canisters of glass produced from the DWPF process will be stored in a facility adjacent to the DWPF pending geological disposal by DOE.

DOE selected this stabilization alternative for several reasons. These targets are in a variety of physical forms and shapes and contain no or small amounts of fissile materials; primarily they contain such materials as thorium, cobalt, and thulium. Their dissolution and transfer for vitrification in the DWPF will place these physically and chemically diverse materials into a uniform medium suitable for future emplacement in a geologic repository. Improved storage (the environmentally preferable alternative) would require the development of one or more packaging configurations for repository emplacement. Although vitrification in the DWPF will not occur for several years, processing and storage for vitrification in the DWPF can be implemented one to six years earlier than the improved storage alternatives. This will remove the targets in their deteriorating condition from the reactor disassembly basins, precluding further release of radioactivity to the basin water. Near-term costs are considerably less for the processing alternative as compared with the improved storage alternative. As with the Mark-16 and Mark-22 fuels, potential safety, health and environmental impacts for the improved storage alternatives are lower than the selected stabilization alternative of processing and storage for vitrification in the DWPF. However, the potential impacts from any of the stabilization alternatives are acceptable and well below any regulatory or management control limits.

VII. Conclusion

While the Final EIS focuses on the interim management of nuclear materials at the SRS, the decisions associated with the safe management of these materials directly affect the operational status of the nuclear material processing facilities at the Site. The decisions in this supplemental ROD and the initial ROD and Notice are structured to effect the earliest completion of actions necessary to stabilize or convert nuclear materials into forms suitable for safe storage and prepare the facilities for subsequent shutdown and deactivation. The actions being implemented will support efficient, cost-effective consolidation of the storage of nuclear materials and, to a great extent, will result in stabilization of the nuclear materials and alleviation of associated vulnerabilities within the timeframe recommended by the DNFSB.

The stabilization decisions utilize existing facilities and processes to the extent practical; can be implemented within expected budget constraints and with minimal additional training to required personnel; rely upon proven technology; use an integrated approach; and represent the optimum use of facilities to stabilize the materials in the shortest amount of time. Only minor modifications of the canyon facilities will be required, and these were also supported by the decisions made in the initial ROD and Notice.

Several years will be required to achieve stabilization of the nuclear materials within the scope of this and the initial ROD. Stabilization of the candidate nuclear materials at SRS will entail the operation of many portions of the chemical processing facilities. Consistent with DNFSB Recommendation 94–1, this will preserve DOE's capabilities related to the management and stabilization of other nuclear materials until programmatic decisions are made.

In summary, the Department has structured its decisions on interim actions related to management of the nuclear materials at SRS to achieve stabilization as soon as possible.

Issued at Washington, DC, February 8, 1996.

Thomas P. Grumbly,

*Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.*

[FR Doc. 96–3884 Filed 2–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

## Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

**[Docket No. RP96–46–000]**

### Algonquin Gas Transmission Corporation, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, Trunkline Gas Company; Notice Cancelling Technical Conference

February 14, 1996.

Take notice that the technical conference in this docket that was scheduled for Tuesday, February 20, 1996 (61 FR 3691, February 1, 1996), is being cancelled. On February 14, 1996, the subject pipelines filed a request that the Commission hold the processing of the proposed tariff sheets in abeyance so that the pipelines can consider revisions based on the standardization recommendations being formulated by the Gas Industry Standards Board pursuant to the Commission's order in Docket No. RM96–1–000.

Lois D. Cashell,

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96–3775 Filed 2–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

### Central Maine Power, Swans Falls Power Corporation; Notice of 10(j) Meeting

**[Project Nos. 2528–ME; 2527–ME; 2194–ME; 2531–ME; 2529–ME; 2530–ME; and 11365–ME]**

February 14, 1996.

a. Date and Time of meeting: February 28, 1996, from 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM.

b. Place: FERC, Room 52–40, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426.

c. FERC Contact: Rich McGuire (202) 219–3084; Robert Bell (202) 219–2806.

d. Purpose of the Meeting: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the United States Department of the Interior intend to have a Section 10(j) discussion and negotiation meeting for the Saco River Projects listed above.

e. Proposed Agenda:

A. Introduction
  Recognition of meeting participants
  Conference or meeting procedures
B. Section 10(j) issues discussion
  Run-of-river operation and minimum flows—Bonny Eagle and Skelton
  Monitoring DO levels—Skelton
  Aquatic invertebrate monitoring studies—Bonny Eagle and Skelton
  Impoundment Drawdown—Bonny Eagle
  Fish population monitoring—Bonny Eagle
C. Section 10(j) conflict resolution
D. Issues outside 10(j) discussion
E. Follow-up actions.

f. All local, State and Federal agencies, Indian Tribes, and interested parties, are hereby invited to attend this meeting as attendant. If you want to be an attendant by teleconference, please contact Rich McGuire or Robert Bell at the numbers listed above no later than February 23, 1996.

Lois D. Cashell,

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96–3776 Filed 2–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

**[Docket No. GP94–2–006]**

### Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of RIA Account Refund Report

February 14, 1996.

Take notice that on January 26, 1996, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation

(Columbia) tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) a refund report in accordance with Article XV, Section D of the April 17, 1995 Customer Settlement (the Settlement) approved by the Commission in Docket No. GP94–2–003, *et al.* on June 15, 1995. Under the terms of the Settlement, Columbia was required to file this report with the Commission within sixty days after the effective date (November 28, 1995) of the Settlement. Columbia states that it distributed copies of the report to the Supporting Parties to the Settlement.

The report shows, by refund issue, the pre-petition period refunds received by Columbia and deposited in the Restricted Investment Arrangement (RIA) account.[1] The report also shows the various dates when these refunds were distributed by Columbia, and to whom they were paid. The subject refunds, including interest, were distributed from the RIA account on November 28, 1995 as a result of the approval of the Settlement and Columbia's bankruptcy proceedings. The report details the following Category I Refunds and the remaining Category II Refunds:[2]

Account No. 191
  Category I—$10,158,582.79
  Category II—$898,243.16
Account No. 858 Tracker
  Category I—$4,240,344.96
  Category II—$0.00
Order 500/528
  Category I—$10,501,132.87
  Category II—$0.00
Account No. 858, Non-Tracker
  Category I—$9,903,376.63
  Category II—$0.00
GRI
  Category I—$885,965.56
  Category II—$0.00
Transco Refunds Applicable to Commonwealth Customers
  Category I—$204,974.44
  Category II—$0.00
Refunds Applicable to Capacity Released to Chevron
  Category I—$478,316.38
  Category II—$0.00

[1] The pre-petition period refers to the period prior to July 31, 1991 when Columbia filed a petition for bankruptcy protection under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code.

[2] As defined in Article II, Section F of the Settlement, Category I Refunds are pre-petition period refunds which had not been flowed through and were held due to the petition for Chapter 11; and Category II Refunds are applicable to the pre-petition period but not received until after July 31, 1991.

Any person desiring to protest Columbia's refund report should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. All such protests should be filed on or before February 21, 1996. 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. 96–3777 Filed 2–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

## Equitrans, L.P.; Notice of Corrected Tariff Sheets Filing

February 14, 1996.

Take notice that on February 9, 1996, Equitrans, L.P. (Equitrans), submitted for filing in its FERC Gas Tariff First Revised Volume NO. 1 the following proposed tariff sheets: Third Revised Sheet No. 58; Third Revised Sheet No. 203A; and Second Revised Sheet No. 238.

Equitrans states that these proposed tariff sheets are being submitted in order to correct the pagination or the superseding pagination contained on the corresponding proposed tariff sheets which were submitted for filing by Equitrans on January 23, 1996.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR Section 385.211). All such 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 in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96–3774 Filed 2–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

**[Docket No. ES96–1–001]**

## Old Dominion Electric Cooperative Notice of Amended Application

February 14, 1996.

Take notice that on February 8, 1996, Old Dominion Electric Cooperative (ODEC) made a filing requesting that the Commission amend the authorization granted in Docket No. ES96–1–000.

By letter order dated November 20, 1995 (73 FERC ¶ 62,120), ODEC was authorized, under § 204 of the FPA, to enter into a tax advantaged lease and leaseback of its 50 percent undivided ownership interest (Undivided Interest) in the Clover Power Station Unit 1 and certain common facilities.

As described in the application, the transaction would involve a lease and leaseback under which a tax-sensitive investor (Equity Investor) will obtain ''ownership'' of the Undivided Interest for income tax purposes.

There are three modifications to the original application indicated in ODEC's February 8, 1996 amendment. They are:

*A. Changes to Debt Structure*

Under the initial application, ODEC would have used part of the prepared rent under the Head Lease to fund a loan characterized as the Series A Loan. Under the proposed structure, the Series A Loan will be made by an independent lender; and, ODEC, would enter into an agreement with an affiliate of the Series A Lender, whereunder the affiliate will undertake to pay that portion of each installment of rent which equals then due principal and interest payments on the Series A Loan in exchange for an up-front payment made by ODEC from the pre-paid Head Lease rent.

*B. Change to Equity Security Deposit*

According to the original application, ODEC was to set aside the Equity Security Deposit to be invested in certificates of deposit. ODEC is now preparing to use the Equity Security Deposit funds to purchase, on the market, ODEC Bonds rather than investing in lower yielding certificates of deposit.

ODEC proposes to replace the repurchased Bonds with new 1996 Series A Bonds which would have a maturity of less than one year. ODEC indicates that the new Bonds would be issued under the authority granted by the Commission in Docket No. ES94–40–000 (69 FERC ¶ 62,054).