will consider projects ranging from one (1) to three (3) years in length.

Eligible applicants must have a teaming arrangement consisting of two or more chemical companies. (A ''chemical company'' is defined as a private (profit or non-profit) organization that manufactures chemicals or provides products or serves to such manufactures. In addition to chemical manufacturers, raw material suppliers, equipment and technology suppliers, architectural and engineering companies, software and consulting firms, trade and professional associations, and research institutes that routinely conduct a minimum of 10% of their business with chemical industry manufactures are within the scope of the definition.) In addition, the teaming arrangement may also include, but is not limited to, universities, trade associations, DOE National Laboratories, and small businesses. All projects must offer significant energy savings when compared to the currently-used technology. Eligible applicants must cost share at least 50% of project costs and projects should be planned for one to three years in duration. Teaming arrangements with DOE National Laboratories are encouraged, however national laboratories may not serve as the prime applicant and may not provide cost share. Industry partner(s) must perform at least 50% of the proposed effort. Further, applicants should describe the work to be performed and plans for project management and technology commercialization; describe how the work will advance one or more of the priority needs of the roadmaps and/or above topic areas; estimate energy savings and waste and emission reductions; describe the innovative aspects of the technology; and provide information on the qualifications and experience of both the project team and of key personnel.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Stricker at (630) 252–2888, U.S. Department of Energy, 9800 South Cass Avenue, Argonne, IL 60439–4899; by fax at (630) 252–5045; or by e–mail at jennifer.stricker@ch.doe.gov.

Issued in Chicago, Illinois on April 28, 1999.

John D. Greenwood,

Acquisition and Assistance Group Manager.

[FR Doc. 99–11406 Filed 5–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Bonneville Power Administration

Mid-Columbia Coho Salmon Reintroduction Feasibility Project

AGENCY: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and floodplain statement of findings.

SUMMARY: This notice announces BPA's proposal to fund research for 2 to 3 years on the feasibility of reintroducing coho salmon into mid-Columbia River basin tributaries. The research would take place in the Methow and Wenatchee river basins in Chelan and Okanogan counties, Washington. BPA has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOE/EA–1282) evaluating the proposed project. Based on the analysis in the EA, BPA has determined that the proposed action is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. Therefore, the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required, and BPA is issuing this FONSI.

The FONSI includes a finding that there is no practicable alternative to locating a portion of the project within 100-year floodplains.

ADDRESSES: For copies of this FONSI or the EA, please call BPA's toll-free document request line: 800–622–4520.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Weintraub, KECN, Bonneville Power Administration, P.O. Box 3621, Portland, Oregon, 97208–3621, phone number 503–230–5373, fax number 503–230–5699.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: BPA proposes to fund coho research and broodstock development in the Wenatchee and Methow river basins for 2 to 3 years. BPA is responding to a need to determine the ecological risks and biological feasibility of reintroducing coho to mid-Columbia River basin tributaries, from which they have been extirpated for at least a half century. Reintroduction of coho into the mid-Columbia region has been identified by regional fish-managing entities as one of fifteen high-priority projects for the Columbia River basin. The project is included in the Northwest Power Planning Council's (Council) Fish and Wildlife Program, and was recommended by the Council to BPA for funding in 1996. However, before a full-scale reintroduction program is implemented, feasibility research needs to be conducted. Besides BPA, project participants include Yakama Indian Nation (YIN) and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), co-managers; National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); U.S. Forest Service (USFS); and Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation.

Federal and State fish agencies and YIN, as well as environmental groups and individual citizens, have been strongly interested in the project. In the Wenatchee and Methow basins, there are several fish species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), as well as several other game fish species, which are the subject of various enhancement programs. The primary concern of most organizations and citizens has been the potential for reintroduced coho to prey on or compete with other weakened, sensitive, or prized species in the two basins. BPA has participated in extensive discussions leading to alternatives that BPA seriously considered and included in this EA/FONSI (see below). BPA has remained open to the views of the community and all project participants as well as those of the original project proponents (YIN). We realize this project, if fully implemented, could increase the risk of harm to other sensitive fish species in the basin. We believe, however, that in this first phase, the feasibility studies, the risks are low and that they are manageable through monitoring and annual review by project participants, with adjustments as necessary to minimize risks. This FONSI documents that the research can be conducted without significant environmental impacts.

Several possible alternative plans have been identified and are addressed in the EA (Chapter 2). Briefly, they are as follows:

- *Tribal Alternative (Proposed Action):* BPA would fund research into all life phases of coho and their interactions with other species in the Wenatchee and Methow basins, including survival, natural spawning, predation, residualism, and productivity studies; genetics monitoring; and a broodstock development program. Research would depend on acclimation and release of up to 1,000,000 coho smolts in the Wenatchee basin and up to 400,000 smolts in the Methow. Up to three of six alternative acclimation sites would be developed in the Wenatchee; up to three existing acclimation sites in the Methow would be used.

• *Phased Study Alternative:* BPA would fund research as described above, including coho releases and acclimation site development, in the Wenatchee basin only.

• Hatchery Releases Alternative: BPA would fund research, including coho releases, designed to answer one key question: can adult coho return to the mid-Columbia in sufficient numbers to replace themselves? Coho would be acclimated and released only at existing hatcheries in the Wenatchee basin; acclimation in natural habitats would not take place. Studies of coho predation and ability to naturally reproduce would not be done.

• *No-Action Alternative:* Continue coho releases of 700,000 smolts/yearlings/etc. as is done currently under the Management Agreement for 1997 Brood Upper Columbia River Coho, a stipulated order under *United States* v. *Oregon*. There would be no BPA funding or participation and no in-basin acclimation. Release numbers and locations would be agreed to annually by parties to the order. Little, if any, research would be done.

Table 4 in the EA summarizes the impacts of each alternative. The impacts of two of the three action alternatives (Tribal and Phased Study) are similar in nature and intensity; the primary difference between the two is that the geographic scope is reduced in the Phased Study alternative. The impacts of the third action alternative (Hatchery Releases) overall are lower in intensity than the other two. BPA has determined, based on the context and intensity of these impacts, that they are not significant, using the definition of this concept in section 1508.27 of the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. This determination is based on the following discussion of each point listed in section 1508.27:

1. The project aims to develop knowledge about how a largely domesticated stock might be reintroduced and naturalized in a basin where it has long been absent. This knowledge may be applicable throughout the Columbia basin. When combined with other current and future research on similar issues, the cumulative benefit of the mid-Columbia project would be to increase the chances that other reintroduction projects would succeed, and that the concomitant resource risks would be reduced. These activities would serve to answer critical uncertainties associated with future reintroduction activities. While the benefits of the proposed research warrant BPA funding, the results from this 2–3 year project alone would not significantly increase the potential for success of reintroduction projects in the region.

2. Implementation of the Tribal, Phased Study, or Hatchery Releases alternatives would not affect the health and safety of the people of the Wenatchee or Methow basins. As documented in section 3.4.1.2 and 3.4.2 of the EA, water and chemical use and wastewater discharges would be within permitted amounts. Water temperatures of local rivers would not be increased because amounts used for acclimation sites (Tribal and Phased Study alternatives) would be small, in most cases water would be part of natural or existing ponds, and use would occur in early spring when water is cold and flows are high (section 3.4.1.3). Screw traps are an obstacle to recreational boaters such as rafters, kayakers, and others. However, traps would be located away from high-use areas for recreational boaters and would be flagged to warn boaters of their presence. These issues are not significant in the context of NEPA because the risks are small relative to other factors affecting health and safety in the local area.

3. Research activities for all alternatives would take place in environmentally sensitive areas. However, because acclimation sites are already developed in the Methow basin (Tribal alternative), and because only one of six alternative sites in the Wenatchee basin requires construction-type activity to develop (Tribal and Phased Study), most sensitive areas would not be affected. Specifically:

a. In the Wenatchee basin, Icicle Creek near one proposed acclimation site, and White River near another have been recommended by the Wenatchee National Forest for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System as Recreational Rivers. Installation of a temporary smolt screen at Icicle Creek, and installation of a temporary net and smolt exit pipe in a beaver dam at White River Side Channels, would not adversely affect the recreational and other values of the rivers (EA, section 3.4.1.3).

b. Although proposed acclimation sites are located in ecologically critical areas such as wetlands, floodplains, and State Shoreline areas, development of only one alternative site in the Wenatchee basin (Two Rivers) would adversely affect those areas. A wetland, a 100-year floodplain, and a State Shoreline area could be affected if that site is developed (Tribal Alternative and Phased Study). Acclimation ponds for the site would be dug on the property of an operating sand and gravel quarry in an already disturbed area. The smolt exit channel, however, would disturb or destroy riparian and/or wetland vegetation for a distance of about 80 meters (260 feet). Plant surveys would be completed before ponds and channels are designed and constructed to determine if any sensitive species occupy the area. If any sensitive species are found, the areas would be avoided or the site would not be developed. To avoid impacts on wetlands, information from wetlands delineation surveys would be used during final design to develop mitigation measures, if necessary, to ensure that the project would result in no net loss of wetlands. Buffers from construction activities would be provided. Upon completion of construction, disturbed land would be restored to its previous condition wherever possible. (EA, section 3.4.1.3). Therefore, impacts on wetlands, floodplains, and State Shorelines would not be significant.

The actions proposed would not affect prime farmland or park lands, as there are none present in the vicinity.

4. The impacts of actions proposed under the three action alternatives are not significant due to their controversy. Controversy that surfaced during development and review of the draft EA centered on the number and locations of coho smolt releases and the consequent level of risk to endangered spring chinook populations in the Wenatchee basin, as originally proposed under the Tribal Alternative. BPA and project participants subsequently developed release numbers and sites for 1999 that parties agree pose minimal risk to spring chinook, and they are committed to reaching agreement on future release numbers and sites to maintain minimal risk for the research period.

5. The impacts of actions proposed under the three action alternatives are not significant due to the degree of highly uncertain, unique, or unknown risks. These issues were raised by project participants and members of the public, particularly in regard to the risks of predation by coho smolts on spring chinook. Concerns were that not enough research has been completed to date to confirm that releases of coho smolts in or near spring chinook habitat would not pose a significant predation risk. While one year of study has been completed in the Yakima Basin that did not show significant predation of coho smolts on spring chinook, several project participants believe that additional studies are needed. In order to address this issue, proposed smolt release numbers in Nason Creek, the primary spring chinook habitat, were

reduced for 1999, and an additional year of study is planned in the Yakima Basin. The fish managers (YIN and WDFW) have agreed that they will annually review the results of the previous year's research and come to agreement on release numbers and locations for the subsequent years based on the results of the ongoing research. The Biological Opinion from the National Marine Fisheries Service supports the conclusion that, with monitoring and risk containment measures (EA, section 3.3.1.2), the risk to spring chinook would not jeopardize their continued existence.

6. The actions proposed would not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. Contrary to the assertions of some, this project does not constitute a decision to reintroduce coho to mid-Columbia tributaries. BPA is unwilling to commit substantial resources to such an effort without some indication of its potential for success, as reintroduction of an extirpated fish species is not a well-researched action. If research shows that the potential exists for full-scale reintroduction to be successful, and that impacts to other sensitive species can be minimized to acceptable levels, then, under NEPA, the time would be ''ripe'' to assess the effects of such a program.

7. The proposal is not connected (40 CFR 1508.25(a)(1)) to other actions with potentially significant impacts, nor is it related to other proposed actions with cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.25(a)(2)). Section 3.6 of the EA addresses the cumulative fishery resource impacts. Although the proposed action is related to actions being addressed under the Impacts of Artificial Salmon and Steelhead Production Strategies in the Columbia River Basin Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS), it is not precluded by 40 CFR 1506.1 or 10 CFR 1021.211 because it is not a major Federal action and would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The actions proposed are independent of the actions proposed under the Draft EIS and would not prejudice the ultimate decision on the program, as they are low-tech, minimal-impact actions to be taken for research purposes to answer specific questions regarding the potential impacts of and viability of an artificial coho production program in the mid-Columbia. Additional environmental review would be completed prior to the initiation of any long-term, full-scale production program.

8. There are no sites listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places at or near any facility location. Only one of the six potential acclimation sites in the Wenatchee basin (Tribal and Phased Study alternatives) could require ground disturbance (EA, section 3.4.1.3). If developed, its final location would be surveyed before construction to insure that it would not adversely affect cultural resources, including tribal traditional use areas.

9. Several fish, wildlife, and plant species in the Wenatchee and Methow basins are listed or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. Of those discussed in the EA in Chapter 3, the following could be affected:

a. *Upper Columbia River spring-run chinook,* listed as Endangered, spawn and rear in habitat near proposed coho release sites in the Wenatchee and Methow basins. However, little impact to spring chinook is expected because most coho acclimation/release sites are downstream of the primary spawning and summer rearing areas; once released, coho tend to migrate downstream rapidly; most returning adult coho spawners will home to their points of release, which are downstream of the spring chinook spawning/rearing reaches; and most adult coho would be collected to develop the localized broodstock, so few would be spawning in the wild. In addition, as discussed in #4 and #5 above and in section 3.3.1.2 of the EA, risk of impact to spring chinook would be further minimized by working with other fish managers to determine coho release sites and numbers that minimize risk; by releasing coho smolts in low densities; by releasing fish that more closely resemble sizes of wild coho, which tend to be smaller than hatchery fish; and by waiting until smolts are ready to actively migrate before releasing them.

b. *Bull trout* are listed as Threatened. There could be minor, temporary disturbances to bull trout migratory corridor habitat during construction of the Two Rivers acclimation site smolt exit channel, but erosion and sedimentation control best management practices would ensure impacts were not significant. Migratory adult bull trout could be taken during rotary screw trap sampling, beach seining, electro-fishing, and adult coho broodstock collection. To minimize impacts, rotary traps would be attended 24 hours a day and checked every hour to remove fish and debris from the livebox. Bull trout found in the livebox would be released immediately. Bull trout captured by other collection methods also would be released immediately. To reduce potential mortality from electro-fishing, only personnel trained in the technique would be employed. They would follow guidelines for such procedures recently established by NMFS (NMFS 1998) (EA, section 3.5.1; Biological Assessment [BA], section 5.10). Therefore, impacts to bull trout would not be significant.

c. *The grizzly bear* is listed as Threatened. To access the White River Side Channel acclimation site (Tribal and Phased Study alternatives), the Sears Creek Road would be plowed in late March. This area has been identified as potential spring emergence grizzly habitat, although no use occurs at present. The project would install a locked gate at the point where plowing would begin to control the amount of disturbance from use of the road. All the acclimation sites are in areas with at least moderate human disturbance. There would be no disturbance to grizzly bear habitat from the project (EA, section 3.4.1.3; BA, section 5.4). Therefore, there would be no significant effects to grizzly bears from this project.

d. *Two plants—Ute's Ladies Tresses* (Threatened) and *Wenatchee (Oregon) checkermallow* (Proposed, Wenatchee basin only)—could be at or near the Two Rivers acclimation site (Tribal and Phased Study alternatives). If the site were developed, it would be surveyed before ground disturbing activity begins. If plants are found, they would be avoided or the site would not be developed, so these two plants would not be adversely affected (EA, section 3.4.1.3).

Other listed and proposed fish and wildlife species in the two basins would not be adversely affected (EA, Chapter 3).

10. The actions proposed would not threaten to violate Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. The following permits and consultation may be required and will be obtained, as needed: Section 7 consultation and incidental take permit for trapping and electroshocking activities proposed in 2000 and 2001 (NMFS and USFWS), shoreline development permit (Chelan County), hydraulic project approval permit (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife), State water quality certification (Washington Department of Ecology), modifications to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits, USFS land use permits, Clean Water Act Section 404 permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), and use permits for nets across highway culverts (Washington Department of Transportation). Final determinations regarding the need for permits will be

made after project participants decide on the final course of action.

Floodplain Statement of Findings

This is a Floodplain Statement of Findings prepared in accordance with 10 CFR Part 1022. A Notice of Floodplain and Wetlands Involvement was published in the **Federal Register** on November 9, 1998, and impacts to floodplains and wetlands were assessed in the EA (section 3.4.1.3). At one alternative acclimation site (Two Rivers), BPA would dig a smolt exit channel from the new ponds to the Little Wenatchee River, within the 100-year floodplain. The channel needs to pass through the floodplain in order to allow smolts access to the river. There are no alternatives that would avoid constructing the smolt exit channel in the floodplain at the Two Rivers site; however, there are alternative acclimation sites identified in the EA that would not affect floodplains. The actions proposed would conform to applicable State and local floodplain protection standards; a county floodplain development permit would be obtained, if needed, for work in the floodplain of the Little Wenatchee River.

The steps to be taken to avoid or minimize potential harm to or within the affected floodplain and wetlands include:

- In floodplain and shoreline areas, disturbed land would be restored as closely as possible to pre-project contours and replanted with native and local species. However, site topography could require bank disruption. A restoration and monitoring plan would be prepared before disturbing floodplain and shoreline areas.
- Erosion control measures would be implemented within the 60-meter (200-foot) State Shoreline area.
- Location of new structures within the identified shoreline and floodplain would be avoided.

BPA will endeavor to allow 15 days of public review after publication of this statement of findings before implementing the selected alternative.

Determination

Based on the information in the EA, as summarized here, BPA determines that the actions proposed, as described and analyzed in either the Tribal, Phased Study, or Hatchery Releases alternatives, are not major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of NEPA, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.* Therefore, an EIS will not be prepared, and BPA is issuing this FONSI.

Issued in Portland, Oregon, on April 28, 1999.

James R. Meyer,

Acting Vice President, Environment, Fish and Wildlife Group.

[FR Doc. 99–11533 Filed 5–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Program for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts, Clothes Washers, and Water Heaters

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of public workshops.

SUMMARY: The Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended (EPCA or Act), requires the Department of Energy (DOE or Department) to consider amending the energy conservation standards for certain major household appliances. This notice announces three public workshops as steps in the appliance standards rulemaking procedures. These public workshops will be conducted for the rulemakings on revised energy efficiency standards for fluorescent lamp ballasts, clothes washers, and water heaters.

DATES: The following table lists the respective analyses release dates, workshop dates, and comment period dates.

	Fluorescent lamp ballasts	Clothes washers	Water heaters
Release Analyses	April 27, 1999	June 14, 1999	June 14, 1999.
Comments Due	May 18, 1999	July 6, 1999	July 6, 1999.
Workshops	June 1, 1999	July 22, 1999	July 23, 1999.
Comments Due	June 15, 1999	August 3, 1999	August 3, 1999.

ADDRESSES: The Department will hold the public workshops between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. at the U.S. Department of Energy, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 1E–245, Washington, DC 20585. Written comments are welcome, especially following the workshops. Please submit one signed copy and a computer diskette (WordPerfect 6.1) or 10 copies (no telefacsimiles) to: U.S. Department of Energy, Attn: Brenda Edwards-Jones, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, EE–43, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–2945, e-mail: Brenda.Edwards-Jones@ee.doe.gov.

The Department will also accept electronically-mailed comments, but you must supplement such comments with a signed hard copy.

You should identify all comments on both the envelope and document with the name of the product and the appropriate docket number: Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts, EE–RM–97–500; Clothes Washers, EE–RM–94–403; or Water Heaters, EE–RM–97–900.

If you submit information or data that you believe is confidential, and should not be publicly disclosed, you should submit one complete copy of your document and ten (10) copies or one electronic copy from which the information believed to be confidential has been deleted. We will make our own determination regarding the confidentiality of the information or data according to our regulations at 10 CFR 1004.11.

Copies of the completed analyses may also be obtained from: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Codes and Standards, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 1J–018, Washington, DC 20585.

Public information: The public may access the Freedom of Information Reading room, located at the U.S. Department of Energy, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 1E–190, Washington, DC 20585, between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, (except Federal holidays). Call (202) 586–3142 for information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward Pollock, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Forrestal Building, Mail Station EE–43, 1000 Independence