

contained in OSD Administrative Instruction 81; 32 CFR part 311; or may be obtained from the system manager.

**RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:**

Individual, industrial facilities cleared by the Personnel Security Management Office for Industry (PSMO-I), and DoD Component fingerprint capture devices.

**EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED BY THE SYSTEM:**

None.

[FR Doc. 2015-11606 Filed 5-13-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**Department of the Navy**

**Extension of Public Comment Period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training**

**AGENCY:** Department of the Navy, Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** On April 03, 2015, the Department of Navy (DoN) published a Notice of Availability and Notice of Public Meetings for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training (80 FR 18385, April 03, 2015). The purpose of this notice is to announce an extension of the 60-day public comment period. The public comment period will be extended by 60 days to end on August 3, 2015 Eastern Daylight Time (E.D.T.) [August 4, 2015, Chamorro Standard Time (ChST)].

**DATES:** The extended 120-day public comment period for the Draft EIS began on April 3, 2015, EDT [April 04, 2015, ChST] with the publication of the Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register** by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and with this extension, will end on August 3, 2015, EDT [August 4, 2015, ChST]. Mailed comments should be postmarked no later than August 3, 2015, EDT [August 4, 2015, ChST] to ensure they are considered.

**ADDRESSES:** The public may provide comments through the project Web site at [www.CNMIJointMilitaryTrainingEIS.com](http://www.CNMIJointMilitaryTrainingEIS.com), or by mail at: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific, Attn: 09PA, Public Affairs Office, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, JBPHH, HI 96860-3134.

The Draft EIS/OEIS was distributed to federal and local agencies, elected officials, and other interested individuals and organizations. The Draft EIS/OEIS is available for public review at [www.CNMIJointMilitaryTrainingEIS.com](http://www.CNMIJointMilitaryTrainingEIS.com), and at the following libraries:

(1) Joeten Kiyu Public Library, Saipan; (2) Northern Marianas College Olympio T. Borja Memorial Library, Saipan; (3) Tinian Public Library, Tinian; (4) Antonio C. Atalig Memorial Rota Public Library, Rota; (5) University of Guam Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Library, Guam; (6) Nieves M. Flores Memorial Library, Guam.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The DoN's proposed action is to establish live-fire Range Training Areas (RTAs) within the CNMI to address the U.S. Pacific Command Service Components' unfilled unit level and combined level training requirements in the Western Pacific. The DoN recognizes that public comments are an essential part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Accordingly, the DoN established a 60-day public comment period in lieu of the minimum 45-day period required by NEPA implementing regulations. In response to requests by CNMI officials, Federal resource agencies, and the public, the DoN has extended the Draft EIS 60-day public comment period by a heretofore additional 60 days to August 3, 2015, EDT [August 4, 2015, ChST].

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** CNMI Joint Military Training EIS/OEIS Project Manager by email via the project Web site ([www.CNMIJointMilitaryTrainingEIS.com](http://www.CNMIJointMilitaryTrainingEIS.com)).

Dated: May 11, 2015.

**N.A. Hagerty-Ford**

*Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2015-11674 Filed 5-13-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

**Strengthening U.S. Academic Programs in Accelerator Science**

**AGENCY:** Office of High Energy Physics, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice of request for information (RFI).

**SUMMARY:** The Office of High Energy Physics (HEP), as the Department of Energy's (DOE or Department) lead office for long-term accelerator research and development (R&D), invites interested parties to provide comments on proposed policies, practices and mechanisms which DOE-HEP may

implement to foster robust academic R&D and workforce development in this vitally important high technology area.

**DATES:** Written comments and information are requested on or before June 18, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons may submit comments only by email. Comments must be addressed to [AcademicAcceleratorScienceRFI@science.doe.gov](mailto:AcademicAcceleratorScienceRFI@science.doe.gov), with the subject line "Academic Accelerator Science RFI Comments".

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Bruce P. Strauss, (301) 903-3705, [AcademicAcceleratorScienceRFI@science.doe.gov](mailto:AcademicAcceleratorScienceRFI@science.doe.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**The Challenge**

Accelerators play a key role in the discovery sciences, including High Energy Physics, Nuclear Physics, and Basic Energy Sciences. Modern discovery science accelerators are high technology instruments of remarkable complexity, having advanced over eight orders of magnitude in energy since their invention. Aggressive reinvention of the underlying technology has driven improvements in this science, and has required sustained investment in accelerator science R&D that advances the methods, materials, and understanding of accelerator science.

Accelerator Science is an interdisciplinary field that encompasses the design and improvement of particle accelerators, the development of new methods of charged particle production and manipulation, and the development of unique supporting technologies needed for accelerators. Significant career specialization has evolved as the demand for ever greater performance has required reaching deep into mathematics, computation, materials science, plasma science, radio frequency technology, superconducting materials, laser engineering, and a variety of other disciplines. The accelerator science workforce must be capable of spanning both the breadth and depth of the subject matter needed to build discovery science accelerators. It must also possess the range of skills and proficiency levels needed to support operating accelerators for science, medicine, industry, security, defense, and energy & environmental applications.

National laboratories, academia, and industry each play vital, mutually reinforcing roles in the success of the accelerator-based discovery sciences, and in providing the scientific and technological advances necessary to sustain U.S. leadership in this area.

With an estimated 30,000 particle accelerators operating worldwide, there is a significant—and growing—need<sup>1</sup> for a technically competent workforce that can design, install, operate, upgrade, and repair accelerators.

A High Energy Physics Advisory Panel subcommittee, in 2014, identified the present deficit in the accelerator science workforce as an area of special concern, both for its impact on the Office of Science mission, and for its broader consequences.<sup>2,3</sup> Approximately 10–12 accelerator science Ph.D.s graduate each year in the U.S., nearly an order of magnitude less than Europe. This is traceable to the small number of U.S. universities that have accelerator faculty and offer instruction in accelerator science.

### The Response

The Department, acting through the Office of High Energy Physics in the Office of Science, is considering funding practices and mechanisms which DOE–HEP could implement to help ensure continued world-class accelerator R&D and the training of a world-class accelerator workforce.

*Request for information:* The objective of this RFI is to gather information about the current state of academic practice and policy surrounding accelerator science (as defined above), and to elucidate potential mechanisms to strengthen academic programs in accelerator science at U.S. institutions of higher education. Please note that this is not a request for information about specific scientific research topics. Submissions arguing the merits of specific lines of scientific research will be disregarded as unresponsive.

The questions below are intended to assist in the formulation of comments, and should not be considered as a limitation on either the number or the issues that may be addressed in such comments. The Department will make all comments available to the general public.

The DOE Office of High Energy Physics is specifically interested in receiving comments pertaining to any of the following questions:

<sup>1</sup> “Accelerators for America’s Future”, workshop report, <http://science.energy.gov/~media/hep/pdf/accelerator-rd-stewardship/Report.pdf>, (2009).

<sup>2</sup> “OHEP Workforce Development”, Report presented to HEPAP May 22, 2014, [http://science.energy.gov/~media/hep/hepap/pdf/May%202014/Patterson\\_HEPAP\\_DOEWorkforce\\_v1-1.pdf](http://science.energy.gov/~media/hep/hepap/pdf/May%202014/Patterson_HEPAP_DOEWorkforce_v1-1.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> “HEP Workforce Development Needs”, report of the HEPAP subcommittee, June 30, 2014, [http://science.energy.gov/~media/hep/hepap/pdf/Reports/OHEP\\_Workforce\\_Letter\\_Report.pdf](http://science.energy.gov/~media/hep/hepap/pdf/Reports/OHEP_Workforce_Letter_Report.pdf).

### Increasing the Recognition of Accelerator Science in Academia

1. Does your institution regard accelerator science as an academic discipline? Why or why not?
2. If your institution offers graduate training in accelerator science:
  - a. What is the core curriculum shared by all accelerator students, regardless of specialization? (e.g. What is the common coursework taken by all accelerator students?)
  - b. How often do students change fields to study accelerator science? From which fields do these students typically come?
  - c. Is your accelerator science program primarily located in the physics, applied physics, or engineering department, or in a combination of two or more of those departments?
  - d. What incentives would increase the likelihood that your institution would hire additional accelerator science faculty?
  - e. Is there an on-campus particle accelerator that is dedicated to accelerator science R&D? If not, do you make use of accelerator test facilities at U.S. national laboratories?
  - f. How often do collaborations occur between accelerator science and other programs at the university?
  - g. Does your institution actively seek out corporate sponsorship for an accelerator science program? Do private companies actively recruit students from your accelerator science program?
3. If your institution no longer offers graduate training in accelerator science, why was the program terminated?
4. What funding sources for accelerator science are you aware of?

### Integrating the Roles of the Universities and the U.S. National Laboratories

5. How can the national laboratory system be best utilized by the university accelerator science community?
6. What are the current barriers (e.g. technical, operational, and economic) that prevent closer collaboration between universities and the national laboratories?
7. Does your university accept accelerator course credits from other institutions?
8. Do accelerator science students at your institution routinely take courses and training elsewhere?
9. What could be done to strengthen the participation of academia in the operation and improvement of existing national laboratory accelerators?
10. Considering disciplines, other than Accelerator Science, what mechanisms are in place at your university for collaboration with

national laboratories? Could these mechanisms be extended to accelerator science?

### Contemporary Models of University Accelerator Science

11. What examples exist of thriving academic accelerator science programs?
  - a. Are there policies at your university specific to the accelerator science program that are essential to its success?
  - b. Are there scholarships, endowed chairs, or other awards and positions that give special recognition to accelerator science?
  - c. Are there barriers to having accelerator scientists serve as PI or Co-PI on proposals?
  - d. Is conversion from research faculty to full faculty in accelerator science possible? How many faculty members have attempted the transition, and how many have succeeded?
  - e. Are there specific attributes of the institution’s culture that contribute to the success of the accelerator science program?
  - f. Are there joint appointments with a nearby national laboratory or a private company engaged in accelerator R&D? How many?
12. Are there successful examples of academic programs from other technologically-oriented disciplines that you believe are relevant to establishment or improvement of an accelerator science program? What key attributes make the program successful? (See 11(a)–(f) above).
13. Are there successful examples of academic accelerator science programs from other countries that you believe are relevant to the U.S. system? What key attributes make the programs successful? (See 11(a)–(f) above).

### Possible Mechanisms To Encourage Academic Accelerator Science

14. What specific, cost-effective actions could be taken to:
  - a. Raise the academic status of accelerator science? Examples in this category might include: Funding named accelerator science faculty positions or named scholarships.
  - b. Improve the business case for accelerator science in a university setting? Examples in this category might include grants and practices designed to increase interactions with private industry.
  - c. Encourage students to choose a career in accelerator science and technology? Examples in this category might include a grant for young faculty to conduct R&D in accelerator science, a tuition stipend for a co-terminal master’s degree, or grants to develop instructional materials.

d. Increase the enrollment in education opportunities at the baccalaureate and master's level?

e. Increase the availability of hands-on training opportunities in accelerator technology?

#### Other Factors

15. Other than the actual award of funding, is there any specific funding agency behavior that impacts positively or negatively on the success of an accelerator science program?

16. Are there other factors, not addressed by the questions above, which contribute to the strength or weakness of U.S. academic accelerator science?

This RFI is issued to gather information that may be used to help formulate DOE-HEP funding practices and grant mechanisms to strengthen academic accelerator science.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 30, 2015.

**James Siegrist,**

*Associate Director, Office of High Energy Physics.*

[FR Doc. 2015-11664 Filed 5-13-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy

[Docket Number EERE-2015-BT-BC-0001]

#### Request for Information: Updating and Improving the DOE Methodology for Assessing the Cost-Effectiveness of Building Energy Codes

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

**ACTION:** Extension of public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces an extension of the time period for submitting comments on the request for information on the DOE Methodology for Assessing the Cost-effectiveness of Building Energy Codes, which was originally published in the **Federal Register** on April 14, 2015 (80 FR 19974). The comment period is extended to June 3, 2015.

**DATES:** Comments on the RFI must be received no later than June 3, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** *Instructions:* Comments must identify the docket number EERE-2015-BT-BC-0001 and may be submitted using any of the following methods:

1. *Regulations.gov:* <http://www.regulations.gov/>

*#!docketDetail;D=EERE-2015-BT-BC-0001.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

2. *Email:*

*BCMMethodology2015BC0001@ee.doe.gov.* Include docket number EERE-2015-BT-BC-0001 in the subject line of the message.

3. *Postal Mail:* Ms. Brenda Edwards; U.S. Department of Energy, Building Technologies Office EE-5B, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585; Phone: (202) 586-2945. Please submit one signed paper original.

Further instructions, including the use of topic identifiers, are provided in the original notice. Comments submitted in response to the notice will become a matter of public records and will be made publicly available.

**Public Docket:** The docket, which includes notices published in the **Federal Register** and public comments received, is available for review at [Regulations.gov](http://Regulations.gov). All documents in the docket are listed in the [Regulations.gov](http://Regulations.gov) index. However, some documents listed in the index, such as those containing information exempt from public disclosure, may not be publicly available. A link to the docket Web page can be found under Public Participation at: <http://www.energycodes.gov/events>. This Web page will also contain a link to the docket for this notice on [Regulations.gov](http://Regulations.gov). The [Regulations.gov](http://Regulations.gov) site will contain instructions on how to access all documents, including public comments, in the docket.

For further information on how to submit a comment, review comments received, or otherwise participate in the public comment process, contact Ms. Brenda Edwards by phone at (202) 586-2945 or email: [Brenda.Edwards@ee.doe.gov](mailto:Brenda.Edwards@ee.doe.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Jeremiah Williams; U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Building Technologies Office EE-5B, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585; Phone: (202) 287-1941, Email: [jeremiah.williams@ee.doe.gov](mailto:jeremiah.williams@ee.doe.gov).

For legal matters, contact: Kavita Vaidyanathan; U.S. Department of Energy, Office of the General Counsel, Forrestal Building, Mailstop GC-33, 1000 Independence Ave SW., Washington, DC 20585; Phone: (202) 586-0669, Email: [kavita.vaidyanathan@hq.doe.gov](mailto:kavita.vaidyanathan@hq.doe.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On April 14, 2015, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE or the Department) published a

request for information (RFI) in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 19974) to request information on how the Department may update and improve the methodology it intends to use for assessing cost effectiveness (which includes an energy savings assessment) of building energy codes. The RFI provided for the submission of comments by May 14, 2015. One commenter requested an extension of the comment period in order to sufficiently study and understand the proposed changes and their impacts. It was also noted that many interested stakeholders might also be participating in code development hearings held by the International Code Council (ICC) through April 30th. DOE has concluded that an extension of the comment period is warranted based on the timing of the ICC code development hearings, and is hereby extending the public comment period through June 3, 2015.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 8, 2015.

**Roland Risser,**

*Director, Building Technologies Office, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.*

[FR Doc. 2015-11662 Filed 5-13-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP15-272-000]

#### Regency Field Services, LLC; Notice of Application

Take notice that on April 27, 2015, Regency Field Services, LLC (RFS), 2001 Bryan St., Suite 3700, Dallas, Texas 75201, filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations requesting: (i) A certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing RFS to own, operate and maintain its 8 mile 20-inch diameter Coyanosa Residue Line, located in Pecos County, Texas, for the purpose of transporting its own natural gas; (ii) a blanket certificate, pursuant to Part 157, Subpart F, of the Commission's regulations; (iii) waivers of certain regulatory requirements; and (iv) confirmation that the Commission's assertion of jurisdiction over the Coyanosa Residue Line will not jeopardize the non-jurisdictional status of RFS's otherwise non-jurisdictional gathering and processing facilities and operations, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission