

that the unit costs for separate GTCC LLW disposal would be much higher than is warranted by the low quantities and potential hazards of the waste. Therefore, the DOE initiated a program reassessment activity to identify strategy revisions that could effectively minimize the potential adverse impacts of GTCC LLW management and disposal scenarios.

Relationship to the Department's Preliminary Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS)

The PEIS does not address specific management options for GTCC LLW, but indicates that future options will be developed. These stakeholder workshops will begin the process of identifying GTCC LLW management options. The final management strategy selected for GTCC LLW will be addressed in supplemental National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation to be consistent with the PEIS.

Strategy Development

Two independent program reassessment activities have been performed under the DOE's GTCC LLW Management Program: (1) a reassessment performed by EG&G Idaho, Inc. (now Lockheed Idaho Technologies Company) was based on proposed resolutions for known programmatic issues, and (2) a reassessment by Rogers and Associates Engineering Corporation postulated approaches for minimizing adverse cost, environmental, institutional, and safety impacts. The results of both reassessment studies have been used by DOE in the tentative selection of a strategy for GTCC LLW management and disposal. Copies of the reassessment reports are available from the DOE upon request.

The Department is evaluating the feasibility of recovering radioactive material, including sealed source material, under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act. DOE is considering a recycle/reuse program for such recovered material that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has identified as material of public health and safety concern. The Department has recovered sealed sources in the past that represented immediate threats to public health and safety at the request of NRC. Supplemental NEPA documentation will be required. Depending on its characteristics, any sealed source material that is not recycled may be added to the inventory of GTCC LLW for disposal.

Strategy Options

(1) Pursue co-disposal of GTCC LLW with spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste in a geologic repository as the preferred co-disposal option. The repository will be an NRC-licensed facility that the NRC deems acceptable for GTCC LLW disposal, as well as for spent nuclear fuel and High Level Waste. Most of the projected GTCC LLW will be generated by nuclear utilities, and these utilities already have entered into Standard Contracts for repository disposal of their spent nuclear fuel and certain nonfuel-bearing components. Co-disposal of the remaining small quantity of non-utility GTCC LLW in the repository should also be feasible.

(2) Pursue co-disposal of GTCC LLW with DOE Special Case Waste as an alternative or supplemental co-disposal option. Some GTCC LLW types may be deemed unsuitable for repository disposal. Therefore, an option for GTCC LLW co-disposal with DOE Special Case Waste will also be maintained. The term Special Case Waste (SCW) denotes DOE waste having characteristics similar to those of GTCC LLW, and generally lacking firm disposal plans. Progress in developing this option will necessarily be tied to the development of disposal plans for DOE's SCW inventory. There is a regulatory issue to be resolved where GTCC LLW requires licensed disposal but SCW does not.

(3) Provide DOE storage capability for small quantities of GTCC LLW that DOE might accept for public health and safety reasons. Nuclear utilities generally have capability, and may prefer, to provide onsite storage capability for their GTCC LLW until disposal capability becomes available. However, some non-utility GTCC LLW generators may be financially unable to provide long-term storage for their GTCC LLW. Therefore, DOE storage for small amounts of GTCC LLW will be provided as needed to mitigate potential public health and safety issues. This contingency storage may be provided in conjunction with DOE's near-term acceptance program for sealed sources.

(4) Develop fee determination and collection methods to recover DOE's costs for GTCC LLW management and disposal. Cost recovery for DOE's GTCC LLW management and disposal services is implied by the Act, and is required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, for repository disposal. Preliminary information on this subject will be developed using the best available assumptions regarding probable methods for DOE storage, treatment, and disposal.

(5) Develop waste acceptance criteria for GTCC LLW co-disposal options. Waste acceptance criteria will be developed for the GTCC LLW co-disposal scenarios under consideration. These waste acceptance criteria are dependent upon the performance requirements that are imposed on the disposal facility, and may also be subject to constraints imposed by disposal facility design and siting considerations. Thus, the schedule for developing waste acceptance criteria will be tied to that of disposal facility development.

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 7, 1995.

Jill E. Lytle,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste Management, Environmental Management.

[FR Doc. 95-6120 Filed 3-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DOE Response to Recommendation 94-3 of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Rocky Flats Seismic and Systems Safety

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board published Recommendation 94-3, concerning Rocky Flats Seismic and Systems Safety, in the **Federal Register** on October 4, 1994 (59 FR 50581). Section 315(e) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2286d(e) requires the Department of Energy to transmit an implementation plan to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board by February 25, 1995, or submit a notification of extension for an additional 45 days. The Secretary's notification of extension for an additional 45-days follows.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, data, views, or arguments concerning the Secretary's notification to: Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Thomas P. Grumbly, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 24, 1995.

Mark B. Whitaker,

Departmental Representative to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The Honorable John T. Conway,
Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004

Dear Mr. Conway: This is to advise you, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2286d(e), that the Department of Energy will require an additional 45 days to respond to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 94-3, regarding seismic and systems safety at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site.

The Department recently made some management changes at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site. Because of these changes, and the need for the development of acceptance criteria for safety adequacy and systems for identifying facility upgrades, more time is necessary to respond. In addition, the Department believes that it is necessary to integrate its response to Recommendation 94-3 with Recommendation 90-5, (Systematic Evaluation Program). The Implementation Plan for Recommendation 94-3 will be provided to the Board by April 10, 1995.

Sincerely,

Hazel R. O'Leary.

[FR Doc. 95-6023 Filed 3-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Cultural Resources Industry Outreach Training Course

March 7, 1995.

The Office of Pipeline Regulation (OPR) staff will convene another session of its cultural resources compliance training course. The one-day training course will be held on May 3, 1995. The session is being offered in conjunction with the Society for American Archaeology 60th Annual Meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 3-7, 1995. However, attendance at the course is independent of attendance at the annual meeting for other purposes. We are holding this course so that additional members of the regulated pipeline industry and interested individuals and organizations can gain an understanding of:

- How the Commission gives the industry and the public an opportunity to assist the Commission in meeting its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and other historic preservation laws and regulations; and
- What cultural resources information the industry needs to file with the Commission before and after the Commission issues a certificate.

We encourage interested organizations and the public to take advantage of this course.

The course will include the following topics:

- Objectives and requirements of the Commission regarding compliance with § 106 of the NHPA and related historic preservation laws;

- Guidance for reporting on cultural resources investigations;
- Definition of cultural resources terms used by the Commission in the compliance process; and
- Efficient strategies for planning and conducting cultural resources investigations.

OPR's training course will be held at the Minneapolis Hilton and Towers, 1001 Marquette Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota. For hotel reservations, call (612) 376-1000 and identify yourself as an attendee of the course offered in conjunction with the Society for American Archaeology Conference. Special hotel room rates are available until April 11, 1995.

The OPR staff and Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation, the Commission's environmental support contractor, will conduct the training. There is no fee for the course, but you must pre-register. A cultural resources training session is also being planned for Denver, Colorado in September 1995.

If you would like to attend the May 3, 1995 session, or indicate your preference for other courses and locations, please call the telephone number listed below to obtain a pre-registration form.¹ Because space is limited, please mail or fax the registration form within 15 days of publication of this notice to: Ms. Donna Connor, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation, 470 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA 02210, Telephone: (617) 542-8805, FAX: (617) 695-1587.

You will receive confirmation of pre-registration and additional information before the Commission's training course.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-6078 Filed 3-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. ER95-626-000 et al.]

PSI Energy Inc., et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

March 6, 1995.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

1. PSI Energy, Inc.

[Docket No. ER95-626-000]

Take notice that PSI Energy, Inc. (PSI) on February 21, 1995, tendered for filing proposed changes in its FERC Electric Service Tariff, Original Volume No. 1

¹The registration form referenced in this notice is not being printed in the **Federal Register**. Copies of the form were sent to those receiving this notice in the mail.

(15th Revision) and Original Volume No. 2 (13th Revision), and its Electric Rate Schedule FERC Nos. 233, 234, 241 and 256.

The proposed changes would increase annual revenues from jurisdictional sales and service by \$7,414,000, based on the twelve (12)-month period ending December 31, 1995.

PSI has indicated that the filing of new tariffs and rates has been mandated by inadequate earnings on its jurisdictional sales. The average rate of return on such sales is, in its opinion, inadequate to attract the capital required by PSI to pay for necessary expansion of its electric plant and increased operating expenses. PSI also indicated that the filing has been made to satisfy the requirements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in Docket Nos. EC93-6-000, EC93-6-001 and ER94-1015-000.

Copies of the filing were served upon the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, the City of Logansport, Indiana, Jackson County Rural Electric Membership Corporation, the Indiana Municipal Power Agency, the Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc., and the Indiana municipalities of Brooklyn, Coatesville, Dublin, Dunreith, Hagerstown, Knightstown, Lewisville, Montezuma, New Ross, Pittsboro, Rockville, South Whitley, Spiceland, Straughn, Thorton, Veedersburg and Williamsport.

Comment date: March 20, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

2. Tucson Electric Power Co.

[Docket No. ER95-635-000]

Take notice that on February 22, 1995, Tucson Electric Power Company (Tucson), tendered for filing a Service Agreement, effective as of January 23, 1995 (the Agreement) between Tucson and Gulfstream Energy (Gulfstream). The Agreement provides for the sale by Tucson to Gulfstream of economy energy from time to time at negotiated rates in accordance with Service Schedule A of Tucson's Coordination Tariff, Volume 1, Docket No. ER94-1437-000. Tucson requests an effective date of January 23, 1995, and therefore requests any applicable waivers.

Copies of this filing have been served upon all parties affected by this proceeding.

Comment date: March 20, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

3. Tucson Electric Power Co.

[Docket No. ER95-636-000]

Take notice that on February 22, 1995, Tucson Electric Power Company