Council address: Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 300 S. New Street, Dover, DE 19904, telephone: 302–674–2331.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel T. Furlong, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; telephone: 302–674–2331, ext. 19.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

January 25, 2000, 10:00 a.m. until noon–the Comprehensive Management Committee will meet.

1:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m.—the Demersal Committee will meet.

Wednesday January 26, 2000, 8:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.—the Council will meet to hear the SAW 30 Report.

9:30 a.m. until noon—the Monkfish Committee will meet.

11:00 a.m. until noon—the Law Enforcement Committee will meet.

1:00 p.m. until 4:00 p.m.—the Committee Chairmen will meet.

4:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m.—the Executive Committee will meet.

Thursday, January 27, 2000, 8:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.—the Council will meet.

Agenda items for this meeting are: Discuss the development of workshops for 2000 including a workshop on summer flounder discards; discuss the development of a conservation equivalency amendment for summer flounder; discuss the development of an amendment to review allocation of annual total allowable catch (TAC) and discards and revise summer period state by state quotas for scup; possible review and comment on **Federal Register** notice on 2000 specifications for summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass; discussion of disapproved portions of Sustainable Fisheries Act (SFA) amendment for summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass; discussion of other measures that would be included in amendments to summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass; review stock assessment on surfclams and Atlantic mackerel; discuss and recommend area adjustments through the amendment process for the Monkfish Fishery Management Plan; discuss and finalize procedures for enforcement recognition; develop the annual work plan for Council committees for year 2000.

Although non-emergency issues not contained in this agenda may come before this Council for discussion, these issues may not be the subject of formal Council action during this meeting. Council action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, provided the public has been notified of the Council's intent to take final action to address the emergency.

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Joanna Davis at the Council (see **ADDRESSES**) at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: January 6, 2000.

Bruce C. Morehead,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 00–628 Filed 1–10–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Record of Decision for the Disposal and Reuse of Naval Hospital Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy (Navy), pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C) (1994), and the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality that implement NEPA procedures, 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508, hereby announces its decision to dispose of Naval Hospital Philadelphia, which is located in Philadelphia, PA.

Navy analyzed the impacts of the disposal and reuse of Naval Hospital Philadelphia in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), as required by NEPA. The EIS analyzed three reuse alternatives and identified the Philadelphia Naval Hospital Community Reuse Plan (Reuse Plan), approved by the City of Philadelphia on June 17, 1999, and described in the EIS as the Naval Hospital Reuse Plan Alternative, as the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative proposed to use the Naval Hospital property for residential purposes and for commercial activities and to develop public parks and recreational areas. The City of Philadelphia is the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) for the Naval Hospital. Department of Defense Rule on Revitalizing Base Closure Communities and Community Assistance (DoD Rule), 32 CFR 176.20(a).

Navy intends to dispose of Naval Hospital Philadelphia in a manner that is consistent with the Reuse Plan. Navy has determined that the proposed mixed land use will meet the goals of achieving local economic redevelopment, creating new jobs, and providing additional housing, while limiting adverse environmental impacts and ensuring land uses that are compatible with adjacent property. This Record of Decision does not mandate a specific mix of land uses. Rather, it leaves selection of the particular means to achieve the proposed redevelopment to the acquiring entity and the local zoning authority.

Background

Under the authority of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act, Public Law 100–526, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note (1994), the 1988 Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure recommended the closure of Naval Hospital Philadelphia. This recommendation was approved by the Secretary of Defense, Frank Carlucci, and accepted by the One Hundred First Congress in 1989. The Naval Hospital closed on September 30, 1991.

Naval Hospital Philadelphia is situated on 49 acres in the southern part of the City of Philadelphia. The property is oriented along the east-west axis with a rectangular border. The property is bounded on the north by Hartranft Street; on the east by Broad Street; on the South by Pattison Avenue; and on the west by 20th Street. There are residential neighborhoods north of the Naval Hospital property; a sports stadium complex composed of Veterans Stadium, First Union Spectrum, and First Union Center located east and southeast of the hospital; Franklin D. Roosevelt Park located south and southwest of the hospital; and former Navy family residences known as Capehart Housing to the west of the hospital.

This Record of Decision addresses the disposal and reuse of the entire Naval Hospital property, which is surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. The surplus property, covering 49 acres, contains 56 buildings that provide about 687,000 square feet of space. The 15-story main Hospital building (Building 1) and its wings (Buildings 2 and 3) were built in 1935 and account for about half of the Hospital's floor space. Nearly all of the remaining 53 structures are one-story buildings.

Navy published a Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register** on March 23, 1994, announcing that the Navy would prepare an EIS for the disposal and reuse of Naval Hospital Philadelphia. On April 6, 1994, Navy held a public scoping meeting at the Holy Spirit Roman Catholic Church in Philadelphia, and the scoping period concluded on April 29, 1994. On July 8, 1994, Navy

reopened the scoping comment period for an additional 14 days.

Navy distributed the Draft EIS (DEIS) to Federal, State, and local agencies, elected officials, interested parties, and the general public on February 24, 1995, and commenced a 45-day public review and comment period. During this period, Federal, State, and local agencies, community groups and associations, and interested persons submitted oral and written comments concerning the DEIS. On March 22, 1995, Navy held a public hearing at Holy Spirit Church to receive comments on the DEIS.

After the public comment period for the DEIS concluded, Navy developed additional alternatives for the disposal and reuse of the Navy Hospital and prepared a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Supplemental DEIS). Navy distributed the Supplemental DEIS to Federal, State, and local agencies, elected officials, interested parties, and the general public on October 11, 1996, and commenced a 45-day public review and comment period. During this period, Federal, State, and local agencies, community groups and associations, and interested persons submitted oral and written comments concerning the Supplemental DEIS.

Navy's responses to the public comments on the Supplemental DEIS were incorporated in the Final EIS (FEIS), which was distributed to the public on October 29, 1999, for a review period that concluded on November 29, 1999. During the period between conclusion of the comment period for the Supplemental DEIS and distribution of the FEIS, Navy engaged in the consultations concerning cultural resources prescribed by section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 16 U.S.C. 470f (1994). Navy concluded these consultations in August 1999. Navy received one letter commenting on the FEIS.

Alternatives

NEPA requires Navy to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives for the disposal and reuse of this surplus Federal property. In the FEIS, Navy analyzed the environmental impacts of three reuse alternatives. Navy also evaluated a ''No Action'' alternative that would leave the property in caretaker status with Navy maintaining the physical condition of the property, providing a security force, and making repairs essential to safety.

On August 10, 1993, the Mayor's Commission on Defense Conversion adopted the Philadelphia Navy Hospital Community Reuse Plan. Navy identified this initial reuse plan as the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS dated February 1995 and in the Supplemental DEIS dated September 1996. In mid-1999, the City of Philadelphia modified the 1993 reuse plan by changing the mix of proposed uses to provide for the development of administrative and training facilities for the Philadelphia Eagles, a professional football team, at the eastern end of the property. To accommodate these facilities, the City eliminated the 120-bed nursing home proposed in 1993 and reduced the amount of property to be used for parks and recreational activities from 30 acres to seven acres. The Philadelphia City Planning Commission approved these modifications to the 1993 reuse plan on June 17, 1999.

The Reuse Plan approved in 1999 and identified in the FEIS as the Preferred Alternative proposed a mix of land uses. The Preferred Alternative would use about 15 acres for residential purposes; 27 acres for the Eagles complex; and seven acres for parks and recreational activities. It will be necessary to demolish nearly all of the buildings, including the main Hospital building and its wings (Buildings 1, 2, and 3), and to replace the property's utility distribution systems to support the Reuse Plan's proposed redevelopment of the site.

In the western half of the property, the Preferred Alternative proposed to build a townhouse residential complex on 15 acres that would provide about 150 new townhouses. On seven acres east of the residential complex, this Alternative would develop a park and recreational area to be incorporated in the adjacent Roosevelt Park and build a parking lot with a capacity of 1,000 vehicles to serve Roosevelt Park and the adjacent sports stadium complex.

In the eastern half of the property, the Preferred Alternative would develop the Philadelphia Eagles administrative and training complex on about 27 acres. This complex would consist of a building with 104,000 square feet of space for administrative offices, training activities, and a sports medicine and rehabilitation center; three outdoor practice football fields; one indoor practice football field covered by a fabric bubble; a maintenance garage; and a 200-vehicle parking lot. A commercial medical care provider would manage the rehabilitation facility in partnership with the Eagles, and the facility would also be available for use by the public.

Navy analyzed a second ''action'' alternative, described in the FEIS as the Main Building Reuse Alternative. This Alternative would retain the main Hospital building and wings (Buildings 1, 2, and 3) and demolish the other structures on the Naval Hospital property.

In the center of the property, the main Hospital building and its two wings would be converted into a residential complex composed of about 150 apartments. North of the Hospital wings, the Main Building Reuse Alternative would build 100 townhouses on about ten acres.

On about 15 acres at the western end of the property, the Main Building Reuse Alternative would develop parks and recreational areas to be incorporated in Roosevelt Park. On about 11 acres at the eastern end of the property, this Alternative would develop a parking area with a capacity of 1,100 vehicles to serve Roosevelt Park and the adjacent sports stadium complex.

Navy analyzed a third ''action'' alternative, described in the FEIS as the Retail Alternative. Under this Alternative, all of the Naval Hospital buildings would be demolished to permit the development of a commercial retail center. This Alternative would also develop parks and recreational areas similar in size and purpose to the Main Building Reuse Alternative.

In the center of the property, the Retail Alternative proposed to develop a retail complex covering 23 acres. This complex would consist of two retail buildings that would each provide 100,000 square feet of space; fast food restaurants with 10,000 square feet of space; and a parking lot with a capacity of 750 vehicles to serve the retail stores.

On about 15 acres at the western end of the property, the Retail Alternative would develop parks and recreational areas to be incorporated in Roosevelt Park. On about 11 acres at the eastern end of the property, this alternative would develop another parking area with a capacity of 1,100 vehicles to serve Roosevelt Park and the adjacent sports stadium complex.

Environmental Impacts

Navy analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the disposal and reuse of this surplus Federal property. The EIS addressed impacts of the Preferred Alternative, the Main Building Reuse Alternative, the Retail Alternative, and the ''No Action'' Alternative for each alternative's effects on land use and zoning, socioeconomics, community facilities and services, transportation, air quality, noise, infrastructure, cultural resources, natural resources, and petroleum and hazardous substances. This Record of Decision focuses on the impacts that would likely result from

implementation of the Reuse Plan, identified in the FEIS as the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant impact on land use and would result in land uses that are compatible with existing and planned uses in the surrounding community. Indeed, the Naval Hospital property is zoned to permit the proposed redevelopment.

The sports medicine and rehabilitation facility would be available to the public. The proposed expansion of Roosevelt Park would serve residents of the surrounding community by providing additional recreational resources closer to their homes. The proposed parking lot adjacent to Roosevelt Park would accommodate the parking requirements generated by those visiting Roosevelt Park and the nearby sports stadium complex.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any impact on the socioeconomics of the surrounding area. It proposed to build 150 new townhouses that would provide housing for 480 people. This additional housing would increase the population projected to live in south Philadelphia in the full buildout year, 2002, by about 0.3 percent.

The Preferred Alternative would not likely add a large number of new jobs to the region, because the Philadelphia Eagles already maintains administrative, training, and medical facilities in south Philadelphia. The Eagles would, however, move 150 direct jobs generating $70 million in direct payroll earnings to the proposed facility on the eastern half of the property. By the year 2002, this alternative would create about 10 direct jobs and 421 indirect jobs that would generate about $0.4 million in direct payroll earnings and $88 million in indirect earnings. The Preferred Alternative would generate about $1.17 million annually in property tax revenue.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant impact on community services. By the year 2002, the Preferred Alternative would generate an increase of about 119 school-age children living in the area. This would increase the projected number of school-age children in south Philadelphia about 0.44 percent. Property tax revenues would increase as property previously owned by the Federal Government became taxable and these revenues could be used to support local schools.

The proposed redevelopment of Naval Hospital Philadelphia would not increase the demand on fire, rescue, and police protection services in south Philadelphia. By the year 2002, the population in this part of the city will be five percent less than it was in the year 1990, and this area already has adequate fire, rescue, and police protection services. Additionally, implementation of the Preferred Alternative would increase local government revenues by expanding the property tax base. These revenues could be used to fund fire, rescue, and police protection services.

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would increase the amount of parks and open space in south Philadelphia. Under this alternative, the expansion of Roosevelt Park would provide additional recreational resources for residents of south Philadelphia. It would also provide additional parking for those visiting Roosevelt Park and the adjacent sports stadium complex.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on transportation. By the year 2002, this alternative would generate about 2,000 average daily trips, a decrease of 1,850 average daily trips from the conditions that prevailed when the Naval Hospital was active. The Naval Hospital property has not generated a substantial number of average daily trips since it was placed in caretaker status in 1993. Thus, compared with the ''No Action'' Alternative, the Preferred Alternative would increase the amount of traffic in the area.

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would cause a minor delay at the intersection of Broad Street and Pattison Avenue. However, this delay would not affect the operation of the intersection and would not have a significant impact on transportation. There is adequate public transportation in south Philadelphia to support the proposed redevelopment of the Naval Hospital property.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant impact on air quality. The Naval Hospital property is located in a severe nonattainment area for ozone as regulated by the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q (1994). Ozone, commonly known as smog, is produced when volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides react in the atmosphere. The Naval Hospital property is in attainment for all other common air pollutants regulated under the Clean Air Act. However, emissions of one common air pollutant, carbon monoxide (CO), would increase under the Reuse Plan.

Carbon monoxide is produced by the burning of fossil fuels. As a result of vehicular traffic moving to and from the property, the annual emissions of CO would increase slightly under the Reuse Plan. Nevertheless, there would not be any violation of the national standards governing emissions of carbon monoxide.

The impact on air quality from sources of stationary emissions, such as heating units, would depend upon the nature and extent of activities conducted on the property. Developers of future facilities will be responsible for obtaining the required air permits and for complying with Federal, State, and local laws and regulations governing air pollution. The temporary impacts on air quality resulting from construction activities would not be significant.

Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7506 (1994), requires Federal agencies to review their proposed activities to ensure that these activities do not hamper local efforts to control air pollution. Section 176(c) prohibits Federal agencies from conducting activities in air quality areas such as Philadelphia that do not meet one or more of the national standards for ambient air quality, unless the proposed activities conform to an approved implementation plan. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regulations implementing section 176(c) recognize certain categorically exempt activities. Conveyance of title to real property and certain leases are categorically exempt activities. 40 CFR 93.153(c)(2) (xiv) and (xix). Therefore, the disposal of Naval Hospital Philadelphia will not require Navy to conduct a conformity determination.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant impact on noise. No substantial change in ambient noise levels would occur as a result of the increased vehicular traffic. In fact, at none of the six sites analyzed would the increase in noise be perceptible to the human ear, *i.e.*, greater than three decibels. The existing noise levels in the vicinity of the Naval Hospital are typical of an urban neighborhood and are already high.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant impact on the capacity of the region's utility systems. The Reuse Plan's projected daily demand for potable water would amount to less than one percent of the City's excess water supply; therefore, there would not be any significant impact on the supply of potable water.

The proposed redevelopment of the Naval Hospital property would not have a significant impact on the City's wastewater treatment capacity. The Reuse Plan would require about 0.047 million gallons per day of treatment capacity, which is substantially less

than the City's excess capacity of about 12 million gallons per day.

The Preferred Alternative would generate less solid waste than Navy did when the Naval Hospital was operational. Since the City has adequate disposal capacity, no significant impact is likely to occur from the disposal of solid waste.

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would result in demolition of most of the buildings on the property. As a result, it would be necessary to build new utility distribution systems to serve the new facilities.

The Preferred Alternative would have a significant impact on cultural resources. Pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), 16 U.S.C. 470f (1994), Navy conducted a cultural resource survey and determined that the Naval Hospital property is eligible for listing as a historic district on the National Register of Historic Places. In a letter dated February 28, 1994, the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) affirmed the SHPO's previous determination of the Naval Hospital's eligibility in 1987. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would result in demolition of all structures on the property with the consequent adverse effect on the historic district.

In accordance with section 106 of NHPA, Navy initiated consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) in August 1997, to determine the appropriate mitigation for loss of the historic district. Despite substantial efforts, Navy and the ACHP did not reach agreement on ways to reduce or avoid adverse effects on the historic district. Thus, Navy concluded that further consultation under section 106 would not be productive. In a letter dated April 2, 1999, Navy informed the ACHP of its intent to terminate the section 106 consultation process.

In a letter dated July 9, 1999, the ACHP provided its final comments to the Secretary of the Navy and made three recommendations. First, the ACHP recommended that Navy convey the property to the City of Philadelphia on the condition that the City issue a request for proposals to redevelop the property in a way that would preserve the main Hospital buildings. Second, the ACHP recommended that Navy complete recordation of the Naval Hospital property before conveying it. Third, the ACHP recommended that Navy reevaluate its policy that discourages conveying historic base closure property with a restrictive preservation covenant when that restriction would conflict with local redevelopment plans for the property.

The Secretary of the Navy responded to the ACHP's recommendations in a letter dated August 6, 1999, stating that Navy will not convey the property with a preservation covenant but will complete recordation of the Naval Hospital property before conveying it. The Secretary also stated that Navy's policy concerning disposal of historic base closure property seeks to strike a balance between historic preservation concerns and local redevelopment and zoning considerations. With this letter, Navy concluded the Section 106 process.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant impact on upland vegetation and wildlife. The existing vegetation on the property consists largely of maintained lawns and ornamental and naturally occurring trees and shrubs. The proposed redevelopment would preserve many of the mature trees.

Navy determined that there were no Federally-listed threatened or endangered species, as defined by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 U.S.C. 1531–1544 (1994), on the Naval Hospital property. Therefore, the disposal and reuse of Naval Hospital Philadelphia would not have any adverse effect on Federally-listed threatened or endangered species. In a letter dated September 28, 1995, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service concurred in Navy's determination.

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would reduce the amount of impervious surface on the property from 34 acres to 15 acres. As a result, the amount of stormwater runoff would also decrease. Stormwater must be managed in accordance with Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, and the acquiring entity will be responsible for building adequate drainage facilities.

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would not have any impact on floodplains. The Naval Hospital property does not lie within 100-year or 500-year floodplains.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant impact on the environment as a result of the use of petroleum products or the use or generation of hazardous substances by the acquiring entity. Hazardous materials used and hazardous wastes generated by the Reuse Plan will be managed in accordance with Federal and State laws and regulations.

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would not have any impact on existing environmental contamination at the Naval Hospital. Navy will inform future property owners about the environmental condition of the property and may, when appropriate, include restrictions, notifications, or covenants in deeds to ensure the protection of human health and the environment in light of the intended use of the property.

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 3 CFR 859 (1995), requires that Navy determine whether any low-income and minority populations will experience disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects from the proposed action. Navy analyzed the impacts on low-income and minority populations pursuant to Executive Order 12898. The FEIS addressed the potential environmental, social, and economic impacts associated with the disposal of Naval Hospital Philadelphia and reuse of the property under the various proposed alternatives. Minority and low-income populations residing within the region would not be disproportionately affected. Indeed, the indirect employment opportunities, housing, and recreational resources generated by the Reuse Plan would have beneficial effects.

Navy also analyzed the impacts on children pursuant to Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks, 3 CFR 198 (1998). Under the Preferred Alternative, the largest concentration of children would be present in the residential and recreational areas. The Preferred Alternative would not pose any disproportionate environmental health or safety risks to children.

Mitigation

Implementation of Navy's decision to dispose of Naval Hospital Philadelphia does not require Navy to implement any mitigation measures beyond those discussed here. Navy will take certain other actions to implement existing agreements and regulations. These actions were treated in the FEIS as agreements or regulatory requirements rather than as mitigation. Before conveying any property at Naval Hospital Philadelphia, Navy will complete recordation of the property to mitigate adverse impacts to the Naval Hospital historic district.

The FEIS identified and discussed those actions that will be necessary to mitigate impacts associated with reuse and redevelopment of the Navy Hospital property. The acquiring entity, under the direction of Federal, State, and local agencies with regulatory authority over protected resources, will be responsible

for implementing necessary mitigation measures.

Comments Received on the FEIS

Navy received comments on the FEIS from one private citizen. These comments concerned issues already discussed in the FEIS and do not require further clarification.

Regulations Governing the Disposal Decision

Since the proposed action contemplates a disposal under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (DBCRA), Public Law 101–510, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note (1994), Navy's decision was based upon the environmental analysis in the FEIS and application of the standards set forth in the DBCRA, the Federal Property Management Regulations (FPMR), 41 CFR Part 101–47, and the Department of Defense Rule on Revitalizing Base Closure Communities and Community Assistance (DoD Rule), 32 CFR Parts 174 and 175.

Section 101–47.303–1 of the FPMR requires that disposals of Federal property benefit the Federal Government and constitute the ''highest and best use'' of the property. Section 101–47.4909 of the FPMR defines the ''highest and best use'' as that use to which a property can be put that produces the highest monetary return from the property, promotes its maximum value, or serves a public or institutional purpose. The ''highest and best use'' determination must be based upon the property's economic potential, qualitative values inherent in the property, and utilization factors affecting land use such as zoning, physical characteristics, other private and public uses in the vicinity, neighboring improvements, utility services, access, roads, location, and environmental and historic considerations.

After Federal property has been conveyed to non-Federal entities, the property is subject to local land use regulations, including zoning and subdivision regulations, and building codes. Unless expressly authorized by statute, the disposing Federal agency cannot restrict the future use of surplus Government property. As a result, the local community exercises substantial control over future use of the property. For this reason, local land use plans and zoning affect determination of the ''highest and best use'' of surplus Government property.

The DBCRA directed the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to delegate to the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer and dispose of base closure property. Section 2905(b) of the DBCRA directs the Secretary of Defense to exercise this authority in accordance with GSA's property disposal regulations, set forth in part 101–47 of the FPMR. By letter dated December 20, 1991, the Secretary of Defense delegated the authority to transfer and dispose of base closure property closed under the DBCRA to the Secretaries of the Military Departments. Under this delegation of authority, the Secretary of the Navy must follow FPMR procedures for screening and disposing of real property when implementing base closures. Only where Congress has expressly provided additional authority for disposing of base closure property, *e.g.*, the economic development conveyance authority established in 1993 by Section 2905(b)(4) of the DBCRA, may Navy apply disposal procedures other than those in the FPMR.

In section 2901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, Public Law 103–160, Congress recognized the economic hardship occasioned by base closures, the Federal interest in facilitating economic recovery of base closure communities, and the need to identify and implement reuse and redevelopment of property at closing installations. In Section 2903(c) of Public Law 103–160, Congress directed the Military Departments to consider each base closure community's economic needs and priorities in the property disposal process. Under Section 2905(b)(2)(E) of the DBCRA, Navy must consult with local communities before it disposes of base closure property and must consider local plans developed for reuse and redevelopment of the surplus Federal property.

The Department of Defense's goal, as set forth in section 174.4 of the DoD Rule, is to help base closure communities achieve rapid economic recovery through expeditious reuse and redevelopment of the assets at closing bases, taking into consideration local market conditions and locally developed reuse plans. Thus, the Department has adopted a consultative approach with each community to ensure that property disposal decisions consider the LRA's reuse plan and encourage job creation. As a part of this cooperative approach, the base closure community's interests, as reflected in its zoning for the area, play a significant role in determining the range of alternatives considered in the environmental analysis for property disposal. Furthermore, section 175.7(d)(3) of the DoD of the DoD Rule provides that the LRA's plan generally will be used as the basis for the proposed disposal action.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 40 U.S.C. 484 (1994), as implemented by the FPMR, identifies several mechanisms for disposing of surplus base closure property: by public benefit conveyance (FPMR Sec. 101–47.303–2); by negotiated sale (FPMR Sec. 101–47.304–9); and by competitive sale (FPMR 101–47.304–7). Additionally, in Section 2905(b)(4), the DBCRA established economic development conveyances as a means of disposing of surplus base closure property. The selection of any particular method of conveyance merely implements the Federal agency's decision to dispose of the property. Decisions concerning whether to undertake a public benefit conveyance or an economic development conveyance, or to sell property by negotiation or by competitive bid, are left to the Federal agency's discretion. Selecting a method of disposal implicates a broad range of factors and rests solely within the Secretary of the Navy's discretion.

Conclusion

The LRA's proposed reuse of Naval Hospital Philadelphia, reflected in the Reuse Plan, is consistent with the requirements of the FPMR and Section 174.4 of the DoD Rule. The LRA has determined in its Reuse Plan that the property should be used for various purposes including residential, commercial, park and recreational. The property's location and physical characteristics as well as the current uses of adjacent property make it appropriate for the proposed uses.

The Reuse Plan responds to local economic conditions, promotes economic recovery from the impact of the closure of the Naval Hospital, and is consistent with President Clinton's Five-Part Plan for Revitalizing Base Closure Communities, which emphasizes local economic redevelopment and creation of new jobs as the means to revitalize these communities. 32 CFR Parts 174 and 175, 59 FR 16,123 (1994).

Although the ''No Action'' Alternative has less potential for causing adverse environmental impacts, this Alternative would not take advantage of the property's location and physical characteristics or the current uses of adjacent property. Additionally, it would not foster local economic redevelopment of the Naval Hospital property.

The acquiring entity, under the direction of Federal, State, and local

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,