

issued in July 2000. Transmit the Reallocation Form data to us only if you are releasing 1999–2000 campus-based funds or are requesting supplemental 2000–2001 FWS funds.

Although the FISAP is not due until October 1, 2000, you must complete the Campus-Based Reallocation Form electronic data transmission prior to midnight, Eastern time, on August 25, 2000. (For purposes of this notice, this deadline means that an institution has all of August 25, 2000, to transmit electronically.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department will reallocate unexpended FWS Federal funds from the 1999–2000 award year as supplemental allocations for the 2000–2001 award year under the FWS Program. Supplemental allocations will be issued this fall in accordance with the reallocation procedures contained in the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA). Under section 442(d) of the HEA, unexpended FWS funds returned to the Secretary must be reallocated to eligible institutions that used at least 10 percent of the total FWS Federal funds granted to the institution to compensate students employed in community services. Because reallocated FWS funds will be distributed on the basis of fair share shortfall criteria, you must also have a fair share shortfall to receive these funds. A fair share shortfall means that you have an unmet need for FWS funds as determined by the FWS allocation formula in the HEA that uses data reported on the FISAP. You must use all the reallocated FWS Federal funds to compensate students employed in community services. To ensure consideration for supplemental FWS Federal funds for the 2000–2001 award year, you must submit the Campus-Based Reallocation Form data by August 25, 2000.

Applicable Regulations

The following regulations apply to the Federal Work-Study Program:

- (1) Student Assistance General Provisions, 34 CFR part 668.
- (2) General Provisions for the Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Work-Study Program, and Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, 34 CFR part 673.
- (3) Federal Work-Study Programs, 34 CFR part 675.
- (4) Institutional Eligibility under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, 34 CFR part 600.
- (5) New Restrictions on Lobbying, 34 CFR part 82.
- (6) Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and

Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants), 34 CFR part 85.

(7) Drug-Free Schools and Campuses, 34 CFR part 86.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For technical assistance concerning the Campus-Based Reallocation Form or other operational procedures of the campus-based programs, contact Mr. Milton Thomas, Jr., Student Financial Assistance, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Portals Building, Suite 600D, Washington, DC 20202–5353. Telephone (202) 708–9756. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape or computer diskette) by contacting the Alternate Format Center at (202) 260–9895 between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

Electronic Access to this Document

You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at either of the following sites:

<http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm>

<http://www.ed.gov/news.html>

To use the PDF version you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at either of the previous sites. If you have questions about using the PDF version, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free at 1–888–293–6498 or in the Washington, DC area at (202) 512–1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>

Program Authority: 42 U.S.C. 2752.

Dated: July 24, 2000.

Greg Woods,

Chief Operating Officer, Student Financial Assistance.

[FR Doc. 00–19069 Filed 7–25–00; 10:41 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–U

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Availability of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Accomplishing Expanded Civilian Nuclear Energy Research and Development and Isotope Production Missions in the United States, Including the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) announces the availability of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Accomplishing Expanded Civilian Nuclear Energy Research and Development and Isotope Production Missions in the United States, Including the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility [Nuclear Infrastructure Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (NI PEIS)] (DOE/EIS–0310D) for public review and comment. This draft PEIS, prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), analyzes the potential environmental impacts of using various irradiation and processing facilities to meet the following projected mission needs over a period of 35 years: (1) Production of medical, research, and industrial isotopes; (2) production of plutonium-238 to support future National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) space missions; and (3) support for U.S. civilian nuclear research and development activities. In addition to a No Action alternative, DOE evaluated other alternatives that include using existing facilities within the DOE complex, constructing and operating a new research reactor, constructing and operating one or two new accelerators, restarting the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) that is currently in stand-by status, and procuring irradiation services at a commercial light water reactor to produce plutonium-238. As a result of comments received from the public during the scoping period, DOE evaluated a fifth alternative to deactivate FFTF permanently without pursuing any further expansion of the infrastructure to accommodate expanded mission areas. As part of the No Action alternative, DOE has also evaluated the option of purchasing plutonium-238 from Russia through an existing contract. The Department has no preferred alternative at this time, but will identify one in the Final PEIS.

DATES: The Department invites the general public, other Federal agencies, and Tribal, State and local Governments to provide comments on this draft PEIS.

The transmittal letter for the draft PEIS and the Summary stated that the comment period would end on September 11, 2000. The comment period has changed and now ends September 18, 2000. To ensure consideration in the preparation of the final PEIS, comments should be transmitted or postmarked by September 18, 2000. Comments submitted after that date will be considered to the extent practicable. The information obtained during the comment period will assist the Department in preparing the final PEIS, which is scheduled to be completed by November 2000.

During the comment period, the Department will hold public hearings to discuss the draft PEIS and to receive oral and written comments on the draft PEIS. Registration will begin at 6:00 p.m. before each meeting (2:00 p.m. in Virginia) and a brief DOE presentation on the draft PEIS will begin at 6:30 p.m. (2:30 p.m. in Virginia). The hearings will include an opportunity for informal discussions with project personnel before and after the DOE presentation. The hearings are scheduled for the following dates, times, and locations:

Tuesday, August 22, 2000

American Museum of Science and Energy, 300 South Tulane Avenue, Oak Ridge, TN 37830, (865) 576-3200

Friday, August 25, 2000

Westcoast Idaho Falls Hotel (formerly Cavanaugh's on the Falls), 475 River Parkway, Idaho Falls, ID 83402, (208) 523-8000

Monday, August 28, 2000

Hood River Inn, 1108 E. Marina Way, Hood River, OR 97031, (541) 386-2200

Tuesday, August 29, 2000

Oregon Museum of Science and Technology, 1945 SE Water Avenue, Portland, OR 97214, (503) 797-4671

Wednesday, August 30, 2000

Washington State Convention and Trade Center, 800 Convention Place, Seattle, WA 98101, (206) 694-5111

Thursday, August 31, 2000

Best Western Tower Inn and Conference Center, 1515 George Washington Way, Richland, WA 99352, (509) 946-4121

Wednesday, September 6, 2000

Crystal Gateway Marriott, 1700 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, (703) 271-5108

The format for the hearings will include registration, a DOE presentation on the draft PEIS, a question and answer session, and an opportunity to provide

comments to DOE staff members. The purpose of registration is to provide handouts to each participant, update the project mailing list, and answer any questions participants may have about the hearings. Registration is not required and there will be no sign-up sheets for the order of speakers. A DOE staff member will give a presentation, about 20 minutes long, followed by a short question and answer period about the presentation. A facilitator will then open the floor to the public for comments. To ensure that all persons wishing to provide comments are given an opportunity, each speaker may be limited to five minutes, including representatives of groups. Elected officials will be given first priority for speaking and each official may be limited to ten minutes. Then the facilitator will select participants at random from the audience to provide their comments. Those commentators who need more time will be invited to speak after everyone has had an initial opportunity to provide their comments. Comments will be transcribed by a comment recorder. Another comment recorder will be available in a separate room to receive comments from participants who may not be able to attend the entire session, or who would like to give their comments and depart. DOE personnel will be available throughout the hearings and will stay until all participants have had a chance to comment. The Department encourages those providing oral comments at the hearings to also submit them in writing. Comment forms will be available at the hearings.

The Department will make transcripts of the draft PEIS hearings available to the public at the following public reading rooms about one month after the public hearings have been held. References for the draft PEIS are available in the public reading rooms listed below.

U.S. Department of Energy, Freedom of Information Reading Room, Forrestal Building, Room 1E-190, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585-0117, Telephone: (202) 586-3142

Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, DOE-Idaho Operations Office Public Reading Room, 1776 Science Center Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415, Telephone: (208) 526-0271

Portland State University, Branford Price Millar Library, Government Documents Section, 951 Southwest Hall, Portland, Oregon 97207, (503) 725-3690

U.S. Department of Energy, Public Reading Room, 230 Warehouse Road,

Building 1916-T-2, Suite 300, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, (865) 241-4780

Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Drive, Richland, Washington, 99352, Telephone: (509) 942-7457

U.S. Department of Energy, DOE Public Reading Room, 2770 University Drive, CIC, Room 101L, Richland, Washington 99352, Telephone: (509) 372-7443

University of Washington, Suzzallo Library, Government Publications Room, Seattle, Washington 98195, Telephone: (206) 543-1937

Gonzaga University, Foley Center Library, East 502 Boone, Spokane, Washington 99258, Telephone: (509) 323-6532

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the draft PEIS, requests for special arrangements to enable participation in the hearings (*e.g.*, an interpreter for the hearing impaired), requests to be placed on the final PEIS distribution list, and questions concerning the proposed action should be sent to: Ms. Colette Brown, PEIS Document Manager, Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, U.S. Department of Energy, NE-50, 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown, Maryland 20874-1290.

Comments, questions and special requests may also be submitted by toll-free facsimile to (877) 562-4592, or by electronic mail to Nuclear.Infrastructure-PEIS@hq.doe.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information about the proposed action, contact Ms. Colette E. Brown as above under **ADDRESSES**, or call her toll-free at (877) 562-4592. For general information on the Department's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, please contact: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance (EH-42), Office of Environment, Safety and Health, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585-0119; or telephone (202) 586-4600 or leave a message at (800) 472-2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, DOE is responsible for ensuring the availability of isotopes for medical, industrial and research applications, meeting the nuclear material needs of other Federal agencies, and undertaking research and development activities related to development of nuclear power for civilian use. To meet these responsibilities, DOE maintains nuclear infrastructure capabilities that support various missions in these areas. These

infrastructure capabilities include those of nuclear research and test facilities, such as reactors and accelerators, as well as shielded "hot cell" and glovebox facilities used to prepare nuclear materials for testing and/or to perform postirradiation processing of materials.

To continue to maintain sufficient irradiation facilities to meet its obligations under the Atomic Energy Act, DOE must assess the need for expanding its nuclear infrastructure in light of its commitments to ongoing programs, its commitment to other agencies for nuclear materials support, and its role in supporting civilian nuclear research and development programs.

The Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee (NERAC), established in 1998 by DOE to provide independent, expert advice on complex science and technical issues that arise in the planning, management, and implementation of DOE's civilian nuclear energy research programs, informed the Secretary of Energy that "(a) there is an urgent sense that the Nation must rapidly restore an adequate investment in basic and applied research in nuclear energy if it is to sustain a viable United States capability in the 21st Century, (b) the most important role for DOE in the nuclear energy area at the present time is to ensure that the education system and its facility infrastructure are in good shape, and (c) of particular need over the longer term are dependable sources of research isotopes and reactor facilities providing high volume flux irradiation for nuclear fuels and materials testing" (letter dated June 13, 2000, from J.J.Duderstadt, Chair, Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee to The Honorable W. Richardson, Secretary of Energy).

Under the guidance of NERAC, DOE has completed an assessment of its existing nuclear facility infrastructure capabilities (U.S. Department of Energy Nuclear Science and Technology Infrastructure Roadmap, Draft, Revision 1 Summary, March 2000). The basic finding of this assessment was that the capabilities of currently operating DOE facilities will not meet projected U.S. needs for nuclear materials production and testing, research, and development. As demand continues to increase for steady-state neutron sources needed for isotope production and nuclear research and development, DOE's nuclear infrastructure capabilities to support this demand have not improved. Over the years, DOE's nuclear facility infrastructure has diminished because of the shutdown of old facilities, including the High Flux Beam Reactor

at Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, and the Cyclotron Facility at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee. This has hampered DOE's ability to satisfy increasing demands in various mission areas. The Department's facilities at the Savannah River Site, previously used for plutonium-238 production for the space program, are also no longer available.

Consistent with these findings, DOE recognizes that adequate nuclear research reactor, accelerator, and associated support facilities must be made available in order to implement and maintain a successful nuclear energy program. To continue meeting its responsibilities under the Atomic Energy Act and to satisfy projected increases in the future demand for isotope products and irradiation services, DOE proposes to enhance its existing nuclear facility infrastructure to: (1) Produce isotopes for medical, research, and industrial uses, (2) produce plutonium-238 for use in advanced radioisotope power systems for future NASA space exploration missions, and (3) support the Nation's nuclear research and development needs for civilian applications.

The NI PEIS evaluates a No Action Alternative and five action alternatives. The action alternatives focus on the use of irradiation facilities that are currently operating, those that could be brought online, or those that could be constructed and operated to meet DOE's nuclear facility infrastructure requirements.

No Action Alternative (maintain status quo): Ongoing operations at existing facilities would continue. DOE would not establish a domestic plutonium-238 production capability, but could, instead, purchase Russian plutonium-238 to meet the needs of future U.S. space missions. However, the existing contract, which expires in 2002, would have to be renegotiated or a new contract would have to be established. FFTF at Hanford would be maintained in standby status.

Alternative 1—Restart FFTF: FFTF at Hanford would be restarted to irradiate targets for medical and industrial isotope production, plutonium-238 production, and nuclear research and development irradiation requirements for a period of 35 years. Ongoing operations at other existing facilities would continue.

Alternative 2—Use Only Existing Operational Facilities: DOE would use existing operating DOE reactors or U.S. commercial light water reactors to produce plutonium-238 for future space missions. The production of medical and industrial isotopes and support of

nuclear research and development in DOE reactors and accelerators would continue at the No Action Alternative levels. Other ongoing operations at existing facilities would continue. FFTF at Hanford would be permanently deactivated.

Alternative 3—Construct New Accelerator(s): One or two new accelerators would be constructed for target irradiation and operated for a period of 35 years. The new accelerator(s) would be constructed at an existing DOE site and would be used to irradiate all of the targets for production of plutonium-238, isotopes for medical and industrial uses, and materials testing for research and development. Other ongoing operations at existing facilities would continue. FFTF at Hanford would be permanently deactivated.

Alternative 4—Construct New Research Reactor: A new research reactor would be constructed for target irradiation and operated for a period of 35 years. The new research reactor would be constructed at an existing DOE site, and would be used to irradiate all targets for production of plutonium-238, isotopes for medical and industrial uses, and materials testing for research and development. Other ongoing operations at existing facilities would continue. FFTF at Hanford would be permanently deactivated.

Alternative 5—Permanently Deactivate FFTF (with no new missions): FFTF at Hanford would be permanently deactivated and no enhancements to DOE's nuclear facilities infrastructure would be made. Plutonium-238 would not be produced or purchased. Ongoing operations, such as medical and industrial isotope production and nuclear research and development missions, at existing facilities would continue.

The environmental impact analysis addresses the full range of natural and human resource areas pertinent to the sites considered for the nuclear infrastructure alternatives. Impacts are assessed for human health, land resources, noise, air quality, water resources, geology and soils, ecological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, socioeconomics, and waste management. A region of influence for each resource area is identified and analyzed for each candidate site.

Baseline conditions at the three DOE sites assessed in the NI PEIS, the Oak Ridge Reservation, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, and Hanford, as well as an existing generic commercial light water reactor, include present and reasonably foreseeable future actions at each site.

Sitewide data set forth in the No Action Alternative define the baseline conditions used in the analysis of action alternatives for each site and are the data upon which incremental impacts for action alternatives were imposed to determine overall impacts.

The Department does not have a preferred alternative at this time, but a preferred alternative will be identified in the final PEIS. The environmental analysis in the PEIS, public comments, the findings of a separate cost study and a nonproliferation report that are being prepared concurrently with the PEIS, as well as other program and policy factors, will be considered in making a decision. The Record of Decision to be published in the **Federal Register** will be issued no sooner than 30 days after the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability of the final PEIS has been published in the **Federal Register**.

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 24th day of July 2000.

R. Shane Johnson,

Acting Associate Director for Technology and International Cooperation, Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.

[FR Doc. 00-19092 Filed 7-27-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Docket No. RP98-40-000]

Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company; Notice of Informal Settlement Conference

July 24, 2000.

On July 31, 2000, an informal settlement conference in the above-docketed proceeding respecting the Kansas *ad valorem* issues will be held at the offices of Shook, Hardy & Bacon, 1 Kansas City Place, 1200 Main Street, Kansas City, Missouri. The conference will begin at 10:45 a.m. in Conference Room 31A. All interested parties in the above docket are requested to attend the informal settlement conference. If a party has any questions respecting the conference, please call Richard Miles, the Director of the Dispute Resolution Service. His telephone number is 1 877 FERC ADR (337-2237) or 202-208-0702 and his e-mail address is richard.miles@ferc.fed.us.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-19060 Filed 7-27-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER98-2668-009, et al.]

Duke Energy Moss Landing LLC, et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

July 20, 2000.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

1. Duke Energy Moss Landing LLC and Duke Energy Oakland LLC

[Docket Nos. ER98-2668-009, ER99-1127-007, and ER98-4300-006; ER98-2669-008, ER99-1128-007, and ER98-4296-006]

Take notice that on July 13, 2000, Duke Energy Moss Landing, LLC and Duke Energy Oakland, LLC tendered for filing a revised compliance report regarding refunds as required by the Commission's Order issued January 28, 2000 approving the Final Offer of Settlement filed in the above-captioned proceeding on November 16, 1999. This revised compliance report substitutes for the compliance report noticed by the Commission on April 18, 2000 in the above-captioned proceedings.

Comment date: August 3, 2000, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

2. Lowell Cogeneration Company Limited Partnership

[Docket No. ER97-2414-003]

Take notice that on July 17, 2000, Lowell Cogeneration Company Limited Partnership (Lowell), tendered for filing a three year update to its market power study in compliance with the Commission's Order in Docket No. ER97-2414-000 granting Lowell market based rate authority.

Comment date: August 7, 2000, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

3. Central Power and Light Company, West Texas Utilities Company, Public Service Company of Oklahoma, and Southwestern Electric Power Company

[Docket Nos. ER99-1659-006 and ER99-1660-006]

Take notice that on July 17, 2000, Central Power and Light Company, West Texas Utilities Company, Public Service Company of Oklahoma, and Southwestern Electric Power Company (for the purposes of this filing, the CSW Operating Companies), tendered for filing a refund report pursuant to the Commission's June 1, 2000 order in the above-captioned docket regarding refunds to Northeast Texas Electric

Cooperative, Inc., and East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc., on their network service agreements under the CSW Operating Companies' open access transmission service tariff.

A copy of this filing has been served on each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding, each of the affected wholesale customers, and on the Arkansas Public Service Commission, the Louisiana Public Service Commission, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission and the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

Comment date: August 7, 2000, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

4. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

[Docket No. ER00-1712-001]

Take notice that on July 17, 2000, PPL Utilities Corporation (PPL Utilities), tendered for filing an updated market power analysis pursuant to Ordering Paragraph (D) of the Commission's order in Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, 80 FERC ¶ 61,053 (1997).

PPL Utilities has served a copy of this filing on the parties on the Commission's official service list for this docket.

Comment date: August 7, 2000, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

5. Wisconsin Electric Power Company

[Docket No. ER00-3161-000]

Take notice that July 17, 2000, Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Wisconsin Electric), tendered for filing an amendment to its electric service agreement (SA) with Badger Power Marketing Authority of Wisconsin (BPMA). The SA is under Wisconsin Electric's FERC Electric Tariff Third Revised Volume No. 1 and is Service Agreement No. 25.

Wisconsin Electric respectfully requests an effective date of July 17, 2000.

Copies of the filing have been served on BPMA, the Michigan Public Service Commission, and the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin.

Comment date: August 7, 2000, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

6. Cinergy Services, Inc.

[Docket No. ER00-3162-000]

Take notice that on July 17, 2000, Cinergy Services, Inc. (Cinergy), tendered for filing a Non-Firm Point-To-Point Service Agreement under Cinergy's Open Access Transmission Service Tariff (OATT) entered into between Cinergy and Indianapolis Power & Light Company (IPL).