time delay, (t-), using a stopwatch. Record the measured temperatures. During the heat-up test for oil-fueled furnaces, maintain the draft in the flue pipe within 0.01 inch of water column of the manufacturer's recommended on-period draft.

(iii) With the exception of the modifications set forth above, York International shall comply in all respects with the test procedures specified in Appendix N of 10 CFR Part 430, Subpart B.

(3) The Waiver shall remain in effect from the date of issuance of this Order until DOE prescribes final test procedures appropriate to the P2LN and PBNL lines of condensing furnaces manufactured by York International.

(4) This Waiver is based upon the presumed validity of statements, allegations, and documentary materials submitted by the petitioner. This Waiver may be revoked or modified at any time upon a determination that the factual basis underlying the petition is incorrect.

(5) Effective December 23, 1994, this Waiver supersedes the Interim Waiver granted York International on November 2, 1994. 59 FR 56064, November 10, 1994 (Case No. F–077).

Issued In Washington, DC, on December 23, 1994.

Christine A. Ervin,

Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 94–32319 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL93–54–002, et al.]

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

December 23, 1994.

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

1. Wisconsin Public Service Corporation

[Docket No. EL93–54–002]

Take notice that on November 28, 1994, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation tendered for filing its refund compliance report in the above-referenced docket.

Comment date: January 6, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

2. Enron Power Marketing, Inc.

[Docket No. ER94–24–005]

Take notice that on December 12, 1994, Enron Power Marketing, Inc. tendered for filing a summary of its activity for the quarter ending September 30, 1994, pursuant to the Commission's letter order issued December 2, 1993.

Comment date: January 6, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

3. New England Power Company

[Docket No. ER95–267–000]

Take notice that on December 13, 1994, New England Power Company (NEP), tendered for filing further information concerning its filing in this docket, in particular how the net revenues expected to be received from NEP's sale of sulfur dioxide allowances produced by the involvement of NEP's generating stations in the acid rain program of the Federal Clean Air Act would be treated under NEP's filing.

Comment date: January 9, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

4. Altresco-Pittsfield, L.P.

[Docket No. QF88–21–005]

On December 16, 1994, Altresco-Pittsfield, L.P. (Applicant), tendered for filing an amendment to its filing in this docket.

The amendment provides additional information pertaining to the ownership of its cogeneration facility. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

Comment date: January 12, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

5. Selkirk Cogen Partners, L.P.

[Docket No. QF89–274–011]

On December 13, 1994, Selkirk Cogen Partners, L.P. (Applicant), submitted for filing an amendment to its filing in this docket.

The amendment provides additional information pertaining to the ownership of its cogeneration facility. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

Comment date: January 12, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

6. Pasco Cogen, Ltd.

[Docket No. QF92–156–001]

On December 19, 1994, Pasco Cogen, Ltd. (Applicant), submitted for filing an amendment to its filing in this docket.

The amendment provides additional information pertaining to the ownership and technical aspects of its cogeneration facility. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

Comment date: January 12, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraphs

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. 94–32282 Filed 12–30–94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Project No. 1267–002, Project No. 2406–002, Project No. 2465–000, South Carolina]

Greenwood County and Duke Power Company; Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Assessment

December 27, 1994.

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 FR 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 Draft Multiple Project Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) covering all three projects. In the Draft EA, the Commission's staff has analyzed the existing and potential future environmental impacts of the projects and has concluded that licensing the projects, with appropriate