

emission allowances with fractions of allowances, if any, to be settled in cash.

Georgia Power renews its request for a January 1, 1995 effective date and states that copies of the filing have been served on the Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia and the City of Dalton.

Comment date: October 17, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

10. Interregional Transmission Coordination Forum

[Docket No. ER95-1738-000]

Take notice that on September 11, 1995, Interregional Transmission Coordination Forum tendered for filing a Notice of Cancellation of Rate Schedule FERC No. 1.

Comment date: October 16, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

11. Southwestern Electric Power Company

[Docket No. ER95-1750-000]

Take notice that on September 14, 1995, Southwestern Electric Power Company (SWEPCO) submitted a service agreement establishing Entergy Services, Inc. as a customer under SWEPCO's umbrella Coordination Sales Tariff CST-1 (CST-1 Tariff).

SWEPCO requests an effective date of August 16, 1995 for the service agreement. Accordingly, SWEPCO seeks waiver of the Commission's notice requirements. Copies of this filing were served upon Entergy Services, Inc., the Arkansas Public Service Commission, the Louisiana Public Service Commission and the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

Comment date: October 17, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

12. Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

[Docket No. ER95-1754-000]

Take notice that on September 14, 1995, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (NMPC) tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an executed Service Agreement between NMPC and Phibro Inc. (Phibro). This Service Agreement specifies that Phibro has signed on to and has agreed to the terms and conditions of NMPC's Power Sales Tariff designated as NMPC's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 2. This Tariff, approved by FERC on April 15, 1995, 1994, and which has an effective date of March 13, 1993, will allow NMPC and Phibro to enter into separately scheduled transactions under

which NMPC will sell to Phibro capacity and/or energy as the parties may mutually agree.

In its filing letter, NMPC also included a Certificate of Concurrence executed by the Purchaser.

NMPC requests an effective date of August 29, 1995. NMPC has requested waiver of the notice requirements of good cause shown.

NMPC has served copies of the filing upon the New York State Public Service Commission and Phibro.

Comment date: October 17, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

13. Texaco Natural Gas Inc.

[Docket No. ER95-1787-000]

Take notice that on September 18, 1995, Texaco Natural Gas Inc. (TNGI) tendered for filing a petition for waivers and blanket approvals under various regulations of the Commission and for an order accepting its FERC Electric Rate Schedule No. 1 to be effective no later than sixty (60) days from the date of its filing.

TNGI intends to serve the electric power market as both a broker and a marketer of electric power. TNGI seeks authority to purchase electric capacity, energy or transmission services from third parties, and to sell such capacity and energy to others at market-based rates. TNGI is not affiliated, directly or indirectly, with any investor-owned utility or any entity owning or controlling electric transmission facilities. TNGI is affiliated with several entities that own or control assets used for the generation of electric power. Each of these projects involves the generation of power by a "qualifying facility" under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act. Rate Schedule No. 1 provides for the sale of electricity at market-based rates.

Comment date: October 17, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

14. Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company

[Docket No. FA94-23-000]

Take notice that on September 18, 1995, Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company tendered for filing a compliance filing in the above-referenced docket.

Comment date: October 17, 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. 95-25231 Filed 10-11-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Project Nos. 2406-002 and 2465-003 South Carolina; Project No. 1267-000 South Carolina]

Duke Power Company, Greenwood County, SC; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

October 5, 1995.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Regulations, 18 CFR Part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 F.R. 47897), the Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the applications for new licenses for the following three existing hydroelectric Projects, all of which are located on the Saluda River in South Carolina: (1) The Saluda Station Project (No. 2406-002), located in Greenville and Pickens Counties, near Greenville, SC; (2) the Hollidays Bridge Project (No. 2465-003), located in Greenville and Anderson Counties near Greenville, SC; and (3) the Buzzards Roost Project (No. 1267-000), located in Newberry, Laurens, and Greenwood Counties near Greenwood, SC. The Commission has prepared a Final Multiple Project Environmental Assessment (EA) covering all three projects. The FEA contains the Commission staff's analysis of the existing and potential future environmental impacts of the projects and has concluded that licensing the projects, with appropriate environmental protective or enhancement measures, would not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the EA are available for review in the Public Reference Branch, room 3104, of the Commission's offices

at 941 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.
 Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.
 [FR Doc. 95-25230 Filed 10-11-95; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

Western Area Power Administration

Record of Decision for the Energy Planning and Management Program

AGENCY: Western Area Power Administration, DOE.

ACTION: Record of decision.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration (Western) completed a draft and final environmental impact statement (EIS), DOE/EIS-0182, on its Energy Planning and Management Program (Program). Western is publishing this Record of Decision (ROD) to adopt the Program, which will require the preparation of integrated resource plans (IRP) by Western's long-term firm power customers, and establish a framework for extension of existing firm power resource commitments to customers.

DATES: Western will proceed to take action with the publication of this ROD. All parties who have previously expressed an interest in the Program will be notified and copies of the ROD made available to them.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
 Robert C. Fullerton, Western Area Power Administration, P.O. Box 3402, A3100, Golden, CO 80401-0098, (303) 275-1610.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Western has prepared this (ROD) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality NEPA implementing regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and DOE NEPA implementing regulations (10 CFR Part 1021). This ROD is based on information contained in the "Energy Planning and Management Program Environmental Impact Statement," DOE/EIS-0182, and related coordination with agencies, power customers, interested groups, and individuals. Western has considered all comments received on the proposed Program in preparing this ROD. The final Program also implements the provisions of section 114 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAct), Public Law 102-486.

Background

Western proposed the Program in concept on April 19, 1991 (56 FR 16093). The goal of the Program was, and is, to require planning and efficient

energy use by Western's long-term firm power customers and to extend Western's firm power resource commitments as contracts expire. Western published its notice of intent to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register on May 1, 1991 (56 FR 19995).

Combined public information/environmental scoping meetings on the proposed Program were held in seven states in June 1991. Based on the feedback received from these meetings, Western developed alternatives to be analyzed in the EIS. Public alternatives workshops were held in eight cities in Western's service area during March and April 1992.

President Bush signed EPAct into law on October 24, 1992. Section 114 of EPAct requires the preparation of IRPs by Western's customers, and amends Title II of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984. Western adjusted its proposed Program to fully incorporate the provisions of this law.

The draft EIS was printed and distributed during March of 1994. Notices of availability for the draft EIS were published in the Federal Register by Western on March 31, 1994 (59 FR 15198), and by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on April 1, 1994 (59 FR 15409). Eight public hearings were held throughout Western's service area during the 45-day public comment period. Western did not identify a preferred alternative in the draft EIS, but solicited input from interested parties and the public as to what they thought the appropriate alternative should be.

Because the Program is also a rule-making action, Western conducted a public process under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), coordinated with the ongoing NEPA process. A notice of the proposed Program was published in the Federal Register on August 9, 1994 (59 FR 40543), with seven public information/comment forums held at various locations during September 1994.

With input from oral and written comments from both the NEPA and APA processes, Western modified the EIS alternatives where appropriate, and revised the draft EIS. The final EIS was distributed to the public on June 27, 1995. The EPA notice of availability was published on July 21, 1995 (60 FR 37640). The final EIS identified an agency preferred alternative, a combination of features from Alternatives 5 and 6, as presented in the draft EIS. The alternatives considered in the EIS are described in the following section.

Alternatives

The EIS evaluated a total of 13 alternatives, including a no-action alternative. All but the no-action alternative comprised different approaches to implementing the proposed Program. The two parts of the proposed Program are the IRP provision and the Power Marketing Initiative (PMI). The IRP provision requires customers to prepare IRPs, and establishes administrative procedures and requirements. Small customers could be exempt from the IRP requirement, but would still have to accomplish some resource planning on a simpler scale as needed.

Options for the PMI include PMI Extensions, PMI Limited Extensions, and PMI Non-extensions. These options, which are explained more fully in the EIS, include varying amounts of existing resources (from 90 to 100 percent of the present commitments) that would be extended to Western's power customers, varying the lengths of contracts (from 10 to 35 years), determining the existence and size of a resource pool ranging from 0 to 10 percent, establishing options for how pooled resources would be generally allocated, and setting penalties for noncompliance.

The alternatives in the EIS consisted of various reasonable combinations of the above components. The summary of the EIS contains a table, Table S.3, which concisely describes the principal attributes of each alternative. That table is reprinted here. The no-action alternative assumes the continuation of Western's Guidelines and Acceptance Criteria for the Conservation and Renewable Energy Program. The alternatives are not described in further detail here, as they are combinations of the components discussed above, and the EIS analysis did not reveal any important differences in impacts among the alternatives, except with the no-action alternative.

All alternatives had positive impacts when compared to no action, as each alternative would encourage energy efficiency on the part of Western's customers. The predicted effect of the Program within Western's service territory is reduced energy usage of approximately 2 to 6 percent in the year 2015, depending on the alternative. Western's customers are forecast to use 5 to 15 percent less energy in 2015, depending on the alternative. Within Western's service territory, the savings varies from area to area, depending primarily on the amount of conservation activity already accomplished and the number and type of existing energy-efficient buildings.