would result in the least potential long-term impacts to the local environment because the treated waste would leave the INEEL.

The Non-Thermal Treatment Alternative would result in smaller near-term potential impacts to air quality than the Preferred Alternative and the Treatment and Storage Alternative, but more than the No Action Alternative. Under the Non-Thermal Treatment Alternative, there would be less potential health risk over the short term, but a portion of the RCRA waste (i.e., hazardous organic wastes) and all of the PCB waste would remain in storage at the INEEL indefinitely. The long-term potential impacts of indefinite storage under the Non-Thermal Treatment Alternative are smaller than the No Action Alternative but larger than the Preferred Alternative. If the wastes were not isolated from the environment in a disposal facility, they could enter the environment and impact public health and the environment via the air or groundwater pathways.

In conclusion, the potential short-term environmental impacts from any of the action alternatives are small. The Preferred Alternative results in the least long-term potential impacts and is the only alternative that meets all regulatory and legal commitments. In addition, the Preferred Alternative is also consistent with DOE's long-range plans to dispose of this waste. DOE therefore believes that the Preferred Alternative is the Environmentally Preferable Alternative.

Mitigation

DOE is committed to operating the INEEL in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, executive orders, departmental orders, permits and compliance agreements. Volume 1, Section 5.19 of the AMWTP EIS presents an overview of the mitigation measures that will be taken to minimize the risks associated with the construction and operation of the proposed AMWTP facility (e.g., watering of soil for dust control, strong ''Stop Work'' stipulations in the event that cultural resources or human remains are discovered, and runoff control). DOE considers these to be routine mitigation measures that do not require a mitigation action plan to be prepared (see 10 CFR 1021.331(a)).

Decision

DOE selects the Preferred Alternative of the AMWTP EIS (construct and operate an AMWTP facility at the INEEL in accordance with DOE's contract with BNFL Inc). DOE will treat 65,000 cubic meters of INEEL waste for offsite disposal and could treat up to 120,000 cubic meters of additional waste from the INEEL or other DOE sites.

DOE anticipates that construction of the AMWTP facility will begin during the 1999 construction season. Under the Settlement Agreement/Consent Order, construction of the AMWTP facility will be completed by December 31, 2002, and operation of the facility will begin by March 31, 2003.

The AMWTP treatment contract requires 65 percent volume reduction and compliance with RCRA LDR standards, TSCA requirements, and the WIPP WAC, as applicable. The facility and equipment will be capable of processing up to 85,000 cubic meters of waste in the first 13 years of operation. The Preferred Alternative as analyzed in the EIS includes the treatment processes of supercompaction, macroencapsulation, incineration, and microencapsulation. The potential exists that not all of these treatment processes will be used because future changes in disposal requirements might necessitate changes in treatment processes, with resulting modifications to contract specifications. Other changes or substitutions to the proposed processes may occur, provided the performance requirements specified in the contract are met. For example, although vitrification originally was analyzed in the EIS for the treatment of incinerator ash, it is no longer being considered as a treatment process. Any proposed substitution or major change in a treatment process would be evaluated where appropriate under NEPA.

DOE made this decision after considering the following factors associated with the Preferred Alternative:

- public comments on the EIS;
- a small potential for short-term environmental impacts;
- a waste form that will be ready for disposal at WIPP or another appropriate disposal facility;
- if WIPP or another appropriate disposal facility is unable to receive and dispose of INEEL waste, the treated waste will be in a form that would minimize potential impacts to the public and the environment during storage;
- consistency with DOE policy and previous decisions;
- compliance with negotiated agreements and commitments (e.g. Settlement Agreement/Consent Order) and regulatory requirements under RCRA and TSCA;
- smallest long-term potential impacts from continued management of this waste;
- cost effectiveness as shown in the AMWTP EIS Alternatives Cost Study; and
- use of commercially available, proven technologies.

After consideration of all relevant information and data, DOE has decided to implement the Preferred Alternative.

Issued in Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of March 1999.

James M. Owendoff,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.

[FR Doc. 99–8606 Filed 4–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EC99–57–000]

AES Eastern Energy, L.P., AEE 2, L.L.C.; Notice of Filing

April 1, 1999.

Take notice that on March 26, 1999, AES Eastern Energy, L.P. and AEE 2, L.L.C. tendered for filing an application under Section 203 of the Federal Power Act for authorization to further transfer certain jurisdictional facilities associated with the sale of two of six coal-fired plants located in New York State and currently owned by NGE Generation, Inc. The two plants will be transferred to a wholly-owned subsidiary of AES Eastern Energy, L.P., AEE 2, L.L.C., rather than held by it directly, as previously authorized by the Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest such 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 385.214). All such motions and protests should be filed on or before April 8, 1999. Protests will be considered by the Commission to determine the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. 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. This filing may also be viewed on the Internet at http://

www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm (call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

Linwood A. Watson,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–8520 Filed 4–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. EC98–40–000; ER98–2770–000; and ER98–2786–000]

American Electric Power Company and Central and South West Corporation; Notice of Informal Settlement Conference

April 1, 1999.

Take Notice that an informal settlement conference will be convened in this proceeding commencing at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 13, 1999 at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, for the purpose of exploring the possible settlement in the above-referenced dockets.

Any party, as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(c), or any participant as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(b), is invited to attend. Persons wishing to become a party must move to intervene and receive intervenor status pursuant to the Commission's regulations (18 CFR 385.214).

For additional information, please contact James A. Pepper at (202) 208–0556, Charles F. Reusch at (202) 208–0401, Edith A. Gilmore at (202) 208–2158, or Gary D. Levenson at (202) 208–1210.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–8522 Filed 4–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP95–408–026]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Refund Report

April 1, 1999.

Take notice that on March 22, 1999, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission its Refund Report made to comply with the November 22, 1996 Settlement in Docket No. RP95–408, *et al.* as approved by the Commission on April 17, 1997.

On February 20, 1999, Columbia made refunds, as billing credits, in the amount of $137,801.69. The credits represent a deferred tax refund based on the sale of certain gathering facilities to Columbia Natural Resources. These refunds were made pursuant to Stipulation II, Article III, Section G(2) of the Settlement.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed on or before April 8, 1999. 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 proceedings. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room. This filing may be viewed on the web at http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm (call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–8525 Filed 4–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODe 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP97–373–016]

Koch Gateway Pipeline Company; Notice of Filing of Refund Report

April 1, 1999.

Take notice that on March 29, 1999, Koch Gateway Pipeline Company (Koch) tendered for filing its Refund Report and supporting narrative in accordance with the Commission's Order issued in Docket No. RP97–373 on August 3, 1998, 84 FERC ¶ 61,142 (1998).

The August 3, 1998 order directed Koch to refund to customers charged a rate in excess of the maximum settlement rates during the period December 1, 1997 through August 31, 1998.

Koch states that copies of the filing have been served upon all reflected customers, state commissions and all parties on the official service list.

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 filed on or before April 8, 1999. 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 proceedings. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room. This filing may be viewed on the web at http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm (call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–8526 Filed 4–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP98–404–004]

Mississippi River Transmission Corporation; Notice of Compliance Filing

April 1, 1999.

Take notice that on March 29,1999, Mississippi River Transmission Corporation (MRT) tendered for filing as part of its Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1, the following revised tariff sheets to become effective March 17, 1999:

2nd Sub Third Rev. Sheet No. 99
3rd Sub Original Sheet No. 99A
3rd Sub Original Sheet No. 99B
3rd Sub Original Sheet No. 99C
3rd Sub Original Sheet No. 99D
3rd Sub Original Sheet No. 99E
Substitute Original Sheet No. 99F
Substitute Original Sheet No. 99G

MRT states that the purpose of this filing is to comply with the Commission's Order Accepting Tariff Sheets, Subject to Conditions, and Denying Rehearing issued on March 16, 1999. These tariff sheets set forth the method MRT will use to allocate firm capacity that become available for subscription on MRT's system.

MRT states that a copy of this filing is being mailed to each of MRT's customers and to the state commissions of Arkansas, Illinois, and Missouri.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such 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 will not serve to make