

travelers are paid per diem at the most current rates.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 1, 1982.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This document gives notice of changes in per diem rates prescribed by the Per Diem, Travel and Transportation Allowance Committee for non-foreign areas outside the continental United States. Distribution of Civilian Per Diem Bulletins by mail was discontinued effective June 1, 1979. Per Diem Bulletins published periodically in the **Federal Register** now constitute the only notification of changes in per diem rates to agencies and establishments outside the Department of Defense.

The text of the Bulletin follows:

**Civilian Personnel Per Diem Bulletin Number 111 to the Heads of Executive Departments and Establishments**

Subject: Table of maximum per diem rates in lieu of subsistence for United States Government civilian officers and employees for official travel in Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and Possessions of the United States

1. This bulletin is issued in accordance with Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Establishments from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, August 17, 1966, "Executive Order 11294, August 4, 1966 Delegating Certain Authority of the President to Establish Maximum Per Diem Rates for Government Civilian Personnel in Travel Status," in which this Committee is directed to exercise the authority of the President (5 U.S.C. 5702(a)(2)) delegated to the Secretary of Defense for Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone and possessions of the United States. When appropriate and in accordance with regulations issued by competent authority, lesser rates may be prescribed.

2. The maximum per diem rates shown in the following table are continued from the preceding Bulletin Number 110 except in the case identified by an asterisk which rates are effective on the date of this Bulletin. The date of this Bulletin shall be 1 June 1982.

3. Each Department or Establishment subject to these rates shall take appropriate action to disseminate the contents of this Bulletin to the appropriate headquarters and field agencies affected thereby.

4. The maximum per diem rates referred to in this Bulletin are:

Locality	Maximum rate
<b>Alaska:</b>	
Adak <sup>1</sup> .....	\$12.80
Anaktuvuk Pass.....	140.00
Anc horage.....	89.00
Barrow.....	160.00
Bethel.....	114.00
College.....	97.00
Cordova.....	89.00
Deadhorse.....	107.00
Dillingham.....	103.00
Dutch Harbor.....	82.00
Eielson AFB.....	97.00
Elmendorf.....	89.00
Fairbanks.....	97.00
Ft. Richardson.....	89.00
Ft. Wainwright.....	97.00
Juneau.....	97.00
Ketchikan.....	98.00
Kodiak.....	103.00
Kotzebue.....	109.00
Murphy Dome.....	97.00
Noatak.....	109.00
Nome.....	110.00
Noorvik.....	109.00
Petersburg.....	98.00
Point Hope.....	100.00
Prudhoe Bay.....	107.00
Shemya AFB <sup>1</sup> .....	11.00
Shungnak.....	109.00
Sitka-Mt. Edgecombe.....	96.00
Skagway.....	98.00
Spruce Cape.....	103.00
Tanana.....	110.00
Valdez.....	93.00
Wainwright.....	79.00
Wrangell.....	96.00
All Other Localities.....	83.00
<b>American Samoa.....</b>	<b>65.00</b>
*Guam M.I.....	74.00
<b>Hawaii:</b>	
Oahu.....	91.00
All Other Localities.....	67.00
Johnston Atoll <sup>2</sup> .....	16.75
Midway Island <sup>1</sup> .....	12.80
<b>Puerto Rico:</b>	
Bayamon:	
12-16-5-15.....	119.00
5-16-12-15.....	88.00
Carolina:	
12-16-5-15.....	119.00
5-16-12-15.....	88.00
Fajardo (Including Luquillo):	
12-16-5-15.....	119.00
5-16-12-15.....	88.00
Ft. Buchanan (Incl. GSA Service Center, Guaynabo):	
12-16-5-15.....	119.00
5-16-12-15.....	88.00
Ponce (Incl. Ft. Allen NCS).....	70.00
Roosevelt Roads:	
12-16-5-15.....	119.00
5-16-12-15.....	88.00
Sabana Seca:	
12-16-5-15.....	119.00
5-16-12-15.....	88.00
San Juan (Incl. San Juan Coast Guard Units):	
12-16-5-15.....	119.00
5-16-12-15.....	88.00
All Other Localities.....	77.00
<b>Virgin Islands of U.S.:</b>	
12-1-4-30.....	102.00
5-1-11-30.....	82.00
Wake Island <sup>2</sup> .....	15.00
All other Localities.....	20.00

<sup>1</sup> Commercial facilities are not available. This per diem rate covers charges for meals in available facilities plus an additional allowance for incidental expenses and will be increased by the amount paid for Government quarters by the travelers.

<sup>2</sup> Commercial facilities are not available. Only Government-owned and contractor operated quarters and mess are available at this locality. This per diem rate is the amount necessary to defray the cost of lodging, meals and incidental expenses.

M.S. Healy,

OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,  
Washington Headquarters Services,  
Department of Defense.

May 26, 1982.

[FR Doc. 82-14754 Filed 5-28-82; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3810-01-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Defense Waste Processing Facility Savannah River Plant Aiken, S.C.; Record of Decision

This Record of Decision has been prepared pursuant to regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR Part 1505) and Implementing Procedures of the Department of Energy (45 FR 20694).

#### Decision

The Department of Energy (DOE) has decided to construct and operate a Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) at the Savannah River Plant (SRP) to immobilize existing and future high-level radioactive wastes (HLW) generated and stored at SRP. The DWPF will be built at Site S in stages; construction of the sludge processing facility will begin first, followed by facilities to treat the salt cake and supernatant liquid. The strategy for disposal of the immobilized HLW is to dispose of it of site in a Federal geologic repository. Decontaminated salt will be disposed of on site. The selection of the waste form for the DWPF, and the siting and design of the repository will be addressed in subsequent environmental analyses.

#### Background

The SRP near Aiken, South Carolina, is a major installation of the DOE for the production of nuclear materials for national defense. It began operations in the early 1950's and is the nation's primary source of reactor-produced defense materials. These operations also generate HLW from the chemical processing of fuel and target materials after their irradiation in the SRP nuclear reactors. The HLW is stored in underground tanks at SRP. It is composed of sludge, crystallized salt cake, and a supernatant aqueous solution.

The long-term management strategies for the SRP HLW were evaluated in the "Environmental Impact Statement—Long Term Management of Defense High-Level Radioactive Waste (Research and Development Program for Immobilization), Savannah River Plant,

Aiken, South Carolina" (DOE/EIS-0023), November 1979. As a result, DOE decided to continue the research and development program directed toward immobilization of the SRP HLW, and not to undertake an R&D program on direct disposal of waste in bedrock under SRP (Record of Decision, February 13, 1980).

The Department of Energy published the "Environmental Impact Statement—Defense Waste Processing Facility, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, South Carolina" (DOE/EIS-0082), in February 1982. The proposed action in the EIS was: (1) To select a disposal strategy for existing and future SRP high-level radioactive waste, and (2) to decide on the construction and operation of a DWPF to immobilize the HLW in a form suitable for shipment to and disposal in a Federal repository. Reasonable alternatives for the proposed action were also analyzed. Notice of the availability of the EIS was published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency on March 12, 1982 (47 FR 10901).

The analysis of alternative strategies for the disposal of the immobilized HLW relies on analyses and decisions resulting from the "Environmental Impact Statement—Management of Commercially Generated Waste," DOE/EIS-0046F, October 1980. Based on this EIS, DOE decided to: (1) Adopt a strategy to develop mined geologic repositories for disposal of commercially generated HLW and transuranic wastes, while continuing to examine subseabed and very deep hole disposal as potential backup technologies, and (2) conduct a research and development program to develop repositories and the necessary technology to ensure the safe, long-term containment and isolation of the waste.

#### Description of Alternatives

The preferred disposal strategy identified in the EIS is disposition of the immobilized HLW in a Federal geologic repository. The following alternative strategies were considered:

1. Indefinite tank storage at SRP (no action).
2. Other
  - a. Subseabed disposal.
  - b. Very deep hole disposal.
  - c. Rock melting.
  - d. Island disposal.
  - e. Ice sheet disposal.
  - f. Deep well disposal.
  - g. Partitioning and transmutation.
  - h. Space disposal.

Disposal in a Federal geologic repository will require that the SRP HLW be processed into a form meeting applicable repository criteria. The following immobilization alternatives were considered:

#### 1. Reference Immobilization

*Alternative:* Construction and operation of a large Defense Waste Processing Facility for the integrated processing of sludge, salt cake, and supernatant to form: (1) Borosilicate glass for disposal in a Federal repository, and (2) decontaminated salt for disposal at SRP. The immobilized HLW would be stored temporarily at SRP until a Federal repository becomes available. Borosilicate glass is presented in the EIS as the reference waste form for immobilizing the SRP HLW. Alternative waste forms are being evaluated. The selection of the waste form for the DWPF will be addressed in a subsequent environmental review.

2. *Delayed Alternative:* This action delays construction and operation of a DWPF under the reference immobilization alternative for ten (10) years. It assumes that by then a Federal repository would be available to receive the immobilized waste so that no more than ninety (90) days of interim storage may be required, and that a decision on a waste form would have been made for the DWPF.

#### 3. Staged Process Alternative

*(Preferred Alternative):* This alternative was developed from the reference immobilization alternative and would incorporate a phased or modular construction program along with improvements resulting from ongoing R&D. First, a facility would be constructed to treat the sludge, and then a facility would be constructed to treat the salt cake and supernatant. In this alternative, construction costs would be spread more evenly over the years of construction.

Alternative sites, all located near the middle of the SRP site, were considered for the DWPF. The construction site, Site S, was chosen primarily because of its proximity to the HLW storage tanks and to a suitable salt disposal area, as well as its suitability for construction. Although site S was not clearly the environmentally preferred site, differences in potential environmental impact were not of sufficient magnitude to affect the selection of Site S based on the above considerations.

Disposal alternatives considered for the decontaminated salt include: Land disposal, returning it to the waste tanks, and packaging it for shipment to a geologic repository. Land disposal in a form commensurate with its chemical and radioactive properties is the preferred disposal method. Four sites at SRP were considered for disposal of the decontaminated salt. The primary advantages of Site Z are its proximity to the DWPF and the depth of groundwater. These considerations

make Site Z the environmentally preferable alternative.

#### Basis for Decision

High-level defense waste must be managed so that current and future generations will be protected from potential hazards. The principal objective for disposal is to isolate the waste from the human environment with minimum reliance on maintenance and surveillance. Continued tank storage at SRP would require periodic construction of, and transfer of, the wastes to replacement tanks and is an interim measure.

The strategy of geologic disposal of the immobilized SRP HLW was adopted based on numerous analyses and on the decision for disposal of commercially generated HLW. As discussed in both DOE/EIS-0046F and DOE/EIS-0082, systems that can adequately dispose of commercial radioactive wastes can reasonably be expected to adequately dispose of defense wastes because they produce lower temperature and lower radiation levels than do comparable commercial high-level wastes.

The construction and operation of the DWPF in stages is consistent with DOE policies and earlier documents (ERDA 77-42, ERDA-1537, and DOE/EIS-0023) for SRP waste management and operations. Although the reference immobilization alternative is technically viable, the staged process alternative achieves the same objectives with comparable safety and environmental impact at lower initial capital cost. Ongoing research and development efforts will further refine design, construction, the operational aspects of the DWPF. The process for the actual DWPF, as built, may therefore differ from the present descriptions due to the incorporation of such refinements.

None of the immobilization and disposal alternatives is so clearly environmentally superior that it can be identified as environmentally preferable. As stated in the Record of Decision for DOE/EIS-0046F, the long-term effects of mined geologic disposal and those of the backup disposal strategies (subseabed and very deep hole concepts) would be very similar, and the radiation doses to the public are only a small fraction of the naturally occurring doses. The immobilization alternatives are similar environmentally. In general, the staged process appears to be environmentally, slightly preferable.

#### Considerations in the Implementation of the Decision

The DWPF will be designed and built to comply with DOE standards including

earthquake, tornado, fire, radiation protection, and environmental protection. The construction of the DWPF will not pose any significant or unmitigable impacts. Measures to minimize potential environmental impacts include sound engineering design, proper construction practices (e.g., erosion and storm run/off control to minimize aquatic impacts), and an effective quality assurance program. Impacts on a one hectare wetland, one of about 200 Carolina Bays on the SRP site, however, cannot be avoided. No practicable alternatives of locating the DWPF at Site S exist that would avoid eliminating the wetland. DWPF construction at alternative sites would impact similar wetlands. The final site layout and design of the DWPF will include all practicable methods of mitigating the impact. For example, permanent retention of storm run-off sedimentation basins after DWPF construction will result in manmade wet areas similar in most respects to the natural wetland. The ongoing comprehensive environmental monitoring programs will be expanded to detect any unanticipated impact of DWPF construction and operation.

For the United States Department of Energy.

Dated: May 24, 1982.

Herman E. Roser,

Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs.

[FR Doc. 82-14719 Filed 5-28-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

## Bonneville Power Administration

### Final Charges for Operation and Maintenance Charges on Customer-Owned Facilities

**AGENCY:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), DOE.

**ACTION:** Final notice of charges for operation and maintenance charges on customer-owned facilities.

**SUMMARY:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) by Federal Register notice of May 3, 1982, published proposed adjustments to operating and maintenance charges on customer-owned transmission related facilities (47 FR 18947). Written comments and requests for data were solicited, and were to be submitted by May 24, 1982. This notice announces the final charges. **DATE:** The charges will be effective July 1, 1982.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Donna L. Geiger, Public Involvement Coordinator, P.O. Box 12999, Portland, Oregon 97212; (503) 230-3478. BPA maintains toll-free lines for the use of

persons within the region. Oregon callers may use 1-800-452-8429; callers in Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, and California may use 1-800-547-6048. Messages and requests for information received outside of normal business hours (4:30 p.m. to 7:30 a.m.) may be recorded on the toll-free lines.

Additional information is available from:

Mr. George E. Gwinnutt, Area Manager, Suite 288, 1500 NE. Irving Street, Portland, Oregon 97232, 503-230-4551;

Mr. Ladd Sutton, District Manager, Room 206, 211 East Seventh Street, Eugene, Oregon 97401, 503-345-0311;

Mr. Ronald H. Wilkerson, Area Manager, Room 561, West 920 Riverside Avenue, Spokane, Washington 99201, 509-456-2518;

Mr. Gordon H. Brandenburger, District Manager, P.O. Box 758, Kalispell, Montana 59901, 406-755-6202;

Mr. Ronald K. Rodewald, District Manager, P.O. Box 741, Wenatchee, Washington 98801, 509-662-4377;

Mr. Thomas M. Noguchi, Acting Area Manager, Room 250, 415 First Avenue North, Seattle, Washington 98109, 206-442-4130;

Mr. Roy Nishi, Area Manager, West 101 Poplar, Walla Walla, Washington 99362, 509-525-5500, extension 701;

Mr. Robert N. Laffel, District Manager, 531 Lomax Street, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401, 208-523-2706.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:** In its Federal Register notice of May 3, 1982, BPA announced the need to increase its operation and maintenance (O&M) charges over its January 1, 1981, charges, effective July 1, 1982. BPA had previously notified its customers through BPA's Area and District offices of the need for the increase. Under the terms of various agreements, BPA's O&M charges may be unilaterally adjusted by BPA "when necessary to conform with BPA's cost of operating and maintaining like facilities." These O&M charges listed below are based upon a system wide 3-year rolling year cost for O&M on the various types of equipment, by voltage class.

By the close of business on May 24, 1982, BPA has received no written data, views, or comments on the proposed adjustments. BPA, therefore, finds that based on the staff analysis of the costs of operating and maintaining customer-owned facilities, BPA's proposed adjustments are reasonable and accurately reflect the costs of providing these services.

In consideration of the foregoing, BPA hereby establishes the following charges

for operation and maintenance on customer-owned facilities performed by BPA.

### ANNUAL O&M CHARGES FOR CUSTOMER-OWNED FACILITIES

<b>Terminal Charges:</b>	
Low voltage industrial terminal.....	\$6,624
Other low-voltage terminal.....	4,152
115-kV terminal.....	8,112
230-kV terminal.....	12,828
500-kV terminal.....	37,104
<b>Power Circuit Breakers:</b>	
Low voltage industrial.....	5,976
69 kV and under.....	3,516
115 kV.....	6,900
230 kV.....	11,616
500 kV.....	28,476
<b>Switches and Capacitors:</b>	
Group operated 345 kV and under.....	396
Group operated 500 kV and above.....	2,880
Hook operated 345 kV and under.....	120
Load break 345 kV and under.....	4,296
Capacitors per KVAR (series).....	0.444
Capacitors per KVAR (shunt).....	0.444
<b>Transformers:</b>	
230/low voltage.....	8,028
230/115 kV.....	35,784
500/230 kV.....	100,380
Industry transformers 230/low voltage.....	22,392

Issued in Portland, Oregon on May 24, 1982.

Edward W. Sienkiewicz,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 82-14906 Filed 5-28-82; 10:19 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

## Energy Information Administration

### Publication of Alternative Fuel Price Ceilings and Incremental Price Threshold for High Cost Natural Gas

#### Correction

In FR Doc. 82-13817 appearing at page 21914 in the issue for Thursday, May 20, 1982, please make the following correction:

On page 21914, in the third column, in the table, the entries for California and Texas should not have carried any footnote references.

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

### Independent Ocean Freight Forwarder License; Applicants

Notice is hereby given that the following applicants have filed with the Federal Maritime Commission applications for licenses as independent ocean freight forwarders pursuant to section 44(a) of the Shipping Act, 1916 (75 Stat. 522 and 46 U.S.C. 841(c)).

Persons knowing of any reason why any of the following applicants should not receive a license are requested to communicate with the Director, Bureau of Certification and Licensing, Federal