

the technical requirements for the treatment technology, uncertainty in the repository waste acceptance criteria, and unquantifiable programmatic risks associated with some of the alternatives.

After reviewing the various alternatives, DOE's Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation concluded that "All but one alternative—the one involving plutonium-uranium extraction reprocessing at the SRS—are fully consistent with U.S. policy with respect to reprocessing and nonproliferation." (DOE/Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation, Nonproliferation Impacts Assessment for the Treatment and Management of Sodium-Bonded Spent Nuclear Fuel, July 1999)

The National Research Council's final report on Electrometallurgical Techniques for DOE Spent Fuel Treatment (April 2000) concluded that "The EBR-II demonstration project has shown that the electrometallurgical technique can be used to treat sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel." The report further stated that "the committee has found no significant technical barriers in the use of electrometallurgical technology to treat EBR-II spent fuel, and EMT therefore represents a potentially viable technology for DOE spent nuclear fuel treatment."

#### VIII. Decision

DOE has decided to implement the preferred alternative as stated in the final EIS. That is, DOE will electrometallurgically treat the EBR-II spent nuclear fuel (about 25 metric tons of heavy metal) and miscellaneous small lots of sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel. The fuel will be treated at ANL-W. In addition, Fermi-1 sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel (about 35 metric tons of heavy metal) will be stored while alternative treatments are evaluated further. Should no alternative prove more cost-effective for this spent nuclear fuel, electrometallurgical treatment of the Fermi-1 spent nuclear fuel remains a key option.

DOE will validate the cost of using alternative treatment techniques (e.g., sodium removal and placement in high-integrity cans) for the Fermi-1 blanket spent nuclear fuel. These techniques may be economically favorable for the Fermi-1 blanket spent nuclear fuel because of characteristics that distinguish it from the EBR-II spent nuclear fuel. The most significant distinguishing characteristic is that the Fermi-1 blanket spent nuclear fuel does not require the extensive safeguards and security measures that are required for the EBR-II blanket fuel. The difference in security requirements for these two

types of fuel is a result of the difference in plutonium content; the EBR-II blanket fuel has 30 times more plutonium at a greater concentration than the Fermi-1 blanket fuel. DOE will proceed with the electrometallurgical treatment of the EBR-II spent nuclear fuel and monitor the results and costs while continuing the evaluation of sodium removal techniques for the Fermi-1 blanket spent nuclear fuel. While EBR-II spent nuclear fuel is undergoing electrometallurgical treatment and the Fermi-1 blanket spent nuclear fuel remains in storage, DOE has approximately four years in which to evaluate the operating experience of electrometallurgical treatment technology and further evaluate other alternatives for the Fermi-1 blanket spent nuclear fuel. After these data are evaluated, DOE will decide whether to treat the Fermi-1 blanket spent nuclear fuel using electrometallurgical treatment or to use another treatment method and/or disposal technique.

For several years, DOE has been actively developing electrometallurgical treatment technology specifically for the management of sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel. Having completed a successful demonstration of electrometallurgical treatment, DOE believes that this technology has the highest probability of meeting the objective of reducing the uncertainties associated with qualifying the sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel for disposal in a geologic repository. Electrometallurgical technology will convert the reactive fuel into ceramic and metallic waste forms, both of which are more stable than untreated sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel. In addition, uranium would be separated from the spent nuclear fuel, blended with depleted uranium if needed to reduce the enrichment levels, and cast into ingots to be stored until a disposition decision is made through a separate NEPA review. Most of the plutonium will be disposed of in the ceramic waste form, with the remaining small fraction disposed of in the metallic waste form. Currently, the only waste form that has been tested and analyzed extensively under geologic repository conditions and may be accepted for repository disposal is borosilicate glass. Tests have shown that the ceramic and metallic waste forms from electrometallurgical treatment may perform as well as the standard borosilicate glass waste form. The ceramic and metallic waste forms would require less storage volume than untreated spent nuclear fuel.

#### IX. Mitigation

The strictly controlled conduct of operations associated with DOE's spent nuclear fuel management activities are integral to the selected alternative. DOE has directives and regulations for safe conduct of spent nuclear fuel treatment and management operations. DOE has adopted stringent controls for minimizing occupational and public radiation exposure. The policy is to reduce radiation exposures to as low as reasonably achievable. Singly and collectively, these measures avoid, reduce, or eliminate any potentially adverse environmental impacts from spent nuclear fuel treatment and management. DOE has not identified a need for additional mitigation measures.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 11th day of September 2000.

**William D. Magwood IV,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.*

[FR Doc. 00-24005 Filed 9-18-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

##### Secretary of Energy Advisory Board

##### Notice of Open Meeting

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the third in a series of meetings of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board's Panel on Emerging Technological Alternatives to Incineration. The Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463, 86 Stat. 770), requires that agencies publish these notices in the **Federal Register** to allow for public participation.

**Name:** Secretary of Energy Advisory Board—Panel on Emerging Technological Alternatives to Incineration.

**DATES:** September 27, 2000, 8 am—2:30 pm

**ADDRESSES:** U.S. Department of Energy, Program Review Center, Room 8E-089, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585. Note: Members of the public are requested to contact the Office of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board at (202) 586-7092 in advance of the meeting (if possible), to expedite their entry to the Forrestal Building on the day of the meeting.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mary Louise Wagner, Executive Director, or Francesca McCann, Staff Director, Office of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board (AB-1), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW.,

Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586-7092 or (202) 586-6279 (fax).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The purpose of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board's Panel on Emerging Technological Alternatives to Incineration is to provide independent external advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board on emerging technological alternatives to incineration for the treatment of mixed waste which the Department of Energy should pursue. The Panel will focus on the evaluation of emerging non-incineration technologies for the treatment of low-level, alpha low-level and transuranic wastes containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and other hazardous constituents. Waste categories to be addressed include inorganic homogeneous solids, organic homogeneous solids, and soils. The Panel will also evaluate whether the emerging non-incineration technologies could be implemented in a manner that would allow the Department of Energy to comply with all legal requirements, including those contained in the Settlement Agreement and Consent Order signed by the State of Idaho, Department of Energy, and the U.S. Navy in October 1995.

#### **Tentative Agenda**

The agenda for the September 27 meeting has not been finalized. However, the meeting will include panel discussion and presentations on Waste Characterization and R&D Plans for Tru Mixed Waste. Members of the Public wishing to comment on issues before the Panel on Emerging Technological Alternatives to Incineration will have an opportunity to address the Panel during the scheduled public comment period. The final agenda will be available at the meeting.

#### *Tentative Agenda*

8:00-8:10 Opening Remarks  
8:10-8:30 Review of Minutes from the Idaho Falls, Idaho and Jackson, Wyoming Meetings  
8:30-9:00 INEEL Wastes to be Treated: Volumes vs Criteria  
9:00-9:30 Characterization Video  
9:30-9:45 Break  
9:45-10:30 R&D Plan for TRU Mixed Waste  
10:30-11:00 RFI Review and Technical Analysis Plan/Responses Received  
11:00-12:00 Discussion of Report Outline and Writing Assignments  
12:00-12:30 Lunch  
12:30-01:00 Public Comment  
1:00-2:00 Actions and Plans for future meetings  
2:00-2:30 Specific Questions to be Answered by DOE/Closing

#### **Public Participation**

In keeping with procedures, members of the public are welcome to observe the business of the Panel on Emerging Technological Alternatives to Incineration and submit written comments or comment during the scheduled public comment period. Members of the public will be heard in the order in which they sign up at the beginning of the meeting. The Panel will make every effort to hear the views of all interested parties. The Chairman of the Panel is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will, in the Chairman's judgment, facilitate the orderly conduct of business. You may submit written comments to Mary Louise Wagner, Executive Director, Secretary of Energy Advisory Board, AB-1, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20585. This notice is being published less than 15 days before the date of the meeting due to the late resolution of programmatic issues.

#### **Minutes**

A copy of the minutes and a transcript of the meeting will be made available for public review and copying approximately 30 days following the meeting at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, 1E-190 Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday except Federal holidays. Further information on the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board and its subcommittees may be found at the Board's web site, located at <http://www.hr.doe.gov/seab>.

Issued at Washington, DC, on September 14, 2000.

**Rachel M. Samuel,**

*Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-24053 Filed 9-18-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

##### **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. EL00-109-000]

##### **Alternate Power Source, Inc., Complainant v. ISO New England, Inc., Respondent; Notice of Complaint**

September 13, 2000.

Take notice that on September 11, 2000, Alternate Power Source, Inc. (APS), tendered for filing a Complaint under Section 206 and 306 of the Federal Power Act in which APS petitions the Commission for an order

directing ISO New England, Inc. (ISO-NE) to suspend the April, 2000 ICAP auction "clearing price"; cease and desist from requiring APS to pay into escrow \$700,000 for the month of April, 2000; cease and desist from "settling" the ICAP prices for the months of May, June and July, 2000, and from requiring any payments into escrow until a thorough investigation of all conduct and actions is completed; and if, after an investigation, there is a finding of anomalous conduct in the so-called ICAP auction "market" for the months April through July, 2000, direct ISO-NE to mitigate ICAP prices for those months.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). All such motions or protests must be filed on or before September 21, 2000. 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. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room. This filing may also be viewed on the Internet at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222) for assistance. Answers to the complaint shall also be due on or before September 21, 2000.

**Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 00-23983 Filed 9-18-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717-01-M**

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

##### **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. CP00-457-000]

##### **Canadian-Montana Pipeline Corporation and 3698157 Canada Ltd; Notice of Application to Transfer Natural Gas Act Section 3 Authorization and Presidential Permit**

September 13, 2000.

On September 7, 2000, The Canadian-Montana Pipeline Corporation (CMPL) and 3698157 Canada Ltd. (Canada Ltd.) filed an application pursuant to Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Section 153 of the Commission's Regulations and Executive Order No.