

expected to result from the addition of a new combined cycle power plant to TVA's power system for meeting baseload and intermediate electricity needs. In addition to adding baseload/intermediate capacity to the TVA system, location of the plant in the project area would have increased system reliability.

Alternatives Considered

The No Action alternative would result in TVA not constructing a combined-cycle generating plant at either of the proposed sites in Franklin County, Tennessee. Under this alternative, TVA's overall ability to supply low cost, reliable power would rely upon other options from the *Energy Vision 2020* portfolio. Although the FEIS states that relying on those approaches alone might not allow TVA to meet future customer demands for low-cost, reliable power, TVA's perception of the risk changed based on changes in economic and power supply conditions.

Feasible action alternatives for meeting the stated purpose and need include the entire portfolio of actions recommended in *Energy Vision 2020*. These actions include various supply-side actions, customer service alternatives, and environmental control alternatives. TVA is currently using all of these *Energy Vision 2020* recommended options, and managing their use in a way which provides optimum flexibility at the lowest cost. However, at the time the FEIS was prepared, TVA's generation (or avoidance of demand) was not expected to be sufficient to meet near-term baseload demands. Within the time frame for which additional generation capacity was needed, the only action alternatives considered reasonable for detailed assessment in the EIS were the proposed construction and operation of a combined cycle power plant at one of two sites in Franklin County, Tennessee.

Two candidate sites were selected for detailed evaluation in the EIS based upon extensive screening using the following criteria: Transmission system connection (system support and connection cost); natural gas supply (pipeline availability, capacity and delivered fuel cost); air quality impacts (likelihood of the area being able to incorporate additional emissions); and water supply (surface or groundwater availability). The EIS assessed the impacts of one plant configuration. Infrastructure requirements for the site alternatives are very similar. Road upgrades, potential routes for a new 500-kV transmission line from the

substation to the alternative sites, water supply/discharge pipelines, a construction/emergency power line, and a natural gas pipeline for connecting with an East Tennessee Natural Gas (ETNG) pipeline were evaluated for potential impacts. In addition, the EIS assessed the impacts of upgrading 26.5 miles of existing natural gas pipeline by ETNG to ensure adequate gas supply for the project.

Decision

Due to changing economic conditions and reduced forecasts of electric power supply requirements, TVA re-evaluated whether and under what conditions to proceed with the proposed combined cycle power plant project. Current projections indicated that ample power from generation sources within the TVA service area should be available to meet TVA's near-term power needs at competitive prices without the power from the proposed combined cycle plant. After careful consideration, in March 2002, TVA concluded that the most prudent course of action was to not proceed with the proposed project.

Environmentally Preferred Alternative

Except for four environmental criteria the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed 510-MW combined cycle plant and its associated infrastructure would be indistinguishable at the two alternative sites. Use of Site 2 would involve longer utility lines for connection to natural gas, water, potable water, etc., which would result in greater disturbance to the environment for trenching and equipment activity. However, these impacts would be minor with the use of best management practices. Considering all environmental factors, including, as discussed below, socioeconomic impacts and the speculative impacts of purchased power generation, the FEIS selected the construction and operation of a combined cycle combustion turbine electric generating plant at Site 4 in Franklin County, Tennessee as the marginally environmentally preferred alternative.

The No Action Alternative would have no known local impacts at either of the sites (*i.e.*, baseline conditions would continue). Adoption of the No Action Alternative however, could increase the risks of TVA's possible inability to meet electricity demand and the consequent socioeconomic impacts to residents of the region. However, in light of changed projections for near-term demand and available known baseload generation sources, the risk of adverse socioeconomic impacts from TVA's possible inability to meet

electricity demand is minimal. TVA has determined that the current mix of available and planned generation sources is sufficient to meet electricity demand. The FEIS also asserts that there would be speculative environmental impacts associated with generation of electricity from other unknown sources. While these impacts are too speculative for detailed analysis, it is unlikely that they would, by themselves (*i.e.*, without the risk of socioeconomic impacts from not meeting power demand) outweigh the impacts of constructing and operating the proposed new generation plant. Therefore, TVA has concluded that the No Action Alternative is environmentally preferable.

Environmental Consequences and Commitments

With the continuance of baseline conditions under the No Action Alternative, no environmental consequences are anticipated, and, therefore, no commitments are required.

Dated: April 2, 2003.

Joseph R. Bynum,

Executive Vice President, Fossil Power Group,
[FR Doc. 03-11161 Filed 5-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8120-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA 2003-14880]

Notice of Rescheduling of Public Meeting Regarding NHTSA's Initial Decision That Certain Motorcycle Helmets Manufactured by NexL Sports Products Fail To Comply With Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 218

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of rescheduling of public meeting.

SUMMARY: NHTSA has rescheduled the public meeting previously scheduled for May 14, 2003 regarding its Initial Decision that NexL Sports Products (NexL) "Beanie DOT Motorcycle Helmets" (model 02) fail to comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 218, *Motorcycle Helmets*. NHTSA has also rescheduled the hearing to determine if NexL's remedy for the noncompliance of its model 01 helmets with FMVSS No. 218 was adequate. The public meeting regarding NHTSA's Initial Decision and the hearing on the adequacy of the remedy for the model 01 helmets have been

rescheduled for 10 a.m. on June 27, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew J. DiMarsico, Office of Chief Counsel, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590; (202) 366-5263. NHTSA's Initial Decision, and the information on which it is based, are available at NHTSA's Technical Information Services, Room 5111, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590; Telephone: 202-366-2588. When visiting Technical Information Services or contacting it via the telephone, refer to Investigation File CI-218-020612.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 11, 2003, NHTSA published a Notice in the **Federal Register** that it would hold a public meeting regarding its Initial Decision that model 02 motorcycle helmets manufactured by NexL Sports Products (NexL) fail to comply with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard (FMVSS) No. 218, Motorcycle Helmets, 49 CFR 571.218 and a hearing to determine whether the remedy provided by NexL to address a noncompliance in its model 01 helmets was adequate. For further details regarding this notice, see 68 FR 17857 (April 11, 2003). This public meeting and the associated remedy adequacy hearing have been rescheduled to June 27, 2003 at 10 a.m. in room 6332, Department of Transportation Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC.

Persons wishing to make oral presentations must notify Tilda Proctor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5321, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, (202) 366-4759, or by fax at (202) 366-8065, before the close of business on June 20, 2003. Other information in the **Federal Register** Notice of April 11, 2003 continues to apply.

Persons who wish to file written comments should submit them to the same address, preferably no later than the beginning of the meeting/hearing on June 27, 2003. However, the agency will accept written submissions until July 11, 2003.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118(a), (b), and 49 U.S.C. 30120(c), (e); delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50(a) and 49 CFR 501.8.

Issued on: May 1, 2003.

Kenneth N. Weinstein,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 03-11158 Filed 5-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[Ex Parte No. 333]

Meetings of the Board; Sunshine Act

TIME AND DATE: 10 a.m., Friday, May 9, 2003.

PLACE: The Board's Hearing Room, Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423.

STATUS: The Board will meet to discuss among themselves the following agenda items. Although the conference is open for public observation, no public participation is permitted.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

STB Finance Docket No. 34079, *San Jacinto Rail Limited Construction Exemption and The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company Operation Exemption-Build-Out to the Bayport Loop Near Houston, Harris County, TX.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34040, *Riverview Trenton Railroad Company—Petition for an Exemption from 49 U.S.C. 10901 to Acquire and Operate a Rail Line in Wayne County, MI.*

Docket No. 41185, *Arizona Public Service Company and Pacificorp v. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.*

Embraced case:

STB Docket No. 42077, *Arizona Public Service Co. & Pacificorp v. The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company.*

STB Docket No. 42072, *Carolina Power & Light Company v. Norfolk Southern Railway Company.*

STB Finance Docket No. 33989, *Pejepscot Industrial Park, Inc., d/b/a Grimm Industries—Petition for Declaratory Order.*

STB Docket No. AB-55 (Sub-No. 618), *CSX Transportation, Inc.—Discontinuance—at Memphis, in Shelby County, TN.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34236, *Bolen-Brunson-Bell Lumber Company, Inc. v. CSX Transportation, Inc.*

Embraced case:

Ex Parte No. 346 (Sub-No. 25), *Rail General Exemption Authority—Lumber or Wood Products.*

STB Finance Docket No. 33740, *The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company—Petition for Declaration or Prescription of Crossing, Trackage, or Joint Use Rights.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34293, *Metro-North Commuter Railroad Company—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Line of Norfolk Southern Railway Company and Pennsylvania Lines LLC.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34145, *Bulkmatic Railroad Corporation—Acquisition Exemption—Bulkmatic Transport Company.*

Embraced case:

STB Finance Docket No. 34179, *Bulkmatic Railroad Corporation—Operation Exemption—Bulkmatic Transport Company.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34284, *Southwest Gulf Railroad Company—Construction and Operation Exemption—Medina County, TX.*

STB Docket No. AB-596, *New York City Economic Development Corporation—Adverse Abandonment—New York Cross Harbor Railroad in Brooklyn, NY.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34299, *Gulf & Ohio Railways Holding Co., Inc., H. Peter Claussen and Linda C. Claussen—Continuance in Control Exemption—Chattahoochee & Gulf Railroad Co., Inc.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34316 (Sub-No. 1), *The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company—Trackage Rights Exemption—Union Pacific Railroad Company.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34320 (Sub-No. 1), *Union Pacific Railroad Company—Trackage Rights Exemption—The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34321 (Sub-No. 1), *Union Pacific Railroad Company—Trackage Rights Exemption—The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company.*

STB Finance Docket No. 34333 (Sub-No. 1), *Union Pacific Railroad Company—Trackage Rights Exemption—The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company.*

STB Ex Parte No. 282 (Sub-No. 20), *Railroad Consolidation Procedures—Exemption for Temporary Trackage Rights.*

Docket No. AB-389 (Sub-No. 1X), *Georgia Great Southern Division, South Carolina Central Railroad Co., Inc.—Abandonment and Discontinuance Exemption—Between Albany and Dawson, in Terrell, Lee and Dougherty Counties, GA.*

STB Docket No. MC-F-20995, *Peter Pan Bus Lines Trust—Purchase and Acquisition of Control—Arrow Acquisition, LLC, Bonanza Acquisition, LLC, Maine Line, LLC, Pawtuxet Valley, LLC, Peter Pan Boston, LLC, and Peter Pan Bus Lines, Inc.*

STB Docket No. WCC-105, *DHX, Inc. v. Matson Navigation Company and Sea-land Service, Inc.*

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:

A. Dennis Watson, Office of Congressional and Public Services, Telephone: (202) 565-1596. FIRS: 1-800-877-8339