

and tied to the NRC siting criteria set forth in 10 CFR Part 60. In addition, should any differences between the 10 CFR Part 960 and 10 CFR Part 60 be identified, 10 CFR Part 60 would prevail in the licensing process.

The Implementation Guidelines of 10 CFR Part 960, Subpart B, establish procedures for applying the postclosure and preclosure provisions of the Guidelines in Subparts C and D for the evaluation of multiple sites in different geohydrologic settings in different kinds of host rock. Although prior to 1987, the DOE used these provisions of the Guidelines to assess individual sites as part of the site screening process, the 1987 amendments to the NWPA eliminated the need to consider alternative sites. Therefore, much of Subpart B is no longer applicable to the characterization of a single site. In addition, the various stages of site selection, except for site recommendation for repository development, were completed before passage of the 1987 amendments to the NWPA and the provisions of the Guidelines relating to these stages are no longer applicable to the evaluation of one site. Also, references to comparative site evaluations and associated performance levels are no longer applicable because, the 1987 amendments to the NWPA eliminated the need for any such comparative studies. These provisions will not be applied by DOE in evaluating the suitability of Yucca Mountain as a repository.

The portion of Subpart B of 10 CFR Part 960 that remains applicable to the evaluation of a single site and the relevant postclosure and preclosure guideline provisions in Subparts C and D, respectively, provide the basis for evaluating the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site. In addition, for the purpose of recommending Yucca Mountain for development as a repository, Subpart B provides that the DOE will supply evidence that the repository is likely to comply with applicable EPA and NRC requirements.

As discussed in Section II.B., the DOE provided clarification in the SCP regarding the Guideline conditions for which specific findings would be made in evaluating whether or not the Yucca Mountain site is suitable for development as a repository. Before a DOE decision is made that the site is suitable and can be recommended for development as a repository, the evidence must support findings by the DOE that none of the disqualifying conditions are likely to be present, that all qualifying conditions are likely to be

met, and that conclusions regarding such findings are unlikely to change.

DOE recognizes that the licensing process provides additional motivations for conducting activities that go beyond site suitability concerns. Even if there is high confidence that additional information will not change conclusions about site suitability, the DOE may determine that it is prudent to continue activities to address residual uncertainties, to build confidence in models, to confirm performance estimates, or to provide additional assurance to review boards or other parties in the siting and licensing process.

While no provision is made in the Guidelines for specific findings on either the favorable conditions or potentially adverse conditions, if these conditions exist under an evaluated technical or system qualifying condition, DOE will explicitly consider them when making findings on that technical or system qualifying condition, along with other important factors. The DOE notes, however, that as part of its separate and parallel effort to address NRC regulatory issues under 10 CFR Part 60, the DOE will ensure that site characterization studies are conducted to provide the information needed to specifically address the NRC potentially adverse and favorable conditions found in 10 CFR Part 60, Subpart E.

In summary, because Congress directed that only the Yucca Mountain site should be characterized to determine whether it is suitable for development as a geologic repository, none of the comparative portions of the Guidelines are currently applicable. The DOE will make specific findings regarding the applicable qualifying and disqualifying conditions identified in the postclosure and preclosure provisions in 10 CFR Part 960 Subparts C and D respectively, in making its decision whether to recommend the Yucca Mountain site for development as a repository. If favorable or potentially adverse conditions are found to exist under an evaluated technical or system qualifying condition, DOE will explicitly consider them when making findings on that qualifying condition, along with other important factors.

Issued in Washington, DC, on September 5, 1995.

Daniel A. Dreyfus,

Director.

[FR Doc. 95-22840 Filed 9-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER95-1654-000, et al.]

Northern States Power Company (MN) et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

September 6, 1995.

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

1. Northern States Power Company (Minnesota Company)

[Docket No. ER95-1654-000]

Take notice that on August 30, 1995, Northern States Power Company (Minnesota)(NSP), tendered for filing a Construction Agreement between NSP and Cooperative Power Association (CPA). This agreement provides for NSP to complete construction of the JohnnyCoke Substation for CPA.

NSP requests that the Commission accept the agreement effective September 1, 1995, and requests waiver of the Commission's notice requirements in order for the revisions to be accepted for filing on the date requested.

Comment date: September 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

2. Entergy Power, Inc.

[Docket No. ER95-1655-000]

Take notice that on August 30, 1995, Entergy Power, Inc. (EPI), tendered for filing an Interchange Agreement with Ruston Utilities System.

EPI requests an effective date for the Interchange Agreement that is one (1) day after the date of filing, and respectfully requests waiver of the notice requirements specified in Section 35.11 of the Commission's Regulations.

Comment date: September 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

3. Southwestern Electric Power Company

[Docket No. ER95-1656-000]

Take notice that on August 30, 1995, Southwestern Electric Power Company (SWEPCO), submitted a service agreement establishing LG&E Power Marketing, Inc. as a customer under SWEPCO's umbrella Coordination Sales Tariff CST-1 (CST-1 Tariff).

SWEPCO requests an effective date of August 10, 1995 for the service agreement. Accordingly, SWEPCO seeks waiver of the Commission's notice requirements. Copies of this filing were served upon LG&E Power Marketing, Inc. and the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

Comment date: September 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

4. Public Service Company of Oklahoma

[Docket No. ER95-1657-000]

Take notice that on August 30, 1995, Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO), submitted a service agreement establishing LG&E Power Marketing Inc. as a customer under the terms of PSO's umbrella Coordination Sales Tariff CST-1 (CST-1 Tariff).

PSO requests an effective date of August 10, 1995, and accordingly, seeks waiver of the Commission's notice requirements. Copies of this filing were served upon LG&E Power Marketing Inc. and the Oklahoma Corporation Commission.

Comment date: September 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

5. Central Power and Light Company

[Docket No. ER95-1658-000]

Take notice that on August 30, 1995, Central Power and Light Company (CPL), submitted a service agreement establishing LG&E Power Marketing Inc. as a customer under CPL's umbrella Coordination Sales Tariff CST-1 (CST-1 Tariff).

CPL requests an effective date of August 10, 1995. Accordingly, CPL seeks waiver of the Commission's notice requirements. Copies of this filing were served upon LG&E Power Marketing Inc. and the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

Comment date: September 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

6. West Texas Utilities Company

[Docket No. ER95-1659-000]

Take notice that on August 30, 1995, West Texas Utilities Company (WTU), submitted a service agreement establishing LG&E Power Marketing Inc. as a customer under the terms of WTU's umbrella Coordination Sales Tariff CST-1 (CST-1 Tariff).

WTU requests an effective date of August 10, 1995 for the service agreement. Accordingly, WTU seeks waiver of the Commission's notice requirements. Copies of this filing were served upon LG&E Power Marketing Inc. and the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

Comment date: September 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

7. Indiana Michigan Power Company

[Docket No. ER95-1660-000]

Take notice that on August 30, 1995, Indiana Michigan Power Company (I&M), tendered for filing with the Commission Facility Request No. 7 to the existing Agreement, dated December 11, 1989 (1989 Agreement), between I&M and Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc. (WVPA). Facility Request No. 7 was negotiated in response to WVPA's request that I&M provide facilities at a new 69 kV tap station to be owned by Jay County REMC (Co-op Name) and operated by I&M know as Jay County REMC-Trinity Tap Station. The Commission has previously designated the 1989 Agreement as I&M's Rate Schedule FERC No. 81.

As requested by, and for the sole benefit of WVPA, I&M proposes an effective date of November 1, 1995, for Facilities Request No. 7. A copy of this filing was served upon WVPA, the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, and the Michigan Public Service Commission.

Comment date: September 21 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraph

E. Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. 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 motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-22804 Filed 9-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. CP95-716-000, et al.]

Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

September 6, 1995.

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

1. Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company

[Docket No. CP95-716-000]

Take notice that on August 29, 1995 Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle), P.O. Box 1642, Houston, Texas, 77251-1642, filed in Docket No. CP95-716-000 a request pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) for authorization to abandon in place approximately 4,000 feet of 6-inch pipeline and 4,000 feet of 10-inch pipeline on Panhandle's Lincoln Laterals, and install approximately 4,400 feet of new 6-inch and 4,400 feet of new 10-inch pipeline all located in Logan County, Illinois, under Panhandle's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-83-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Panhandle states that the proposed abandonment would allow the current landowner, Material Service Corporation (MSC), to continue its rock mining operations in the area were the pipeline laterals currently exist. Panhandle states further that the estimated cost to abandon the pipeline in place would be approximately \$22,500 and would be 100 percent reimbursed by MSC.

It is said that the new pipeline would be completely installed before the cutting and capping of the existing laterals takes place, in order to minimize the outage time.

Comment date: October 23, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

2. Northwest Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP95-718-000]

Take notice that on August 29, 1995, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158, in Docket No. CP95-718-000, filed a request pursuant to §§ 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the