

Additional information concerning this notice may be obtained by contacting Major Joe Cox or Mr. Ron Pearce, Range Management Department, Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 85369-9160, telephone (602) 341-3318.

Dated: January 18, 1996.

Kim G. Weirick,
Acting Head, Land Use and Military
Construction Branch, Facilities and Services
Division / Installations and Logistics
Department, By Direction of the Commandant
of the Marine Corps.

[FR Doc. 96-860 Filed 1-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DOE Response to Recommendation 95-2 of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Regarding Safety Management

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Section 315 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2286d(b) requires the Department of Energy to publish its response to Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board recommendations for notice and public comment. The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board published Recommendation 95-2 concerning Safety Management in the Federal Register on October 19, 1995 (60 FR 54065). The Department of Energy published notice of a request for an additional 45 days to respond to Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 95-2 concerning Safety Management in the Federal Register on December 11, 1995 (60 FR 63514). The Department of Energy (DOE) hereby publishes its response to Recommendation 95-2 as allowed by the statute cited above.

DATES: Comments, data, views, or arguments concerning the Secretary's request are due on or before February 22, 1996.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Peter N. Brush, Principal Deputy, Assistant Secretary for Environmental, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. 20585.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on January 18, 1996.

Mark B. Whitaker,

Departmental Representative to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The Secretary of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

January 17, 1996

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

Dear Mr. Chairman: On October 11, 1995, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board issued Recommendation 95-2, Safety Management, to the Department of Energy. The Department shares the concerns that prompted the Board to formulate its recommendation. Like you, we are committed to conducting our work efficiently and in a manner that ensures protection of workers, the public and the environment. Over the past three years, we have developed and implemented a number of systems that are designed to achieve an acceptable level of safety throughout Departmental operations. These systems are designed to achieve the following objectives:

- enhance our ability to plan and execute work, identify the hazards associated with specific operations and activities, and control or eliminate such hazards in an appropriate and cost-effective manner;
- clarify our expectations for the work to be accomplished and the level of environment, safety and health protection to be established and to do so in a manner that is not overly prescriptive but allows contractors to exercise the best means of meeting these expectations;
- establish clear roles and responsibilities for protection of environment, safety and health throughout the Department and our contractor corps;
- shift the focus of attention from "paper requirements" and documentation to a disciplined, analytical and collaborative focus on work planning, hazards analysis and hazards control; and
- establish analytical bases for setting risk-based management and project priorities.

Key among these policy initiatives and programs are directives reform, the Necessary and Sufficient Closure Process, including the companion process relating to Standards/Requirements Identification Documents, and contract reform, including performance-based contracting.

In developing and implementing these safety systems, we have recognized that the size and diversity of the Department's organization and operations do not permit a "one-size-fits-all" approach to management. Further, the need for the Department's Headquarters program managers to be responsible and accountable for establishing environment, safety and health policies and management systems must be balanced against the practical imperative to provide field operations and contractors sufficient flexibility to accomplish their missions effectively. Finally, in this period of severely constrained resources, it is critical that management systems ensure that we are

attending to our most significant risks to environment, safety and health, that resources dedicated to environment, safety and health are both adequate and appropriate to the attendant level of risk throughout the complex, and that hazard control be achieved in a cost-effective manner.

The Department accepts Recommendation 95-2 as follows:

1. The first subpart of Recommendation 95-2 calls for the Department to institutionalize the process of incorporating into the planning and execution of every major defense nuclear activity involving hazardous materials those controls necessary to ensure that environment, safety and health objectives are achieved. We accept this Recommendation. While we believe that we have accomplished a great deal in this regard, we are committed to further improvements as evidenced by our ongoing safety management initiatives and recognize the need to further institutionalize the process of incorporating environment, safety and health considerations into the planning and execution of all activities at our facilities.

The task of institutionalizing the process includes incorporation in work planning of the "Necessary and Sufficient Closure Process," along with other relevant processes, such as the process for Standards/Requirements Identification Documents.

2. Subpart 2 calls for the conduct of all operations and activities within the defense nuclear complex or the former defense nuclear complex that involve radioactive and other substantially hazardous materials to be subject to management plans that are graded according to the risk associated with the activity. We accept this portion of the Recommendation.

We cannot accept the portion of subpart 2 which calls for "Safety Management Plans" to be "structured on the lines" of certain Board Technical Documents. As stated above, we are committed to the development of effective safety plans which reflect the diversity of the Department's operations and the need for a flexible approach to these activities. We stand ready to work closely with the Board as we refine our approach to subpart 2, but the Department is not able to accept this part in all of its detail.

3. Subpart 3 calls for the Department to prioritize its facilities and activities according to their hazard and their importance to defense and cleanup programs. We accept this portion of the Recommendation because for both safety and budget formulation reasons, the Department always will need an effective understanding of its priorities.

The Department cannot accept the portion of subpart 3 that calls for the development of priorities "following the process of Section I of DNFSB/TECH-6," relating to the revised Standards/Requirements Identification Document process, and Safety Management Plans. To be useful, any such new list of prioritized facilities and activities must reflect other current initiatives underway in the Department and should not be carried out exclusively for the purpose of focusing the transition from implementation programs related to Board Recommendations 90-2 and 92-5. Again, the Department stands ready to

work with the Board to seek a common understanding of an acceptable approach to this subpart.

4. Subpart 4 calls for the Department to promulgate requirements and associated instructions (Orders/Standards) which provide direction and guidance for the process defined in subpart 1, including responsibility for carrying it out. It also recommends that these requirements and associated instructions be made a contract term. We accept these portions of the Recommendation.

The Department cannot accept that portion of subpart 4 that would impose as a "model" for this process a specific Departmental Order relating to Operational Readiness Reviews. This "model," which has proven quite effective for start-up and re-start of high hazard nuclear facilities, may simply prove to be inappropriate for all activities covered by this subpart.

5. The Department accepts subpart 5 of Recommendation 95-2 and will continue to take measures to ensure that we have or will acquire the technical expertise to implement effectively our integrated safety management process.

The Department's initiatives and programs to improve safety management are at various stages of maturation, implementation and institutionalization. We are mindful of our responsibility to keep the Board apprised of the direction and progress of these undertakings and are appreciative of the time and attention that Board Members and staff already have devoted to reviewing and consulting with Departmental management and staff on several of the initiatives and programs.

It is our intent to work closely with the Board and any individuals identified by the Board as the Department prepares its plan to develop this integrated safety management process. We also look forward to further discussions with the Board to determine how we may best accomplish our mutual objectives and responsibilities in these matters.

Sincerely,

Hazel R. O'Leary

[FR Doc. 96-902 Filed 1-18-96; 4:01 pm]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. TM96-2-97-001]

Chandeleur Pipe Line Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

January 17, 1996.

Take notice that on January 4, 1996, Chandeleur Pipe Line Company (Chandeleur) tendered for filing proposed changes in its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, Sheet Nos. 5, 8 and 14.

Chandeleur states that it is proposing to change its Fuel and Line Loss provision in its FT and IT Rate

Schedules from allocation of actual Fuel and Line Loss to a fixed retention percentage based on allocated receipt volumes. This percentage will be retained by Chandeleur each month to cover the actual Fuel and Line Loss. Any differences between the actual Fuel and Line Loss, and the retained volumes will be made up by an annual change/recalculation in the retention percentage. The 1996 Fuel and Line Loss percentage is set at 0.5% on allocated receipt volumes.

Chandeleur states that copies of the filing were served upon the company's jurisdictional customers and state regulatory commissions.

Chandeleur has proposed an effective date for the revised tariff sheets of January 1, 1996.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 to the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed as provided in Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-786 Filed 1-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-408-000 and RP95-408-001]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.; Notice of Informal Settlement Conference

January 17, 1996.

Take notice that an informal settlement conference will be convened in this proceeding on Wednesday, January 24, 1996, at 10:00 a.m., at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, for the purpose of exploring the possible settlement of the above referenced docket.

Any party, as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(c), or any participant as defined in 18 CFR 385.102(b), is invited to attend. Persons wishing to become a party must move to intervene and receive intervenor status pursuant to the Commission's regulations (18 CFR 385.214).

For additional information, contact Thomas J. Burgess at 208-2058, David R.

Cain at 208-0917 or Anja M. Clark at 208-2034.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-781 Filed 1-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP96-112-000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

January 17, 1996.

Take notice that on January 5, 1996, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the following revised tariff sheet bearing a proposed effective date of February 1, 1996.

Fourth Revised Sheet No. 395

Columbia states that the purpose of this filing is to revise Section 20 (Discounting) of the General Terms and Conditions (GTC) of Columbia's FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1 (Tariff), which provides for the appropriate apportionment of discounts consistent with the Commission's policy on the order of apportionment of discounts to base rates and transition cost components of rates. Columbia states that it is revising Section 20.2 to refer to the Stranded Facilities Charge (SFC) in GTC Section 46 of its Tariff, which was part of Columbia's general Section 4 rate filing on August 1, 1995 in Docket No. RP95-408 currently set for hearing.

Columbia states that GTC Section 46 and the SFC provide for Columbia's recovery of costs associated with stranded gathering and products extraction facilities as a result of implementation of Order No. 636. As with the other transition cost items currently listed in GTC Section 20.2, pursuant to this filing the SFC component will be discounted after base rate and non-transition cost components. GTC Section 46 and the SFC will become effective on February 1, 1996, subject to refund and hearing. Consequently, Columbia states that it is appropriate that this tariff revision also be made effective on February 1, 1996, and Columbia respectfully requests a waiver of Section 154.207 of the Commission's regulations in order to permit this tariff sheet to become effective on that date.

Columbia states that copies of its filing have been mailed to all firm customers, affected state commissions and interruptible customers that have made a standing request for service of filings.