kind, rather than a cash contribution. For example, if the Federal share of the grant is $80,000 (80% of the grant), then the matching share will be $20,000 (20% of the grant), for a total grant of $100,000. The matching share may exceed 20%.

Evaluation Process and Criteria

Applications for grants solicited in this notice will be evaluated on a competitive basis by the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health with assistance and advice from OSHA staff.

The following factors, which are not ranked in order of importance, will be considered in evaluating grant applications.

1. Program Design

a. The plan to develop and implement a training and education program that addresses one of the following targets.

i. Fall protection in the residential construction industry.

ii. Safety and health programs for small businesses.

iii. Prevention of injuries in hospital and nursing or medical care facilities.

iv. Logging.

b. The number of workers and/or the number of employers to be trained by the program.

c. The number of workers to be trained as trainers of their fellow workers.

d. The appropriateness of the planned activities for the target selected.

e. The plan to recruit trainees for the program.

f. The plan for evaluating the program's effectiveness in achieving its objectives.

g. The feasibility and soundness of the proposed work plan in achieving the program objectives effectively.

2. Program Experience

a. The occupational safety and health experience of the applicant organization.

b. The experience of the applicant organization in developing and conducting training or education programs.

c. The technical and professional expertise of present or proposed project staff in training workers and/or employers and in occupational safety and health.

d. The applicant organization's experience in reaching the target population and conducting occupational safety and health and/or training and educational programs for that population.

3. Administrative Capability

a. The managerial expertise of the applicant as evidenced by the variety and complexity of programs it has administered over the past five years.

b. The experience of the applicant in administering Federal and/or State grants.

c. The completeness of the application, including forms, budget detail, narrative and workplan, and required attachments.

4. Budget

a. The reasonableness of the budget in relation to the proposed program activities.

b. The proposed non-Federal share is at least 20% of the total budget.

c. The compliance of the budget with Federal cost principles contained in applicable OMB Circulars and with OSHA budget requirements contained in the grant application instructions.

Preferential consideration will be given to applications that include one or more of the following elements.

1. Train-the-trainer programs, especially those that train workers to train other workers.

2. Submission by a consortium, particularly one that includes one or more community-based organizations or other organizations that can reach out to workers who are minorities, migrants, limited English-speaking, or have entry level and/or minimum wage jobs.

In addition to the preceding factors, the Assistant Secretary will consider other factors such as the overall geographical distribution and coverage of populations at risk.

Availability of Funds

There is approximately $1,700,000 available for this program, $500,000 each for fall protection, safety and health programs for small businesses, and injury prevention in hospitals and nursing or medical care facilities, and $200,000 for logging. The average Federal award will be $100,000.

Grants will be awarded for a twelve-month period. Grants may be renewed for additional twelve-month periods depending on the availability of funds, the continuing need for the training, and satisfactory performance by the grantee.

Application Procedures

Organizations that meet the eligibility requirements described above and are interested in applying for a grant may request grant application instructions from the OSHA Office of Training and Education, Division of Training and Educational Programs, 1555 Times Drive, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018.

All applications must be received no later than 4:30 p.m. Central Time, August 4, 1995.

Notification of Selection

Following review and evaluation, organizations selected as potential grant recipients will be notified by a representative of the Assistant Secretary. An applicant whose proposal is not selected will be notified in writing to that effect. Notice of selection as a potential grant recipient will not constitute approval of the grant application as submitted. Prior to the actual grant award, representatives of the potential grant recipient and OSHA will enter into negotiations concerning such items as program components, funding levels, and administrative systems. If negotiations do not result in an acceptable submittal, the Assistant Secretary reserves the right to terminate the negotiation and decline to fund the proposal.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 14th day of June 1995.

Joseph A. Dear,

Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 95–15128 Filed 6–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs

National Institute of Justice

[OJP (NIJ) No.1053]

RIN 1121–ZA15

National Institute of Justice Solicitation for Research and Evaluation on Violence Against Women

AGENCY: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

ACTION: Announcement of the availability of the National Institute of Justice Solicitation for Research and Evaluation on Violence Against Women.

ADDRESS: National Institute of Justice, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20531.

DATES: The deadline for receipt of proposals is close of business on August 1, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bernard Auchter at (202) 307–0499, National Institute of Justice, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20531.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following supplementary information is provided:

Authority

This action is authorized under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, §§ 201–03, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 3721–23 (1988).

Background

The National Institute of Justice is soliciting research and evaluation proposals responsive to the evaluation and research requirements related to the Violence Against Women Act—Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Interested organizations should call the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) at 1–800–851–3420 to obtain a copy of ''Solicitation for Research and Evaluation on Violence Against Women'' (refer to document No. SL000124). The solicitation is available electronically via the NCJRS Bulletin Board, which can be accessed via Internet. Telnet to ncjrsbbs.aspensys.com, or gopher to ncjrs.aspensys.com 71. Those without Internet access can dial the NCJRS Bulletin Board via modem: dial 301–738–8895. Set modem at 9600 baud, 8–N–1.

Jeremy Travis,

Director, National Institute of Justice.

[FR Doc. 95–15130 Filed 6–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–18–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–320]

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Regarding the Extension of Possession-only License No. DPR–73; GPU Nuclear Corporation Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Possession-Only License No DPR–73 which allows GPU Nuclear Corporation (the licensee) to possess but not operate the permanently shut down Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (TMI–2). The amendment would extend the expiration date of the license from November 9, 2009, to April 19, 2014.

Description of the Proposed Action

TMI–2 has been shut down since the March 28, 1979 accident. The facility has been defueled to the extent practicable and has been partially decontaminated. It is now in a safe storage mode called Post-Defueling Monitored Storage (PDMS). The licensee intends to keep TMI–2 in PDMS until the TMI–1 license expires on April 19, 2014, at which time the units would be decommissioned simultaneously.

Environmental Impacts

The staff evaluated the potential environmental and safety consequences of PDMS in Final Supplement 3 to the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Related to Decontamination and Disposal of Radioactive Wastes Resulting from the March 28, 1979 Accident at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (PEIS Supplement 3 or NUREG–0683 Supplement 3), dated August 1989. The staff evaluated radiological and non-radiological impacts associated with the licensee's proposal and seven staff identified alternatives. The licensee's proposal included storage of TMI–2 until the end of the TMI–1 license in the year 2014. The staff concluded that each of the alternatives (with the exception of the no-action alternative) were within applicable regulatory limits and could each be implemented without significant environmental impact. The potential health impact on both workers and the offsite public from any of the alternatives was very small. The staff concluded that none of the alternatives was obviously superior to the licensee's proposal from the perspective of environmental impacts. Although the quantitative estimates of potential impacts varied among the alternatives, the differences were not judged sufficiently large to allow for identification of an obviously superior alternative. The staff further concluded that the licensee's proposal was environmentally acceptable and would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The staff reviewed the conclusions of the 1989 PEIS Supplement 3 and the current TMI–2 conditions now that the facility is in long-term storage. The staff determined that the conclusions reached with respect to environmental impact associated with long-term storage of TMI–2 in the 1989 PEIS Supplement 3 are still valid.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission has concluded that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for this proposed action.

For further details with respect to this action see the licensee's environmental evaluation dated March 11, 1987, the licensee's request for a license amendment dated October 9, 1991, and the staff's PEIS Supplement 3 dated August 1989. These documents are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555 and at the Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–15137 Filed 6–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–315]

Indiana Michigan Power Company; Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License No. DPR–58, issued to Indiana Michigan Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the D.C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, located in Berrien County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of March 17, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to the extent that a one-time interval extension for the Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) by approximately 18 months from the September 1995 refueling outage to the 1997 refueling outage would be granted.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to defer the Type A test from the September 1995 refueling outage to the 1997 refueling outage, thereby saving the cost of performing the test and eliminating test period from the critical path time of the outage.