

The Department is publishing in the Federal Register the Petition for Waiver in its entirety. The Petition contains no confidential information. The Department is soliciting comments, data, and information respecting the Petition.

Sincerely,

Christine A. Ervin,  
Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

August 8, 1995.

Assistant Secretary, Conservation & Renewable Energy,  
United States Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C.

Subject: Petition for Waiver and Application for Interim Waiver.

Dear Assistant Secretary: This is a Petition for Waiver and Application for Interim Waiver submitted pursuant to Title 10 CFR 430.27, as amended 14 November 1986. Waiver is requested from the test procedures for measuring the Energy Consumption of Furnaces found in Appendix N of Subpart B to Part 430, specifically the section requiring a 1.5 minute delay between burner ignition and start-up of the circulating air blower.

York International requests a waiver from the specified 1.5 minute delay, and seeks authorization in its furnace efficiency test procedures and calculations to utilize a fixed timing control that will energize the circulating air blower 30 seconds after the gas valve opens. A control of this type with a fixed 30 second blower on-time will be utilized in our DINA, DAYA, DINH, and DAYH lines of induced draft package gas/electrics.

The current test procedure does not credit York for additional energy savings that occur when a shorter blower on-time is utilized. Test data for these furnaces with a 30 second delay indicate that the overall furnace AFUE will increase approximately 0.4 percent compared to the same furnace tested with the 1.5 minute delay. Copies of the confidential test data confirming these energy savings will be forwarded to you upon request.

York International is confident that this waiver will be granted as similar waivers have been granted to York International in the past along with Inter-City Products Corporation, Rheem Manufacturing, the Trane Company, and others.

Sincerely,

Mark Diesch,  
Product Engineer.

[FR Doc. 95-25351 Filed 10-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

### Record of Decision; Southeast Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Improvements Project and Geysers Effluent Pipeline Project

**AGENCY:** Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Office of Utility Technologies, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice of Record of Decision.

**SUMMARY:** Today's notice is issuing the United States Department of Energy (the

Department) Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy's Record of Decision on the Southeast Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Improvements Project and Geysers Effluent Pipeline Project Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report prepared by the United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management (the Bureau) and the Lake County California Sanitation District. The Department, as a cooperating agency, adopted the Environmental Impact Statement as DOE/EIS-0224 on January 11, 1995 after independent review. This Record of Decision is pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations Parts 1500-1508), which implement the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, and the Department's National Environmental Policy Act regulations (10 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1021). The document was also prepared to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, hence the impacts; the proposed project will be beneficial to the public by extending the life of the Southeast Geysers Geothermal Field providing more electricity for consumption, and the proposed project will be beneficial to the public by bringing the Southeast Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant into compliance with California Regional Water Quality Control Board Waste Discharge Requirements and enable lifting of the Board's 1991 Cease and Desist Order and associated moratorium. The final Environmental Impact Statement was published August 25, 1994.

**ADDRESSES:** The Final Environmental Impact Statement is available for public review at the following locations:

Bureau of Land Management - 2550 N. State St., Ukiah, California  
Lake County Sanitation District - 230A Main St., Lakeport, California  
Lake County Planning Department - 255 N. Forbes St., Lakeport, California  
Lakeport Public Library - 1425 N. High St., Lakeport, California  
Redbud Public Library - 4700 Golf Ave., Lakeport, California  
City of Clearlake Offices - 14360 Lakeshore Dr., Clearlake, California  
Lower Lake Water District - 16175 Main St., Lower Lake, California  
South Lake Water District - 21095 State Hwy. 175, Middletown, California  
Sonoma County Public Library - 3rd & E Sts., Santa Rosa, California  
Sonoma County Planning Dept. - 575 Administration Dr., Santa Rosa, California  
Sonoma County Board of Supervisors Office - 575 Administration Dr., Santa Rosa, California

Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District - 34274 State Hwy. 16, Woodland, California  
U. S. Department of Energy Public Reading Room, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information regarding the Department's involvement in this project and for copies of this Record of Decision please contact the Southeast Geysers Environmental Impact Statement Document Manager, U.S. Department of Energy, 850 Energy Drive, Mail Stop-1146, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401-1563, (208) 526-1483.

For information regarding the National Environmental Policy Act process, contact Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of National Environmental Policy Act Policy and Assistance, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586-4600 or (800) 472-2756. To receive a copy of the final Environmental Impact Statement and the Bureau Record of Decision please contact Mr. Richard Estabrook, Project Manager, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Ukiah District, 2550 North State Street, Ukiah, CA, 95482, (707) 468-4052.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

Since early 1992, the Lake County Sanitation District has pursued a joint venture with the geothermal industry, specifically the Northern California Power Agency, Calpine Corporation (Calpine), and Pacific Gas and Electric Company, to develop a plan for disposal of secondary-treated effluent from the Southeast Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (the Plant) near the City of Clearlake, California, in the Southeast Geysers Geothermal Steam Field. In early 1994, Union Oil Company also became a partner in the joint venture. That plan includes upgrades to treatment facilities at the Plant, construction of a pipeline to divert raw lake water from Clear Lake to be added to the effluent, construction of a 26-mile 24-inch diameter pipeline to the Southeast Geysers, addition of effluent from the Middletown Wastewater Treatment Plant, pump stations, secondary distribution lines for conveying the effluent to injection wells in the steam field, and construction of storage regulating tanks. The project is located primarily in Lake County, California, and also in part of Sonoma County, California.

The project is intended to alleviate two circumstances. (1) It would resolve treatment and disposal deficiencies and would provide additional capacity at

the Plant, thereby bringing the Southeast Regional Wastewater System into compliance with California Regional Water Quality Control Board Waste Discharge Requirements and enable lifting of the Board's 1991 Cease and Desist Order and associated moratorium. Prior to development of this plan, a cost-effective and environmentally acceptable means of disposing treated wastewater effluent could not be identified. (2) The project would also provide a dependable source of water for injection into the Southeast Geysers steam field to support steam reservoir pressure that is used to generate electric power. Since about 1987, declines in steam production have occurred because of lower steam pressure throughout the Southeast Geysers Geothermal Field. The wastewater effluent, combined with diverted lake water, would mitigate the decline and allow continued geothermal energy production in this area for 25 or more years at higher production levels than would occur otherwise.

Implementation of the plan involves multiple federal, state and local agencies. Federal participation includes permitting by the Bureau, as portions of the project in the Southeast Geysers require granting of Rights of Ways on federal lands managed by the Bureau. The Department will provide financial assistance grants to the Lake County Sanitation District for construction of the project. The Department has provided funding for the project in the past for early engineering design work and for preparation of environmental documentation. Additional funding may be provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development Administration, and the Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration. Other federal agencies with permitting or consultation requirements include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

#### Environmental Considerations

The Bureau serves as the lead federal agency under the National Environmental Policy Act for the Environmental Impact Statement. The Department is a cooperating agency. The Lake County Sanitation District is the lead agency representing local authorities and assuming responsibility for compliance with or coordination of State of California requirements for the project including preparation of a joint Environmental Impact Report, pursuant to requirements of the California

Environmental Quality Act. The following summarizes the specific key actions taken to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act.

Notice of Intent published in the Federal Register—March 11, 1993 (58 FR 13499)

Public scoping meetings in Sacramento and Lakeport, CA—March 25 & 26, 1993

Supplemental Notice of Intent published in the Federal Register—September 9, 1993 (58 FR 47469)

Public scoping meeting in Lakeport on the Supplemental Notice of Intent—August 23, 1993

Second Supplemental Notice of Intent—March 31, 1994

Public scoping meeting in Lakeport on the Second Supplemental Notice of Intent—April 13, 1994

Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report on the Southeast Regional Wastewater Treatment Facilities Improvements Project and Geysers Effluent Pipeline Project—May 26, 1994

Notice of Availability for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report published in the Federal Register—June 10, 1994 (59 FR 30000)

Public hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report in Lakeport—June 30 and July 14, 1994

Close of Public Comment Period on Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report—July 26, 1994

Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report on the Southeast Regional Wastewater Treatment Facilities Improvements Project and Geysers Effluent Pipeline Project—August 25, 1994

Notice of Availability for the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report published in the Federal Register—August 26, 1994 (59 FR 44144)

Public Hearing on the Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report before the Lake County Planning Commission in Lakeport (Environmental Impact Report certification) and before the Lake County Sanitation District Board of Directors in Lakeport (Environmental Impact Report re-certification and project approval)—August 25, 1994 and September 20, 1994, respectively.

Close of Public Comment Period on the Final Environmental Impact Statement—September 26, 1994

Department of Energy Adopts the Environmental Impact Statement January 11, 1995

Bureau of Land Management Record of Decision—February 16, 1995

Certification of the Environmental Impact Report by the Lake County Planning Commission included recommendations for implementation of a Mitigation, Monitoring and Operation Plan, pursuant to requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, and drawn from mitigation measures identified in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. The re-certification of the Environmental Impact Report by the Lake County Sanitation District Board of Directors includes the Mitigation, Monitoring and Operation Plan, which establishes enforceable conditions of the County Use Permit. Sonoma County also adopted mitigation measures which are included in the Union Oil Company general use permit. The Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report did not distinguish between mitigation and monitoring responsibilities of the Bureau of Land Management and Lake and Sonoma Counties so the Bureau appended the Mitigation, Monitoring and Operation Plans to their Record of Decision. The Bureau Record of Decision is included here as Appendix A. Mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report and designated mitigation measure enforcement authorities are included in the Bureau Record of Decision. Therefore, the Department will not prepare a separate mitigation action plan.

The Bureau signed a Record of Decision for the project which specifies that the right-of-way grants which implement the decision would be issued only upon completion of the section 106 process under the National Historic Preservation Act, and completion of conference procedures with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the project. The Department, the Environmental Protection Agency, the California State Water Resources Control Board, and the Lake County Sanitation District entered into a Programmatic Agreement with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the California State Historic Preservation Office for protection of cultural resources on all parts of the project according to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The Programmatic Agreement requires identification and

evaluation of cultural resources that may be disturbed by the action and mitigation where significant resources would be disturbed in consultation with historic preservation officials. Implementation of this agreement completes the consultation requirements of sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act for the project. Mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts are listed in the final Environmental Impact Statement and the attached Bureau Record of Decision. The Bureau has formally requested a conference with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding potential impacts to the California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*). This species is proposed for listing as endangered and was scheduled to be listed early in 1995. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires conferring but not formal consultation for proposed species. A proposed species is one that has been proposed for listing as an endangered species. A candidate species is under evaluation to determine whether to propose it for listing as an endangered species. If the evaluation is in the early stages it would be a candidate 2 species, when enough information is available to propose the species for listing it would be called a candidate 1 species. A biological assessment is not required for proposed or candidate species. However, the Bureau prepared a biological assessment of potential impacts to a number of species including the California red-legged frog as well as federal candidate 1 plant species including the Lake County dwarf flax (*Hesperolinon didymocarpum*), the Socrates Mine jewelflower (*Streptanthus brachiatus* ssp. *brachiatus*), and the Freed's jewelflower (*Streptanthus brachiatus* ssp. *hoffmanii*). The project impacts were determined to be "not likely to adversely affect" the plant species listed above. Additional plant and animal species are evaluated in the biological assessment resulting in "no effect" determinations. Surveys for the red-legged frog have discovered no specimens in the project impact area. If the species is discovered in the impact area during construction, a number of mitigation measures would be instituted to lessen the impact. Only one potential habitat area, a stream crossing at Bear Creek, has the potential to result in permanent loss of habitat. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurred with the Bureau determination that the project is not likely to adversely affect the red-legged frog. Mitigation measures reducing the project's potential impact

to the red-legged frog and other special status plant and animal species and their habitats to less than significant levels are included in the final Environmental Impact Statement and the Bureau Record of Decision. Additional mitigation measures such as alterations to the pipeline route or pipeline design to avoid or reduce impacts to the species or their habitat may be implemented based on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service requirements if new information reveals effects of the proposed action that may affect listed species in a manner or to an extent not considered.

#### Alternatives Considered in the Decision-Making Process

##### *Preferred Alternative and Supporting Rationale and Trade-offs*

The preferred alternative is the proposed project identified in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report with mitigation measures. This alternative was selected: (1) Because it will provide a means for the Lake County Sanitation District to resolve its treatment and effluent disposal deficiencies, bringing the Southeast Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant into compliance with its waste discharge permit requirements, as required by law and (2) because it will support continued geothermal steam energy production in the Southeast Geysers, which has been in decline since 1987. The preferred alternative meets the specific objectives of the project that are consistent with provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 and other federal laws regulating geothermal energy use in the Southeast Geysers. The area currently contains extensive geothermal energy development that is regulated by the Bureau. The project with mitigation provides a method of continued long-term use of the natural heat resource for electrical energy generation. Continued use of the geothermal resources of the Southeast Geysers is consistent with federal policy for use of alternative energy resources and the specific land management objectives of the Bureau in this Resource Area. Additionally, this alternative provides an effective means of treated effluent disposal, which is consistent with federal policy promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) pursuant to the Clean Water Act. By providing a remedy that would remove the current Cease and Desist Order for the Plant, the project would support compliance with federal law and EPA wastewater discharge

requirements. Significant impacts of the preferred alternative can be reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of mitigation. Two impacts were identified in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report as significant and unavoidable. Impact 5.2.2.1 identified a short-term impact on water quality by construction of a road and placement of fill in an unnamed tributary of Bear Creek. The Bureau has identified specific mitigation measures in the draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report and final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report which would reduce the risk of slope erosion and silt deposition in the creek in the short term and in the long term. Impact 5.2.3.13 identified long-term cumulative loss of montane hardwood woodland, montane conifer woodland and mixed chaparral that potentially provide habitat for the loggerhead shrike, a federal candidate 2 species. The same area may also be habitat for the Cooper's hawk and sharp-shinned hawk, both California species of concern and protected under State Code. Actual presence of these species at the area of potential effect has not been determined and, therefore, the impact is not definitive. Mitigation has been included that would require preconstruction surveys to determine if the species is present. Mitigation would potentially include establishing habitat preservation plans in the region for these species. These habitats are relatively widespread in the area, providing opportunities for preservation.

Major public concerns relate to induced seismicity, spills and loss of habitat. Seismicity: Evidence suggests that injection of water into the Geysers steam field does induce seismicity in the form of microseismic events which register less than 3.0 on the Richter Scale. This magnitude of seismic event is not great enough to cause any damage to a structure and therefore is not considered to have a significant environmental impact. The Bureau noted in their Record of Decision that injection may be stopped if the link to larger magnitude earthquakes becomes clear. Spills: The public is concerned that effluent from a pipeline break could result in damage to waterways and impacts to plant and animal species. Pipeline monitoring, pipeline design and the mitigation measures in the Environmental Impact Statement and mitigation plans will reduce the risk and impact of a spill to less than significant levels. Loss of Habitat: There

will be temporary loss of habitat during construction and a permanent loss along the pipeline corridor. Mitigation measures reduce habitat loss to a minimum.

#### *Environmentally Preferred Alternative and Rationale for Rejection*

The environmentally preferred alternative identified in the Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report was the proposed project with the exception that Route Alternative F would be implemented. Route F differs from the preferred alternative only in the location of a 5,000-foot segment of the pipeline. Route F included construction of the Geysers Effluent Pipeline in about 3,700 feet of existing roadway and without an access road for about 2,000 feet between the Bear Canyon Power Plant and the Northern California Power Agency M-Site. This alternative would have eliminated the need to construct a new road and place fill in the course of the unnamed tributary of Bear Creek, features which created a potential for significant unavoidable environmental impacts.

The environmentally preferred alternative was rejected because the advantages of having continuous road access to the pipeline in the rugged terrain outweighed the environmental impacts. Mitigation included in the Bureau Record of Decision reduces impacts substantially. While residual impacts on water quality and permanent loss of possible habitat of sensitive bird species would result from the preferred alternative in this segment of the pipeline route, these impacts are deemed acceptable in consideration of the advantages offered by better access to the pipeline. The preferred project also would result in connection of two roads that currently dead end. Connection of the roads would provide improved access for emergency vehicles to the Southeast Geysers.

#### *Other Alternatives and Rationale for Rejection*

The Lake County Sanitation District rejected all alternative forms of wastewater disposal described in the Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report because of significant potential environmental impacts and costs. These considerations were reviewed by the Bureau and the Department. The Lake County Sanitation District had primary responsibility for the rejection of other disposal method alternatives. In making its decision about providing partial funding for the project, the Department considered the environmental effects of

the project and all alternatives, including alternative disposal options.

The No Action Alternative was rejected because it would not allow the Lake County Sanitation District to resolve its wastewater treatment deficiencies. Specifically, it would be unacceptable to take no action and thereby continue conditions that have caused the existing Cease and Desist Order to be in effect for the Plant with periodic violations of the federal Clean Water Act. In addition, the No Action Alternative was rejected by the Bureau because it would not provide a means to support the continued economical use of the geothermal resource in the Southeast Geysers and would not assist northern California in meeting its present and forecast energy demand.

Alternative wastewater disposal locations considered in the Environmental Impact Statement included injection at the Borax Lake geothermal well, Audrey geothermal well or a new on-site disposal well. These alternative locations are speculative and technically unproven for sustaining the geothermal resource and thus would not meet the objectives of the proposal. Engineers and geologists have determined that the Southeast Geysers area is the best location to inject water and sustain the resources, given geological conditions, topographical features and environmental concerns.

A number of alternative facility designs and routes were evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement including differences in the designs for pumping water from Clear Lake, pump stations and surge tanks along the pipeline route, and alternative pipeline segment routes. The discussion below relates the impacts from the alternative to the impacts from the preferred alternative and why those alternatives were not selected.

#### *Alternative Facility Designs*

The Lake Diversion Pumps and Pipeline on Pier alternative differs from the preferred alternative in that the pumps and pipeline to the Clear Lake shore would be located on a pier instead of locating the pipe underwater and the pumps on shore. This alternative would temporarily increase local water turbidity and local noise from driving piles for the pier and would result in an unavoidable and significant alteration of the visual environment.

The Bear Canyon Single Pump Station and One-Way Surge Tank in the Geysers alternative would replace five pump stations with one large pump station and require a surge tank to be located at the high point of the pipeline in The

Geysers. It would result in a significant noise impact to residents near the larger pump station, the loss of several large trees and valley oak woodland habitat which may provide habitat for the Coopers's hawk and sharp-shinned hawks, and increased degradation of the visual environment along a well-travelled highway.

The By-pass Pipeline at the Plant is an alternative to discharging diverted lake water into the Plant reservoir. Instead, a pipeline would be constructed to channel water to the pumps for the Geysers Effluent Pipeline instead of to the reservoir. This alternative offered no significant environmental benefits or detriments over the preferred alternative. It was rejected for engineering reasons because it would create inferior Plant operating conditions and efficiencies by limiting the flexibility of Plant reservoir management.

The alternative site for the Childers Peak regulating tank would be at the high point of the Geysers Effluent Pipeline between the Plant and the Middletown Wastewater Treatment Plant more to the east of the saddle in the Big Canyon Creek watershed. This location would require a substantial cut to be made into the hillside which would introduce some potential slope instability and require a greater amount of grading and possibly some blasting. There would possibly be impacts of greater intensity to water quality because of increased silt generation from the increase in grading. Two special status plant species specimens, scarlet fritillary and thread-leaved miner's lettuce, could potentially be lost.

#### *Alternative Pipeline Routes*

Route Alternatives A-1 and A-2 would avoid placement of the pipeline in existing private driveways by taking short diversions from the proposed route. They would produce silt that would be conveyed into the Clear Lake Outlet Channel. These routes would add 400 and 450 feet respectively to the length of the proposed route. These were rejected due to the siltation potential and higher construction costs.

Route Alternative B would avoid crossing Clayton Creek on the bridge by spanning the deeply incised channel upstream of the bridge and crossing the large meander loop of Clayton Creek. This alternative could result in a significant erosion hazard and the hazard of stream erosion undermining the pipeline, potentially significant short term silt deposition in Clayton Creek and potentially significant short term impact to Northwestern pond

turtles and the habitat of the black-shouldered kite.

Route Alternative C would cross Highway 29 about 150 feet south of a fruit and vegetable stand as proposed in the preferred alternative. This route would result in no increase in negative environmental impacts and would preserve several large conifers and deciduous trees along the east side of the road, providing a beneficial impact on visual resources. This alternative was rejected because of engineering and cost benefits in implementing the preferred alternative.

Route Alternative D would reduce the length of the pipeline by 250 feet by cutting across the longer turn of the existing road leading down from Childers Peak Saddle. This would likely produce high erosion hazards and potentially significant erosion with silt deposition ultimately in Big Canyon Creek.

Route Alternative E would reduce the need for easement acquisition by continuing in a southerly direction on the Big Canyon Road to its intersection with Harbin Springs Road and then proceeding northwesterly on Harbin Springs Road. The preferred alternative route would cut across the northern edge of a pasture. The alternative would require the pipeline to be 900 feet longer than the proposed route and would be located entirely within or on the shoulder of public roads, but would not result in any significant change in environmental impacts. It was rejected because it would result in higher construction costs with no substantial environmental benefits.

Route Alternative F would not follow a new road connecting the Northern California Power Agency M-Pad but follow the Bear Canyon Access Road to the Bear Canyon Power Plant, cross the creek in the fill above the culvert and trend uphill to the M-pad. This route would result in higher erosion hazards, potentially significant impacts on runoff and water quality and would contribute to the permanent cumulative loss of mixed chaparral and montane hardwood habitat of the Cooper's and sharp-shinned hawk.

Route Alternative G was a small deviation from the proposed route near the end of the Geysers Effluent Pipeline to avoid construction in the area of the Northern California Power Agency main gate, which receives heavy vehicle traffic. The road is the Northern California Power Agency's private road. The alternative route was rejected because it offered no substantial environmental advantages and because the construction disturbance for the

preferred alternative route could be accommodated.

#### Consideration of Other Alternatives

The preferred project is a preliminary plan. As the project has been approved by the Lake County Sanitation District Board of Directors, the phase of final engineering design will soon be started. At present, the project sponsors are considering a number of design and route alternatives that would represent modifications of the plan as presented in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. One of the primary reasons for these potential modifications is to reduce mitigation costs by avoiding environmentally sensitive areas altogether. These alternatives include (1) evaluation of isolation valve placement; (2) relocation of the main pump station site on private land within the City of Clearlake (on Robin Lane); (3) a new pump station located near Highway 29 by project station 58 on private land; and (4) an alternative pipeline route between the southern end of the City of Clear Lake and Morgan Valley Road on private land and county roads to avoid the proposed route in Lake Street which is heavily constrained by cultural resources, traffic and other infrastructure. All of these alternatives, if advanced to a specific proposal, would require completion of supplemental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

#### Non-Environmental Factors Affecting The Decision-Making Process, Rationale and Trade-Offs

Non-environmental factors that entered into the Department's decision-making process included the mission of contributing to the research and development of alternative energy resources and a desire to perform that mission while contributing to resolution of the municipal wastewater treatment problems in Lake County. Cost considerations were a significant consideration on the part of The Lake County Sanitation District in selecting alternatives.

#### Decision

After consideration of the entire record and attachments (including the conditions for right-of-way grants in the Bureau of Land Management's Record of Decision) the Department has decided to provide additional funding to the Lake County Sanitation District through financial assistance awards for this project. The project encompasses upgrades to the Southeast Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant and

construction of a pipeline to transport treated municipal wastewater treatment plant effluent and water from Clear Lake in Lake County, California, to the Southeast Geysers Geothermal Field for injection into the steam field.

Issued at Washington DC, this 2nd day of October, 1995.

Christine A. Ervin,

*Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.*

[FR Doc. 95-25360 Filed 10-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

### Energy Information Administration

#### Proposed Extension of FE-746R, "Import and Export of Natural Gas"

**AGENCY:** Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice of the Proposed Extension of FE-746R, "Import and Export of Natural Gas".

**SUMMARY:** The Energy Information Administration (EIA) is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of FE-746R, "Import and Export of Natural Gas."

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before December 12, 1995. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below of your intention to do so as soon as possible.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to John Glynn, FE-531, Rm. 3H-087, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Natural Gas, Fossil Energy, 1000 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, DC 20585. Alternatively, John Glynn can be reached at JGLYNN@FE.DOE.GOV (Internet e-mail), or 202-586-6050 (facsimile).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information or copies of the regulation should be directed to John Glynn at the address listed above, or phone 202-586-9454.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Background.
- II. Current Actions.
- III. Request for Comments.

#### I. Background

In order to fulfill its responsibilities under the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974 (Pub. L. No. 93-275) and the Department of Energy Organization Act (Pub. L. No. 95-91), the Energy Information Administration is obliged to carry out a central, comprehensive, and unified energy data and information program. As part of this