Another alternative would be to remove the S1C Prototype reactor plant as a single large reactor compartment package for offsite disposal. Each of these alternatives was considered but eliminated from detailed analysis.

Public Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Naval Reactors held a public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in Windsor, Connecticut. Comments from 28 individuals and agencies were received in either oral or written statements at the hearing or in comment letters. Nearly all of the commenters expressed a preference for the prompt dismantlement alternative. Most comments resulted in either no changes or minor clarifications in the final environmental impact statement. The comments which resulted in the more significant changes are discussed briefly below. All of the comments and the Naval Reactors responses are included in an appendix to the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Some comments requested additional detail on the process, surveys, and criteria identified in the draft environmental impact statement for unrestricted release of the site under either the prompt dismantlement or deferred dismantlement alternatives. In response to these comments, appendices are included in the final environmental impact statement which provide additional details on these matters.

Several comments questioned whether the cost and volume of radioactive waste generated for each alternative included site remediation as well as reactor dismantlement. The draft environmental impact statement discussed the overall site remediation impacts; however the quantitative cost and waste volume discussions focused on the dismantlement of the reactor plant, which is where essentially all of the radioactivity is located. The final environmental impact statement includes impacts from all efforts anticipated from the time of the record of decision until completion of each alternative (in the cases of prompt and deferred dismantlement, this is through transfer of the property to another owner). The most significant changes reflected in the final environmental impact statement are cost, volume (but not number of shipments) of radioactive waste, and the volume and number of shipments of non-radioactive, non-hazardous solid waste. These changes did not change significantly the estimated impact of the alternatives on the environment or the health and safety of the workers or the public.

Preferred Alternative

Because prompt dismantlement would result in unrestricted release of the Windsor Site at the earliest time with little occupational radiation exposure risk to the workers, and given that impacts associated with prompt dismantlement have a higher degree of certainty, Naval Reactors has identified prompt dismantlement as the preferred alternative.

Availability of Copies of the Final Environmental Impact Statement

The Final Environmental Impact Statement has been distributed to interested Federal, State, and local agencies, and to individuals who have expressed interest. Copies of the Final Environmental Impact Statement and its supporting references are available for inspection at the Windsor Public Library at 323 Broad Street, Windsor, CT 06095. Requests for copies of the Final Environmental Impact Statement should be directed to Mr. C. G. Overton, Chief, Windsor Field Office, Office of Naval Reactors, U.S. Department of Energy, P.O. Box 393, Windsor, CT 06095; telephone (860) 687–5610.

Issued at Arlington, VA this 22nd day of November 1996.

F.L. Bowman,

Admiral, U.S. Navy, Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program.

[FR Doc. 96–30451 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP97–86–000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

November 22, 1996.

Take notice that on November 19, 1996, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the tariff sheet listed as follows to become effective on December 19, 1996:

First Revised Sheet No. 420

Columbia states that the tariff sheet is submitted to comply with Order No. 582, specifically with Section 154.109(b) of the Commission's regulations respecting the financing and construction of lateral facilities, including new delivery points.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's rules and regulations. All motions or protests must be filed as provided in Section 154.210 of the Commission's regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but such protests will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the public reference room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–30424 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. RP97–85–000]

Northern Border Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

November 22, 1996.

Take notice that on November 19, 1996, Northern Border Pipeline Company (Northern Border) tendered for filing to become part of Northern Border Pipeline Company's FERC Gas Tariff, First Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets to become effective January 1, 1997:

Eighth Revised Sheet Number 156
Ninth Revised Sheet Number 157

Northern Border states that it proposes to increase the Maximum Rate from 4.221 cents per 100 Dekatherm-Miles to 5.345 cents per 100 Dekatherm-Miles and to increase the Minimum Revenue Credit from 2.213 cents per 100 Dekatherm-Miles to 2.259 cents per 100 Dekatherm-Miles. The revised Maximum Rate and Minimum Revenue Credit are being filed in accordance with Northern Border's Tariff provisions under Rate Schedule IT–1.

On October 15, 1996, Northern Border filed with the Commission in Docket No. RP96–45–000 a Stipulation and Agreement (Stipulation) in its rate case which when placed into effect will result in a significantly lower cost of service and resulting Maximum Rate under Rate Schedule IT–1. Once the Stipulation is effective, Northern Border will make the appropriate filing to effectuate a Maximum Rate based on the cost of service established by the terms of the Stipulation.

Northern Border states that the herein proposed changes do not result in a change in Northern Border's total revenue requirement.

Northern Border states that copies of this filing have been sent to all of Northern Border's contracted shippers.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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 must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–30423 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. RP96–270–002]

Northern Natural Gas Company; Notice of Compliance Filing

November 22, 1996.

Take notice that on November 20, 1996, Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), tendered for filing to become part of Northern's FERC Gas Tariff, Fifth Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets proposed to be effective November 1, 1996:

Substitute Second Revised Sheet No. 135
Original Sheet No. 135A
Original Sheet No. 135B
Original Sheet No. 135C
Original Sheet No. 135D
Substitute Second Revised Sheet No. 136

On June 6, 1996 in Docket No. RP96–270–000, Northern filed tariff sheets to provide increased storage service flexibility under its FDD and IDD Rate Schedules. The Commission issued an order on July 5, 1996 and a technical conference was held on August 1, 1996. On November 5, 1996, the Commission issued an ''Order after Technical Conference''. Northern states that the reason for this filing is to comply with the Commission's Order.

Northern states that copies of the filing were served upon the company's customers and interested State Commissions.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be