

DOE prepared this Draft EIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations that implement the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), and DOE's procedures implementing NEPA (10 CFR Part 1021). Projects considered by DOE for possible CCPI funding originate as a private party's (e.g., electric power industry) application submitted to DOE in response to requirements specified in CCPI funding opportunity announcements. DOE is limited to considering the application as proposed by the private party; however, DOE may require mitigation measures to reduce a project's potential impacts. Consequently, DOE's consideration of reasonable alternatives is limited to the technically acceptable applications and the No Action Alternative for each selected project.

Under the No Action Alternative, DOE would not provide cost-shared funding for the project beyond that required to complete the NEPA process. Although AEP could still elect to construct and operate the proposed project, without DOE funding the project would likely be canceled. Therefore, for purposes of analysis in the Draft EIS, the No Action Alternative is assumed to be equivalent to a "no build" alternative, meaning that environmental conditions would remain as they are (no new construction, resource utilization, emissions, discharges, or wastes generated). The No Action Alternative would not contribute to the goal of the CCPI program, which is to accelerate commercial deployment of advanced technologies that provide the United States with clean, reliable, and affordable energy.

The Draft EIS analyzes the environmental consequences that may result from the Proposed Action, including options for pipeline routes and injection well sites, and the No Action Alternative. Potential impacts identified during the scoping process and analyzed in the Draft EIS relate to the following: air quality and climate; greenhouse gases; geology; physiography and soils; groundwater; surface water; wetlands and floodplains; biological resources; cultural resources; land use and aesthetics; traffic and transportation; noise; materials and waste management; human health and safety; utilities; community services; socioeconomic; and environmental justice.

Copies of the Draft EIS have been distributed to: Members of Congress; Native American Tribal governments;

Federal, State, and local officials; and agencies, organizations and individuals who may be interested or affected. Copies of the Draft EIS are available for review at the New Haven Public Library, 106 Main Street, New Haven, WV 25265, and at the Meigs County Library District, 216 West Main Street, Pomeroy, OH 45769. The Draft EIS will also be available on the Internet at: [http://nepa.energy.gov/DOE\\_NEPA\\_documents.htm](http://nepa.energy.gov/DOE_NEPA_documents.htm); or <http://www.netl.doe.gov/publications/others/nepa/index.html>.

Issued in Washington, DC on March 8, 2011.

**Mark J. Matarrese,**

*Director, Office of Environment, Security, Safety & Health, Office of Fossil Energy.*

[FR Doc. 2011–5694 Filed 3–10–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### **DOE Response to Recommendation 2010–2 of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Pulse Jet Mixing at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant**

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 2010–2, concerning *Pulse Jet Mixing at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant* was published in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 2010 (72 FR 24279). In accordance with section 315(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2286d(b), the Secretary of Energy transmitted the following response to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board on February 10, 2011.

**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, DC 20004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Steven Petras, Nuclear Engineer, Departmental Representative to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Office of Health, Safety and Security, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 28, 2011.

**Mari-Jo Campagnone,**

*Departmental Representative to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Office of Health, Safety and Security.*

The Honorable Peter S. Winokur

Chairman

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board  
625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20004–2901

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your December 17, 2010 letter, which provided Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (Board) Recommendation 2010–2, *Pulse Jet Mixing at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant*. Mr. Dale E. Knutson will be the responsible Manager for this Recommendation.

The Department of Energy (DOE) agrees with the Board that more testing and analysis should be completed to provide additional confidence that pulse jet mixing (PJM) and transfer systems for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) will achieve their design and operating requirements. DOE has previously made commitments to address the concerns raised by the Board in its Recommendation 2010–2. These commitments were made by the Federal Project Director in August 2010 during an internal project management meeting; in the October 7–8, 2010 public hearing on WTP; and in our supplement to the public hearing record submitted to the Board in January 2011. At each point, full disclosure of DOE plans, with identified timelines for further details and schedules for testing and analysis, was included. The implementation of these commitments is on-going as part of WTP project plans that supports scheduled testing to begin in 2012.

The Board acknowledged in its letter that DOE has taken and continues to take steps to increase the confidence that the PJM mixed vessels will comply with their designed operating requirements. As outlined in your letter:

- DOE contracted an independent technical review team, Consortium for Risk Evaluation and Stakeholder Participation (CRESP), that presented DOE with 13 recommendations. DOE is continuing to take actions addressing the CRESP recommendations.

- On October 7–8, 2010, DOE publicly committed to large-scale testing and to complete relevant portions of the testing before installing remaining process vessels in the WTP Pretreatment Facility. As part of that commitment, the testing objectives and summary schedule for the large-scale testing was included in the WTP Project's January 2011 update to the public record.

We believe the Board's concerns regarding PJM at the WTP will be addressed by DOE's current direction related to resolving PJM and transfer system uncertainty. Accordingly, DOE accepts Recommendation 2010–2.

The Board's Recommendation includes specific sub-recommendations that it believes need to be addressed as part of the DOE's pulse jet mixed vessel testing program. There are certain specific details of the Board's Recommendation that require clarification and are summarized below. We believe our intended actions should satisfy the Board's concerns.

- *Sub-recommendations 1 and 2:* Wording in both sub-recommendations calls for "testing that envelope the complete range of

physical properties for the high-level waste stored in the Hanford Tank Farms.”

DOE intends to conduct large-scale testing with simulants selected to represent the vast majority of the waste in the tank farms, consistent with the approach used in WTP’s pulse jet mixing test program conducted to date. The WTP design and planned operations approach is intended to address residual uncertainty with other actions and design features. These include (1) waste feed pre-qualification activities; and (2) specific design features, including the ability to inspect vessels and equipment for vessel heel dilution and cleanout, that would enable waste particles that may not be mixing with the bulk of the waste to be moved forward to the melters.

- *Sub-recommendation 3:* This sub-recommendation calls for “\* \* \* verification and validation of any computational models used by the WTP project team (e.g., Low Order Accumulation Model and FLUENT) based on the results from the ‘large-scale testing.’”

The verification and validation effort is expected to be completed prior to the “large scale testing.” The WTP project intends to compare the results from the “large scale testing” with the computational models.

- *Sub-recommendation 4:* This sub-recommendation calls for “\* \* \* including demonstrating that representative samples can be obtained even if the assumed WTP design particle size or density is exceeded. This will ensure that the sampling system does not exclude large, dense particles and artificially bias the measured particle size and density distribution.”

The vessel testing activities will include determining the acceptability of vessel sampling in conditions where sampling may be challenged by mixing performance, i.e., solids-containing vessels. There may be cases where the sample system operation during normal vessel operations does not retrieve some large dense particles for analysis. As noted above, this is planned to be accommodated by the feed-prequalification process and by the ability to pull a sample during the heel dilution and cleanout process, when larger, denser particles would be retrieved into the sample system. Consequently, the large-scale testing program is not intending to demonstrate that normal sampling activities can retrieve all waste particles.

DOE is committed to the safe design and operation of its nuclear facilities, consistent with the principles of Integrated Safety Management, and values input on how DOE can improve its activities. We look forward to working further with the Board and its staff on preparation of the DOE’s Implementation Plan for Recommendation 2010–2 so that the WTP project can complete its design and construction activities while promoting nuclear safety for the life of WTP operations.

If you have any further questions, please contact me or Inés R. Triay, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, at (202) 586–7709.

Sincerely,

Steven Chu.

[FR Doc. 2011–5608 Filed 3–10–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

#### Proposed Agency Information Collection

**AGENCY:** Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice and Request for Comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy (DOE) invites public comment on a proposed collection of information to support the Weatherization Assistance Program ARRA–Period Evaluation that DOE is developing for submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record. Information about the operation of the program, energy used before and after weatherization, energy used by control group low-income homes, the effectiveness of specific energy efficiency measures, customer satisfaction with the program, and non-energy benefits is needed for a comprehensive and rigorous evaluation of the program operated during the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), which includes Program Years 2009, 2010, and 2011.

**DATES:** Comments regarding this proposed information collection must be received on or before May 10, 2011. If you anticipate difficulty in submitting comments within that period, contact the person listed in **ADDRESSES** as soon as possible.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments may be sent to: Bruce Tonn, Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, One Bethel Valley Road, P.O. Box 2008, MS–6038, Oak Ridge, TN 37831–6038, Fax #: (865) 576–8646, [tonnbe@ornl.gov](mailto:tonnbe@ornl.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Bruce Tonn, Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, One Bethel Valley Road, P.O. Box 2008, MS–6038, Oak Ridge, TN

37831–6038, Fax #: (865) 576–8646, [tonnbe@ornl.gov](mailto:tonnbe@ornl.gov).

The plan for this evaluation can be found at <http://weatherization.ornl.gov>. The surveys and data forms that comprise this information request can also be found at <http://weatherization.ornl.gov>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This package contains: (1) *OMB No.:* 1910–NEW; (2) *Package Title:* The Weatherization Assistance Program ARRA–Period Evaluation; (3) *Type of Review:* Regular; (4) *Purpose:* This collection of information is necessary for a complete evaluation of the program that will weatherize approximately 600,000 low-income homes in Program Years 2009, 2010 and 2011; (5) *Estimated Number of Total Respondents:* 6,996. Information will be collected from seventy-four grantees (fifty states, five U.S. territories, Washington DC, two Native American tribes, and sixteen Weatherization Innovation grantees); one-thousand and nine local weatherization agencies; approximately one thousand utilities; approximately two thousand residents; and approximately 2,913 individuals working in the weatherization field; (6) *Estimated Number of Total Responses:* 8,196; (7) *Estimated Number of Total Burden Hours:* The estimated burden is 67,000 hours; (8) *Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden:* There is no reporting or recordkeeping cost burden associated with this request.

**Authority:** Section 6861 of title 42 of the United States Code and 10 CFR 440.25 authorize the collection of this information.

Issued in Washington, DC on March 3, 2011.

**Cathy Zoi,**

*Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.*

[FR Doc. 2011–5614 Filed 3–10–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

#### Combined Notice of Filings #2

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

*Docket Numbers:* ER07–1195–000.  
*Applicants:* Mittal Steel USA, Inc.  
*Description:* Motion of ArcelorMittal USA LLC For Determination of Category 1 Seller Status.  
*Filed Date:* 02/09/2011.  
*Accession Number:* 20110209–5165.  
*Comment Date:* 5 p.m. Eastern Time on Friday, March 25, 2011.