acceptance criteria. (Use of the term ''regional'' would not impose geographical restrictions on which DOE sites could ship LLW to Hanford or NTS for disposal.) In addition, disposal operations at INEEL, LANL, ORR, and SRS would continue, consistent with current practice and to the extent practicable. LANL and ORR would continue disposal of LLW generated on-site. INEEL and SRS would continue to dispose of LLW generated on-site or by the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program. DOE's current preferred alternative for LLW disposal is a combination of the preferred LLW disposal alternative identified in the Final WM PEIS (i.e., regionalized disposal at two DOE sites—Hanford and NTS) and the Decentralized Alternative described in the Final WM PEIS (on-site disposal of on-site generated LLW—INEEL, LANL, ORR, and SRS).

Preferred Alternative for MLLW Disposal Sites

The Department's preferred alternative for MLLW disposal is to establish regional MLLW disposal operations at two DOE sites: Hanford and NTS. Specifically, Hanford and NTS would each dispose of its own MLLW on-site, and would receive and dispose of MLLW generated and shipped by other sites, consistent with permit conditions and other applicable requirements. Therefore, DOE's current preferred alternative for MLLW disposal is the preferred MLLW disposal alternative identified in the Final WM PEIS.

Factors Used to Identify Preferred Alternatives for LLW and MLLW Disposal Sites

In identifying the preferred alternatives announced today, DOE considered the following factors, among others (a more complete list is presented in Volume I, Section 1.7.3 of the WM PEIS):

- DOE's mission to safely and efficiently dispose of wastes.
- Environmental impacts, including health impacts on workers and the public.
- Distribution of waste management facilities in ways that are considered equitable.
- Overall implementation cost.
- Flexibility of implementation.
- Transportation.

In addition to the factors presented in the Final WM PEIS, DOE also considered the subsequent comments of stakeholders in identifying the preferred alternatives announced in this Notice. DOE received these comments as part of a consultative process it has engaged in with States, Tribal governments, regulators, and other stakeholders since the Final WM PEIS was issued. The preferred alternatives announced today for LLW and MLLW disposal sites are among the options discussed with stakeholders, including on the following occasions:

- National Governors' Association's Federal Facilities Compliance Task Force meetings in March and October 1998.
- National Association of Attorneys General's DOE Workgroup meetings in April and December 1998.
- Intersite Discussions on Nuclear Material and Waste convened by the League of Women Voters Education Fund in June 1998.
- Transportation External Coordination Working Group in July 1998 and January 1999.
- LLW Seminar sponsored by the Nevada Citizens' Advisory Board in August 1998.
- State and Tribal Government Working Group meetings in October 1998 and April 1999.
- LLW Forum in October 1998.
- Environmental Management Advisory Board in October 1998.
- National Council of State Legislators Roundtable Discussion in September 1999.

Through this process, the Department received comments on factors to consider in its decisionmaking process. This public input focused on transportation, site conditions, cost effectiveness, and waste/materials consolidation. In summary, the comments suggested that DOE should:

- Address urgent risks.
- Seek to minimize transportation of nuclear waste and materials.
- Pursue consolidation of nuclear waste and materials only as needed to address risk and to allow for site closures.
- Consider each site's suitability and surrounding population in deciding which sites should receive wastes.
- Consider cost effectiveness in deciding which sites should receive waste.
- Compensate receiving communities for receiving other sites' wastes.
- Continue ongoing discussions with the public about radioactive waste and material issues, including transportation routes and implementation.

Decision Process for LLW and MLLW Disposal Sites

This Notice fulfills a commitment DOE made in the WM PEIS, Volume I, Section 3.7, to announce which specific LLW and MLLW disposal sites it prefers at least 30 days before making decisions on disposal sites. DOE will issue a Record of Decision for LLW and MLLW treatment and disposal no sooner than 30 days after publication of this Notice.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 5th day of December, 1999.

Carolyn L. Huntoon,

Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.

[FR Doc. 99–32053 Filed 12–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP00–112–000]

Colorado Interstate Gas Company; Notice of Tariff Filing

December 6, 1999.

Take notice that on December 1, 1999, Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG) filed of its FERC Gas Tariff, First Revised Volume No. 1, Fifteenth Revised Sheet No. 11A, reflecting a decrease in its fuel reimbursement percentage for Lost, Unaccounted-For and Other Fuel Gas from 1.43% to 1.31% effective January 1, 2000.

CIG states that copies of this filing have been served on CIG's jurisdictional customers and public bodies.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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 proceedings. 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 be viewed on the web at http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm (call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–32044 Filed 12–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M