

agencies with regulatory authority over protected resources, will be responsible for adopting practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm that may result from implementing the Reuse Plan.

Accordingly, Navy will dispose of Naval Hospital Philadelphia in a manner that is consistent with the City of Philadelphia's Reuse Plan for the property.

Dated: December 21, 1999.

William J. Cassidy, Jr.,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Conversion and Redevelopment).*

[FR Doc. 00-642 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Docket Nos. EA-102-C, EA-155-A, EA-163-A, EA-167-A, EA-169-A, EA-217 and EA-218]

Applications to Export Electric Energy; Enron Power Marketing, Inc.; Consolidated Edison Solutions, Inc.; Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, L.L.C.; PG&E Energy Trading-Power, L.P.; Commonwealth Edison Company; and Entergy Power Marketing Corp.

AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of Applications.

SUMMARY: Enron Power Marketing, Inc. (EPMI), PG&E Energy Trading-Power, L.P. (PGET-Power), and Entergy Power Marketing Corp. (EPMC) have applied for authority to transmit electric energy from the United States to Mexico pursuant to section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act. Consolidated Edison Solutions, Inc. (Solutions), Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, L.L.C. (DETM), Commonwealth Edison (ComEd), and Entergy Power Marketing Corp. (EPMC) have applied for authority to transmit electric energy from the United States to Canada.

DATES: Comments, protests or requests to intervene must be submitted on or before February 10, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments, protests or requests to intervene should be addressed as follows: Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex (FE-27), Office of Fossil Energy, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585-0350 (FAX 202-287-5736).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Russell (Program Office) 202-586-9624 or Michael Skinker (Program Attorney) 202-586-6667.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Exports of electricity from the United States to a

foreign country are regulated and require authorization under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (FPA) (16 U.S.C. § 824a(e)).

The Office of Fossil Energy (FE) of the Department of Energy (DOE) has received applications from the following companies for authorization to export electric energy to Mexico using the international electric transmission facilities owned and operated by Central Power and Light Company, Comision Federal de Electricidad (the national electric utility of Mexico), El Paso Electric Company, and San Diego Gas and Electric:

Applicant	Application date	Docket No.
EPMI	12/27/99	EA-102-C
PGET-Power	12/30/99	EA-167-A
EPMC	1/3/00	EA-217

In Docket EA-102-C, EPMI seeks a 5-year renewal of export authority previously granted in Order EA-102-B. That Order will expire on February 2, 2000.

In Docket EA-167-A, PGET-Power seeks a 2-year renewal of the export authority previously granted in Order EA-167. That Order will expire on February 25, 2000.

EPMC is a power marketer that does not own or control any electric generation, transmission or distribution facilities. In Docket EA-217, EPMC requests authority to export electric energy to Mexico on its own behalf. The electric energy that EPMC proposes to export would be purchased from electric utilities and federal power marketing agencies in the United States.

FE has also received applications from the following companies for authorization to export electric energy to Canada using the international electric transmission facilities owned and operated by Basin Electric Power Cooperative, Bonneville Power Administration, Citizens Utilities, Detroit Edison, Eastern Maine Electric Cooperative, Joint Owners of the Highgate Project, Long Sault Inc., Maine Electric Power Company, Maine Public Service Company, Minnesota Power & Light, Minnkota Power Cooperative, New York Power Authority, Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., Northern States Power, and Vermont Electric Transmission Company.

Applicant	Application date	Docket No.
Solutions	12/7/99	EA-155-A
DETM	12/23/99	EA-163-A
ComEd	12/21/99	EA-169-A
EPMC	1/3/00	EA-218

In Docket EA-155-A, Solutions seeks a 5-year renewal of the export authority previously granted in Order EA-155. That Order will expire on January 23, 2000. Order EA-155 was originally issued to ProMark Energy, Inc. On October 23, 1998, ProMark notified DOE that it had changed its name to Consolidated Edison Solutions, Inc.

In Docket EA-163-A, DETM seeks a 5-year renewal of the export authority previously granted in Order EA-163. That Order will expire on January 28, 2000.

In Docket EA-169-A, ComEd seeks a 2-year renewal of export authority previously granted in Order EA-169. That Order will expire on February 19, 2000.

EPMC is a power marketer that does not own or control any electric generation or transmission facilities and does not have a franchised service area. In Docket EA-218, EPMC has applied for authorization to export electric energy to Canada as a power marketer. The electric energy that EPMC proposes to export would be purchased from electric utilities and federal power marketing agencies in the United States.

Procedural Matters

Any person desiring to become a party to any of these proceedings or to be heard by filing comments or protests to these applications should file a petition to intervene, comment or protest at the address provided above in accordance with §§ 385.211 or 385.214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's rules of practice and procedures (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Fifteen copies of each petition and protest should be filed with the DOE on or before the date listed above.

Comments on EPMI's request to export should be clearly marked with Docket EA-102-C. Additional copies should be filed directly with Christi L. Nicolay, Enron Corp., 1400 Smith Street, Houston, TX 77251-1188 and Allan W. Anderson, Jr., Law Office, 4812 W Street, NW, Washington, DC 20007.

Comments on PGET-Power's request to export should be clearly marked with Docket EA-167-A. Additional copies are to be filed directly with Sanford L. Hartman, Assistant General Counsel, PG&E Energy Trading—Power, L.P., 7500 Old Georgetown Road, Suite 1300, Bethesda, MD 20814-6161.

Comments on EPMC's request to export to Mexico should be clearly marked with Docket EA-217. Comments on EPMC's request to export to Canada should be clearly marked with Docket EA-218. Additional copies are to be filed directly with Buddy Broussard,

Staff Attorney, Entergy Power Marketing Corp., 10055 Grogan's Mill Road, Suite 500, The Woodlands, TX 77380.

Comments on Solutions' request to export should be clearly marked with Docket EA-155-A. Additional copies are to be filed directly with:

Richard Staines, Consolidated Edison Solutions, Inc., 701 Westchester Avenue, Suite 320E, White Plains, NY 10604; and

Steven J. Ross, Steptoe & Johnson, LLP, 1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Comments on DETM's request to export should be clearly marked with Docket EA-163-A. Additional copies are to be filed directly with:

Kris Errickson, Legal/Regulatory Coordinator, Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, One Westchase Center, 10777 Westheimer Street, Suite 650, Houston, TX 77042;

Christine M. Pallenik, Managing Counsel, Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, 4 Triad Center, Suite 1000, Salt Lake City, UT 84180; and

Gordon J. Smith, Esq., John & Hengerer, 1200 17th Street, NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036.

Comments on ComEd's request to export should be clearly marked with Docket EA-169-A. Additional copies are to be filed directly with:

Peter Thornton, Esq., Senior Counsel, Commonwealth Edison Company, 125 South Clark Street, Room 1535, Chicago, IL 60603; and

James H. McGrew, Esq., Bruder, Gentile & Marcoux, 1100 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 510 East, Washington, DC 20005-3934.

A final decision will be made on these applications after the environmental impacts have been evaluated pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and determinations are made by the DOE that the proposed actions will not adversely impact on the reliability of the U.S. electric power supply system.

Copies of these applications will be made available, upon request, for public inspection and copying at the address provided above or by accessing the Fossil Energy Home Page at <http://www.fe.doe.gov>. Upon reaching the Fossil Energy Home page, select "Electricity" from the "Regulatory Info" menu, and then "Pending Proceedings" from the options menus.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 5, 2000.

Anthony J. Como,

Deputy Director, Electric Power Regulation, Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex, Office of Coal & Power Systems, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 00-592 Filed 1-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Record of Decision for the Surplus Plutonium Disposition Final Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Record of decision.

SUMMARY: In November 1999, the Department of Energy (DOE or the Department), in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), issued the Surplus Plutonium Disposition Final Environmental Impact Statement (SPD EIS)(DOE/EIS-0283). The SPD EIS was the culmination of a process started on May 22, 1997, when DOE published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 28009) announcing its decision to prepare an EIS that would tier from the analysis and decisions reached in connection with the Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic EIS (Storage and Disposition PEIS)(DOE/EIS-0229). Accordingly, the Surplus Plutonium Disposition Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SPD Draft EIS) (DOE/EIS-0283-D) was prepared and issued in July 1998. It identified the potential environmental impacts of reasonable alternatives for the proposed siting, construction, and operation of three facilities for the disposition of up to 50 metric tons of surplus plutonium, as well as a No Action Alternative. These three facilities would accomplish pit¹ disassembly and conversion, plutonium conversion and immobilization, and mixed oxide (MOX)² fuel fabrication. The SPD Draft EIS also analyzed the potential impacts of fabricating a limited number of MOX fuel assemblies, referred to as lead assemblies, for testing in a reactor before starting full production of MOX fuel, and the potential impacts of examining the lead assemblies after irradiation.

For the alternatives that included MOX fuel fabrication, the SPD Draft EIS described the potential environmental impacts of using from three to eight commercial nuclear reactors to irradiate MOX fuel. The potential impacts were

¹ A nuclear weapon component.

² A physical blend of uranium oxide and plutonium oxide.

based on a generic reactor analysis included in the Storage and Disposition PEIS that used actual reactor data and a range of potential site conditions. In May 1998, DOE initiated a procurement process to obtain MOX fuel fabrication and reactor irradiation services. In March 1999, DOE awarded a contract to Duke Engineering & Services, COGEMA Inc., and Stone & Webster (known as DCS) to provide the requested services. Full implementation of the base contract was contingent upon the successful completion of the NEPA process. A Supplement to the SPD Draft EIS (DOE/EIS-0283-S) was issued in April 1999, which analyzed the potential environmental impacts of using MOX fuel in six specific reactors named in the DCS proposal. Those reactors are: Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 in South Carolina, McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 in North Carolina, and North Anna Power Station Units 1 and 2 in Virginia. The SPD Final EIS addresses the comments received during the public review process for the SPD Draft EIS and the Supplement to the draft.

The Department has decided to implement a program to provide for the safe and secure disposition of up to 50 metric tons of surplus plutonium as specified in the Preferred Alternative in the Surplus Plutonium Disposition Final Environmental Impact Statement. The fundamental purpose of the program is to ensure that plutonium produced for nuclear weapons and declared excess to national security needs (now and in the future) is never again used for nuclear weapons. Specifically, the Department has decided to use a hybrid approach for the disposition of surplus plutonium. This approach allows for the immobilization of approximately 17 metric tons of surplus plutonium and the use of up to 33 metric tons of surplus plutonium as MOX fuel. The Department has selected the Savannah River Site in South Carolina as the location for all three disposition facilities. Based upon this selection, the Department will authorize DCS to fully implement the base contract. In addition, the Department has selected the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico as the location for lead assembly fabrication and Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee as the site for post-irradiation examination of lead assemblies.

As previously stated in the Storage and Disposition PEIS Record of Decision (62 FR 3014, January 21, 1997), the use of MOX fuel in existing reactors will be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with the United States' policy objective on the irreversibility of the