

miles (80 kilometers). It is important to note that according to the 2000 census, the average population density within 50 miles of the center of the 20 highest population urbanized areas in the United States is about 380 people per square kilometer, so the consequences would likely be lower if a severe truck or rail accident took place in an urban area. In addition, the severe accidents were assumed to take place during stable atmospheric conditions. As illustrated in Table 4–13, if the accidents took place during neutral atmospheric conditions, the consequences would be substantially lower. For example, if the severe truck accident involving LEU product occurred during neutral atmospheric conditions, the consequences would range from 3 to 5 LCFs, substantially lower than 75 to 125 LCFs. If the severe rail accident involving LEU product occurred during neutral atmospheric conditions, the consequences would be about 12 LCFs, substantially lower than 310 LCFs.

- Three individuals could suffer irreversible health effects from severe truck accidents and four individuals could suffer irreversible health effects from severe rail accidents due to the chemical toxicity associated with UF₆, hydrogen fluoride (HF), and uranyl fluoride (UO₂F₂). No fatalities are estimated to result from chemical exposure.

- Although it is not possible to predict the probability of an intentional destructive act, implementation of elements identified in the Department of Transportation-required security plan (personnel security, unauthorized access, and en route security) are judged to make these occurrences very unlikely. The consequences of such acts would be similar to the consequences discussed above for severe truck and rail accidents involving DU, NU, and LEU.

- If a severe accident involving stored LEU product were to occur, the accident would result in an estimated population dose. For example, at Global Nuclear Fuel–Americas (GNF–A), a severe accident was estimated to result in a population dose of 29,000 person-rem. In the assumed exposed population around the GNF–A facility, this radiation dose is estimated to result in 17 LCFs. The radiation dose for an individual located 2 kilometers from the facility was estimated to be 5 rem. The probability of an LCF for this person is estimated to be 0.003. If this accident occurred at other sites, the results would vary depending on the amount of material involved in the accident; the enrichment of the UF₆; the release fractions, aerosolized fractions, and

respirable fractions; release assumptions such as whether the release was elevated or from ground level; the number of people exposed; atmospheric conditions; and radiation dosimetry assumptions.

- The potential market impacts (including socioeconomic impacts) on the domestic uranium mining, conversion, and enrichment industries (*i.e.*, domestic uranium industry) from direct sales or transfers of uranium under the Proposed Action are expected to be small. In any event, DOE has prepared a mitigation action plan (MAP) to mitigate any potentially significant impacts on the domestic uranium industry from DOE decisions to disposition the excess NU, DU, and LEU inventory at DOE's Paducah and Portsmouth sites as analyzed in this EA.

- Cumulative impacts under the Enrichment Alternative would essentially be the same as those previously evaluated for the sites involved because DOE's uranium inventory would not increase the sites' enrichment capacity or throughput. Under the Direct Sale Alternative, DOE assumes that actions by the purchasers would be essentially the same as DOE under the Enrichment Alternative. For that reason, DOE finds that the cumulative transportation, enrichment, and storage impacts of the Direct Sale Alternative would be essentially identical to those of the Enrichment Alternative. The cumulative impacts that would occur under the No Action Alternative assessed in this EA are the same as the cumulative impacts identified for the two new conversion facilities at Paducah and Portsmouth.

[FR Doc. E9–15534 Filed 6–30–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. OR09–13–000]

BP Canada Energy Marketing Corp, Complainant v. Kinder Morgan Cochin LLC, Respondent; Notice of Complaint

June 24, 2009.

Take notice that on June 19, 2009, pursuant sections 2, 3(1), 4(1), 9, 13(1), and 15(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U.S.C. app. 2, 3(1), 4(1), 9, 13(1), and 15(1) (1988), Rule 206 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.206, and section 343.2 of the Commission's Procedural Rules Applicable to Oil Pipeline Proceedings, 18 CFR 343.2, BP

Canada Energy Marketing Corp (Complainant) filed a formal complaint against Kinder Morgan Cochin LLC (Respondent) challenging the Respondent's line fill policy which Complainant alleges has expired by its own terms, but Respondent continues to apply the policy to its shippers.

The Complainant states that copies of the complaint were served on the Respondent.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). 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 proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a notice of intervention or motion to intervene, as appropriate. The Respondent's answer and all interventions, or protests must be filed on or before the comment date. The Respondent's answer, motions to intervene, and protests must be served on the Complainants.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the "eFiling" link at <http://www.ferc.gov>. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 14 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

This filing is accessible on-line at <http://www.ferc.gov>, using the "eLibrary" link and is available for review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an "eSubscription" link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive e-mail notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please e-mail FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov, or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. Eastern Time on July 9, 2009.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E9–15457 Filed 6–30–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P