

and responsibility of that company. This is not intended to prevent a carrier from interchanging equipment to allow for the through movement of traffic. Master-leases which do not meet the requirements of a long-term lease or that depend on other documentation and/or subleases to be complete are viewed as trip-leases.

DATE: Comments must be received on or before 1 January 1988.

ADDRESS: Comments should be addressed to: Headquarters, Military Traffic Management Command, ATTN: MT-INFF, 5611 Columbia Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-5050.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Patricia McCormick, HQMTMC 5611 Columbia Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-5050, (202) 756-1887.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Master-leases which do not conform to the requirements of a long-term lease are, in fact, trip-leases and therefore, will not be used for TPS shipments. To be considered a long-term lease, the lease must be in writing, signed by the lessor and lessee, and must not contain a provision authorizing cancellation by either party on less than 30 days' notice. In addition, the lease must provide for the exclusive possession, control, and use of the equipment, and for the complete assumption of liability. The leased equipment may not be further leased or subject to any other carrier for the duration of the lease.

Transportation Officers will refuse to load shipments requiring a TPS onto equipment that is offered under a trip-lease or master-lease. Carriers offering improperly leased equipment and/or driver for a TPS shipment may be charged with a service failure for providing improper/inadequate equipment.

John O. Roach, II,
Army Liaison Officer With the Federal Register.

[FR Doc. 87-25364 Filed 11-2-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

Department of the Navy

Chief of Naval Operations Executive Panel Advisory Committee; Closed Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. app.), notice is hereby given that the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Executive Panel Advisory Committee Mine Warfare Capabilities Task Force will meet November 12-13, 1987 from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. each day, at Norfolk,

Virginia. All sessions will be closed to the public.

The purpose of this meeting is to review current and projected U.S. and Allied Mine Warfare capabilities and potential U.S. vulnerabilities in the broad context of maritime operations and related intelligence. These matters constitute classified information that is specifically authorized by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense and is, in fact, properly classified pursuant to such Executive order. Accordingly, the Secretary of the Navy has determined in writing that the public interest requires that all sessions of the meeting be closed to the public because they will be concerned with matters listed in section 552b(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

For further information concerning this meeting, contact Ann Lynn Cline, Special Assistant to the CNO Executive Panel Advisory Committee, 4401 Ford Avenue, Room 601, Alexandria, Virginia 22303-0268. Phone (703) 756-1205.

Date: October 28, 1987.

Jane M. Virga,
Lieutenant, JAGC, U.S. Naval Reserve,
Federal Register Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. 87-25415 Filed 11-2-87; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3810-AE-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Proposed New Agreement for Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Between the United States and Japan and an Associated Subsequent Arrangement for the Return of Recovered Plutonium From EURATOM to Japan

AGENCY: Department of Energy.
ACTION: Finding of No Significant Impact.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOE-EA-00336) for the proposed new Agreement for Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Between the United States and Japan and an associated "subsequent arrangement" for the return of recovered plutonium from EURATOM to Japan.

The proposed action is to enter into the new Agreement pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act as amended, and an associated "Subsequent Arrangement" which would implement a provision of the proposed Agreement in which the U.S. undertakes to give its approval, subject to specified conditions, to the transfer of separated plutonium from EURATOM to Japan. One of the conditions for this

approval is that the recovered plutonium must be shipped by air pursuant to various measures designed to assure its security and safety. This would include shipments of plutonium via a "polar route or other route selected to avoid areas of natural disaster or civil disorder".

The environmental consequences of the proposed action are limited to those associated with air transport of plutonium oxide from Europe to Japan, and are predicted to be minor. The only radiological dose under normal conditions will be to the transport crew, including the air crew, any escort force on board, and those on the ground during refueling operations. The annual radiation dose is a small fraction of that associated with air transport of all radioactive materials in the United States.

The radiological risk from a major transport accident involving a crash of the plane followed by a fire is also very small. The annual radiological risk is estimated to range from 1.1×10^{-6} person-rem to 3.2×10^{-6} person-rem. The estimated number of adverse health effects from inhalation of plutonium as a result of such an accident ranges from 2×10^{-10} to 6×10^{-10} per year, an extremely small value compared to the normal incidence of cancer in the general population or the hazard from accidental death due to transportation.

The non-radiological impacts of the proposed action will also be negligible given the low number of air shipments per year required to implement the proposed action and the temporal nature of these impacts.

Three alternatives were also considered. The environmental consequences of each would be similar to those for the proposed action.

Based on the findings of this EA, the Department of Energy (DOE) has determined that the proposed action does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Therefore an environmental impact statement is not required.

The Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact are being made available to the public. For further information on the proposed action or for copies of either document contact: Peter N. Brush, IE-13, Office of Nuclear Nonproliferation Policy, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585.

For further information on the NEPA process for the proposed action contact:

Carol Borgstrom, EH-25, Office of NEPA Project Assistance, Office of the Assistant Secretary, for Environment, Safety and Health, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, 20585.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Department of Energy has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOE/EA-0336) for a proposed new Agreement for Cooperation with Japan Concerning the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy Pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended (AEA), and an associated "Subsequent Arrangement" pursuant to section 131 of the AEA. Together these actions will provide the framework for the return from EURATOM to Japan of plutonium recovered from spent fuel reprocessing for Japan in France or the United Kingdom. This Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the mandate of section 404(a) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA).

The proposed "Subsequent Arrangement" within the meaning of section 131 of the AEA, would be concluded under an existing agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and will implement a provision of the proposed agreement in Japan in which the U.S. undertook to give its approval, subject to specified conditions to the transfer of separated plutonium from EURATOM to Japan. One of the conditions for approval is that the recovered plutonium must be shipped by air pursuant to various measures designed to assure its security and safety. This would include shipments of plutonium via a "polar route or other routes selected to avoid areas of natural disaster or civil disorder."

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to assess the potential environmental impacts of air shipments of plutonium over U.S. territory under the proposed new Agreement with Japan and associated subsequent arrangement with EURATOM. Where applicable it also considers the likely environmental effects of such shipments on the global commons.

This Assessment includes a discussion of the quantities of plutonium that could be shipped, the likely number of shipments that would be involved in a given period, the nature of the conditions that will have to be met before any such air shipments will be approved by the United States and the alternatives to authorizing air shipments of the subject plutonium from EURATOM back to Japan including their environmental implications.

The Alternatives to the proposed action considered include:

Taking no action on the proposed Agreement for Cooperation and associated "Subsequent Arrangement" with EURATOM;

Concluding an Agreement for Cooperation not involving advance long-term U.S. consent to the return of U.S. origin plutonium from Europe to Japan (such shipments would continue to be approved case-by-case);

The use of transportation modes or transportation criteria other than those contemplated in the new Agreement and the associated "Subsequent Arrangement";

The environmental consequences of the alternatives were analyzed and found to be similar to those for the proposed action.

The environmental consequences of the proposed action are limited to those associated with air transport of plutonium oxide from Europe to Japan. The environmental impacts are predicted to be minor. The only radiological dose under normal conditions will be to the transport crew, including the air crew, any escort force on board, and those on the ground during refueling operations. The annual radiation dose is estimated to range between 0.73 to 2.19 person-rem, dependent on the number of shipments (the lower value corresponds to 12 shipments per year and the upper value corresponds to a maximum of 36 shipments per year). This value is a small fraction of that associated with air transport of all radioactive materials in the United States.

The radiological risk from a major transport accident involving a crash of the plane followed by a fire is also very small. The annual radiological risk (expressed as the product of the probability of the accident occurring and the consequences of the accident expressed as the 50-year committed effective dose equivalent to 10 individuals located 500 m downwind from the crash site) is estimated to range from 1.1×10^{-6} person-rem (for 12 shipments per year), to 3.2×10^{-6} person-rem (for a maximum of 36 shipments per year). The estimated number of adverse health effects from inhalation of plutonium as a result of such an accident ranges from 2×10^{-10} per year, to 6×10^{-10} , an extremely small value compared to the normal incidence of cancer in the general population or the hazard from accidental death due to transportation.

With respect to the consequences of an accident on the global commons, these are expected to be the same or

similar to those described for a flight transiting or landing in the U.S.

The non-radiological impacts of the proposed action (e.g., degradation of air quality due to the use of aviation fuel, increased noise levels, etc.) will also be negligible given the low number of air shipments per year required to implement the proposed action and the temporal nature of these impacts.

Determination

Based on the findings of this EA, the Department of Energy (DOE) has determined that the proposed action does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not required.

Issued in Washington, DC, September 11, 1987.

Mary L. Walker,

Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 87-25459 Filed 11-2-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Economic Regulatory Administration

[ERA Docket No. 87-36-NG]

Texarkoma Transportation Co.; Order Granting Blanket Authorization To Import Natural Gas From Canada

AGENCY: Economic Regulatory Administration, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of Order Granting Blanket Authorization to Import Natural Gas From Canada

SUMMARY: The Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) of the Department of Energy (DOE) gives notice that it has issued an Order granting Texarkoma Transportation Company (Texarkoma) blanket authorization to import natural gas from Canada. The order issued in ERA Docket No. 87-36-NG authorizes Texarkoma to import up to 29.2 Bcf over a two-year period for sale in the domestic spot market beginning on the date of first delivery.

A copy of this order is available for inspection and copying at the Natural Gas Division Docket Room, GA-076, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, 20585 (202) 586-9478. The docket room is open between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.