

Advanced Light Water Reactor, and Accelerator Production of Tritium. Five sites for new tritium supply facilities and tritium recycling facilities are assessed: the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (near Idaho Falls, Idaho); the Nevada Test Site (near Las Vegas, Nevada); the Oak Ridge Reservation (Oak Ridge, Tennessee); the Pantex Plant (Amarillo, Texas); and the Savannah River Site (Aiken, South Carolina). Additionally, the PEIS evaluates the alternative of producing tritium in existing commercial light water reactors, via the purchase of an existing reactor or irradiation services. The PEIS also evaluates the environmental impacts associated with the use of an Advanced Light Water Reactor, Modular High Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactor or Commercial Light Water Reactor for the purpose of plutonium disposition in addition to the tritium mission (the so-called multipurpose reactor.) Two options for tritium recycling are evaluated: the upgrade of existing tritium recycling facilities at the Savannah River Site, or the collocation of a new tritium recycling facility with the tritium supply facility at one of the other sites.

The Tritium Supply and Recycling PEIS compares the environmental impacts that would be expected to occur from the tritium supply and recycling alternatives. The No Action alternative of not acquiring new long-term, assured tritium supply, and continuing to operate the existing tritium recycling facilities is also evaluated. The Tritium Supply and Recycling PEIS has a classified Appendix that provides additional information and analysis.

DOE issued a Tritium Supply and Recycling Draft PEIS on March 1, 1995 and invited comments on the adequacy and accuracy of the draft analysis. Almost 2000 comments were provided. The Final PEIS reflects changes made by DOE in response to public comments received and to provide additional information. Key revisions to the PEIS included additional discussion and analysis in the following areas: severe accidents and design-basis accidents for all tritium supply technologies; site-specific environmental impacts of a dedicated power plant for an accelerator; water resource sections; site-specific analysis of a multi-purpose reactor that could produce tritium, burn plutonium as fuel, and produce electricity; the addition of the use of a commercial reactor as a reasonable alternative; and the environmental impacts of providing tritium at an earlier date to support a higher stockpile level.

The Final PEIS also identifies the Department's preferred alternative. The preferred strategy is to begin work on the two most promising tritium production alternatives: (1) purchase an existing light water reactor or irradiation services with an option to purchase the reactor for conversion to a defense facility, and (2) design, build, and test critical components of an accelerator system for tritium production. Within a three-year period, the Department would select one of the alternatives to serve as the primary source of tritium. The other alternative, if feasible, would be developed as a back-up tritium source. The Savannah River Site was designated as the preferred site for an accelerator, should one be built. The preferred alternative for tritium recycling and extraction activities is to remain at the Savannah River Site with appropriate consolidation and upgrading of current recycling facilities and a new extraction facility.

DOE has distributed copies of the Tritium Supply and Recycling Final PEIS to interested individuals and organizations. Additional copies of the Final PEIS are available to any other interested persons and can be requested as described above. DOE expects to issue a Record of Decision on the Tritium Supply and Recycling PEIS in late November 1995.

Signed in Washington, D.C. this 31st day of October, 1995, for the United States Department of Energy.

Everet Beckner,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs.

[FR Doc. 95-27549 Filed 11-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP96-41-000]

Colorado Interstate Gas Co.; Notice of Application

November 1, 1995.

Take notice that on October 31, 1995, Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG), Post Office Box 1087, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80944, filed an application in Docket No. CP96-41-000, pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act, for authority to abandon by transfer to CIG Field Services Company (Field Services), its affiliate, certain certificated and non-certificated facilities, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

CIG proposes to spin down to Field Services facilities located in the states of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico and Oklahoma that will be involved in the gathering and processing of natural gas. It is stated that CIG and Field Services would enter into an agreement for the transfer of the facilities at net book value at the time of transfer. CIG indicates that the net book value of the proposed spin down facilities was \$36,111,594 as of December 31, 1994. CIG avers that the transfer of facilities consist of (1) approximately 2,194 miles of pipeline ranging from 2 to 24 inches in diameter, with approximately 2,186 wells attached, (2) approximately 77,710 horsepower of compression, (3) processing facilities, and (4) appurtenant facilities.

CIG proposes to change the accounting classification of certain facilities that are currently on its accounting records in the gathering function to the transmission function. CIG avers that the spindown would not adversely affect customers as Field Services will step in to provide the services that CIG previously provided.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before November 22, 1995, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20406, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (19 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that the issuance of certificate authorization and permission and approval for the proposed abandonment are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion

for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for CIG to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-27490 Filed 11-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. GT96-27-000]

Colorado Interstate Gas Co.; Notice of Filing of Refund Report

November 1, 1995.

Take notice that on October 27, 1995, Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG) filed a refund report in compliance with the Commission's Order Approving Refund Methodology for 1994 Overcollections dated February 22, 1995, issued to GAS Research Institute in Docket No. RP95-124-000. CIG states that refunds were paid by CIG on October 13, 1995.

CIG states that the report summarizes refunds made by CIG to its customers for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994 pursuant to the Commission's February 22, 1995 Order.

CIG states that copies of CIG's filing have been served on CIG's transportation customers, interested state commissions, and all parties to the proceedings.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 214 or 211 of the commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 and 385.211). All such petitions or protests should be filed on or before November 8, 1995. 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 petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-27493 Filed 11-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. GT96-20-000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Co.; Notice of Refund Report

November 1, 1995.

Take notice that on October 25, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Company (Columbia Gas) tendered for filing a Report of Gas Research Institute (GRI) Refund. Columbia Gas states that the refund report is being made in accordance with Ordering Paragraph C of the Commission's February 22, 1995, Order Approving Refund Methodology for 1994 Overcollections in GRI's Docket No. RP95-124-000.

Columbia Gas states it has credited its share of the GRI refund to its eligible firm customers, as a credit to invoices issued on or around September 10, 1995. Columbia Gas states that the refund totalling \$1,014,961 represented GRI's overcollection of GRI surcharges for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First 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 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before November 8, 1995. 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. 95-27491 Filed 11-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. FA94-23-000]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; Order Establishing Hearing Procedures

November 2, 1995.

On July 21, 1995, the Deputy Chief Accountant issued a letter under delegated authority noting Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company's (CY) disagreement with respect to certain recommendations of the Division of Audits.¹ CY was requested to advise whether it would agree to the

¹ 72 FERC ¶ 62,060. The contested matters are discussed in Part I of the letter order.

disposition of the contested matters under the shortened procedures provided for by Part 41 of the Commission's Regulations. 18 CFR Part 41.

By letter dated August 18, 1995, CY responded that it did not consent to the shortened procedures. Section 41.7 of the Commission's Regulations provides that in case consent to the shortened procedures is not given, the proceeding will be assigned for hearing. Accordingly, the Secretary, under authority delegated by the Commission, will set the matters for hearing.

Any interested person seeking to participate in this docket shall file a protest or motion to intervene pursuant to Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) no later than 15 days after the date of publication of this order in the Federal Register.

It is ordered:

(A) Pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by section 402(a) of the Department of Energy Organization Act, the provisions of the Federal Power Act, particularly sections 205, 206, and 301 thereof, and pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR Chapter I), a public hearing shall be held concerning the appropriateness of CY's practices as referred to above.

(B) A Presiding Administrative Law Judge, to be designated by the Chief Administrative Law Judge, shall convene a prehearing conference in this proceeding, to be held within 45 days of the date of this order, in a hearing room of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426. The Presiding Judge is authorized to establish procedural dates and to rule on all motions (except motions to dismiss) as provided in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

(C) This order shall be published in the Federal Register.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-27521 Filed 11-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP93-89-003]

MIGC, Inc.; Notice of Compliance Filing

November 1, 1995.

Take notice that on October 27, 1995, MIGC, Inc. (MIGC), tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, First