be made for their appearance on the agenda.

Summary minutes of the meeting will be available for public review at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, Room 1E-190, DOE, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C., between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued at Washington, D.C., on May 4, 1981.

Roger W. A. LeGassie,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy.

May 4, 1981.

[FR Doc. 81-14499 Filed 5-13-81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

National Petroleum Council, Air Quality Task Group of the Committee on Environmental Conservation; Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the Air Quality Task Group of the Committee on Environmental Conservation has rescheduled its meeting for May 1981. The National Petroleum Council was established to provide advice, information, and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy on matters relating to oil and natural gas or the oil and natural gas industries. The Committee on Environmental Conservation will analyze the environmental problems of the oil and gas industries and the impact of current environmental control regulations on the availability and costs of petroleum products and natural gas. Its analysis and findings will be based on information and data to be gathered by the various task groups. The time, location and agenda of the Air Quality Task Group meeting follows:

The Air Quality Task Group meeting has rescheduled its fourth meeting from May 20, 1981, to Wednesday, May 27, 1981, at 10:00 a.m., in the Conference Room of the National Petroleum Council, 1625 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

The tentative agenda for the meeting follows:

1. Discuss Task Group assignments.
2. Review preliminary draft sections of the Task Group report.
3. Discuss any other matters pertinent to the overall assignment of the Air Quality Task Group.

The meeting is open to the public. The Chairman of the Air Quality Task Group is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will, in his judgement, facilitate the orderly conduct of business. Any member of the public who wishes to file a written statement with the Air Quality Task Group will be permitted to do so, either before or after the meeting. Members of the public who wish to make oral statements should inform G. J. Parker, Office of Oil and Natural Gas, Fossil Energy, 202/633-8303, prior to the meeting and reasonable provision will be made for their appearance on the agenda.

Summary minutes of the meeting will be available for public review at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, Room IE-190, DOE, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C., between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued at Washington, D.C., on May 4, 1981.

Roger W. A. LeGassie,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy.

May 4, 1981.

[FR Doc. 81-14498 Filed 5-13-81; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Program of Research and Development for Management and Disposal of Commercially Generated Radioactive Wastes; Record of Decision

This Record of Decision has been prepared pursuant to the Regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality, 40 CFR Part 1505, on the selection of a strategy for the disposal of commercially-generated radioactive wastes and the supporting program of research and development.

Decision

The United States Department of Energy has decided to (1) adopt a strategy to develop mined geologic repositories for disposal of commercially-generated high-level and transuranic radioactive wastes (while continuing to examine subseabed and very deep hole disposal as potential backup technologies) and (2) conduct a research and development program to develop repositories and the necessary technology to ensure the safe long-term containment and isolation of these wastes.

Description of Alternatives

Three alternatives were considered:

(1) *Emphasize Mined Repositories.* The research and development program for waste management would emphasize use of mined repositories in geologic formations in the continental United States capable of accepting radioactive wastes from either the once-through or reprocessing cycles (while continuing to examine subseabed and very deep hole disposal as potential backup technologies). The program would concentrate on identifying specific locations for the construction of mined repositories. This action would not preclude further study of other disposal methods as possible supplementary methods for handling of specific isotopes.

(2) *Parallel Technology Development.* The research and development program would emphasize the parallel development of several disposal methods. The research and development program would be structured to bring the knowledge and development status of two or three disposal concepts to an approximately equal level. Based upon the Department's current evaluation, the likely candidate technologies for this parallel development strategy would be:

a. Geologic disposal using conventional mining techniques,

b. Placement in sediment beneath the deep ocean (subseabed),

c. Disposal in very deep holes.

Other disposal methods which were analyzed as candidates for consideration included:

a. Disposal by injection of liquid waste into underground cavities resulting in melting of surrounding rocks,

b. Geologic disposal on islands,

c. Disposal by melting into continental ice sheets,

d. Injection into porous or fractured strata beneath the earth's surface,

e. Transmutation of waste actinides in reactors to change to stable or short-lived isotopes, and

f. disposal by rocket transport into space.

(3) *No-Action.* Under this alternative, the Department's research and development programs for radioactive waste disposal would be eliminated or significantly reduced and a decision on a plan to dispose of commercially-generated wastes would be deferred indefinitely.

Basis for Decision

The Department has decided to proceed with a programmatic strategy favoring the disposal of commercially-generated radioactive wastes in mined geologic repositories. This decision is based on the Department's commitment to the early and successful solution of the Nation's nuclear waste disposal problem so that the viability of nuclear energy as a future energy source for America can be maintained. The decision also will save money by focusing Federal funds on the further development of the most advanced disposal technique.

Environmental effects considered for each of the three programmatic alternatives—mined repositories, parallel technology and no-action—included regional and world-wide

radiological impacts, commitment of natural resources and cost. Environmental effects were considered for five nuclear power growth scenarios and for both the once-through and reprocessing fuel cycles. Comparison of 70-year whole-body dose accumulations from normal operations revealed somewhat higher doses for the parallel technology than for the mined repository alternative, but the differences were not large enough to be significant and doses were only a small fraction of the naturally occurring dose even for the highest nuclear growth cases examined. Dose accumulations for the no-action alternative were somewhat lower. The analysis of the no-action alternative did not, however, consider the need for, and environmental effects of, additional facilities when those in use have exceeded their design lifetime, since it was assumed that no Federal funds would be used.

In reaching its decision to emphasize mined geologic repositories, the Department considered the requirements for economic resources. Required resources considered for each of the three programmatic alternatives included steel, cement, diesel fuel, gasoline, propane, electricity, and manpower. Requirements for the parallel technology generally ranged two-to-three times higher than those for the mined repository alternative. In no case was the quantity of a required resource more than a small fraction of the current United States rate of production of the resource.

The Department's decision also included a consideration of total system cost, i.e., the cost of waste treatment, storage, transport and disposal. The Department's research and development and repository site qualification costs, which are to be recovered through fees charged to the utilities for storage and disposal, were also considered. Based on cost information summarized in its Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Department concludes that the parallel technology alternative is generally more costly than the mined repository alternative. This cost of waste management and disposal is expected to add about two-to-six percent to the consumer's cost of electricity.

The no-action alternative could be construed as contrary to the mandate given the Department of Energy by law, and in any event would be undesirable because of the temporary nature of the present storage of wastes and the need to construct additional facilities for extended storage as present facilities reach their design lifetime. The Department also feels the no-action alternative is unacceptable because of the long-term radiological risk posed by the lack of effective containment of the wastes. The Department has, for these reasons, rejected the no-action alternative.

A number of waste disposal methods other than mined repositories were evaluated in the Department's Final Environmental Impact Statement. Factors which were considered in evaluating each of these disposal methods included: (1) Radiological effects during the operational period, (2) non-radiological effects, (3) compliance with existing National and international law, (4) independence from future development of the nuclear industry, and (5) potential for corrective or mitigating actions. The analysis of each of these factors showed a clear preference for the mined geologic alternative.

From a consideration of technical feasibility, only two of the alternative waste disposal methods appeared promising enough to warrant further study: subseabed and very deep hole. For subseabed, the Department has decided to continue studies of the environmental technical, legal, and institutional feasibility of isolating wastes within the sedimentary geologic formations of the deep seabed. This concept is considered a longer-term supplementary disposal method to mined repositories. The Department also feels that very deep hole disposal warrants some additional study as a possible backup for high-level waste disposal. Further development of the very deep hole concept will emphasize the capability to take corrective or mitigating actions.

While not a viable alternative for the disposal of all high-level wastes, the Department has concluded that space disposal may be profitably studied for its application to special disposal concerns, e.g., more remote isolation of long lived and environmentally mobile radionuclides such as ^{99}Tc and ^{129}I.

The other disposal methods considered by the Department (island, transmutation, rock melt, ice sheet, and well-injection) were found to have no clear advantage over mined geologic disposal and to provide no additional complementary function. In some cases these other technologies appeared clearly less desirable (for instance, in the rock melt disposal concept the waste is expected to be liquid for the first 1000 years and thus is most mobile during the period of greatest fission product hazard).

Although the level of knowledge of alternative technologies to mined geologic disposal is not comparable, sufficient evidence exists to support the Department's finding that there is little likelihood that any of these technologies would be superior, from an environmental perspective, to the geologic alternative.

Discussion of Environmentally Preferable Alternative(s)

Based on the information presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Department concludes that the environmental impacts of the program to emphasize mined repositories are similar to those of the parallel technology development program. The evaluation of long-term effects presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement indicates that mined geologic disposal, and those other technologies which justify further consideration, would have similar environmental impact. The Department has concluded that the no-action alternative is environmentally unacceptable from a long-term perspective and that neither of the two remaining programmatic alternatives can be identified as clearly preferred from an environmental viewpoint.

Mitigation

Given the programmatic nature of the proposal, it is difficult to address specific measures that will be taken to minimize adverse environmental impacts resulting from this decision. However, the Department will evaluate the adverse impacts of specific site characterization activities and repository construction at each candidate site in site specific environmental impact statements and will undertake mitigation activities where appropriate. Mitigation activities which may be needed were considered in Section 5.4 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Conditions which may require mitigation include fugitive dust depositions from surface handling of mined material and runoff to nearby surface waters.

Conclusion

The Department has considered the benefits, impacts, and costs of reasonable alternatives and has concluded that the research and development program on disposal of commerically-generated radioactive wastes should focus on mined geologic repositories, while continuing to examine subseabed and very deep hole disposal as potential backup technologies.

Dated: April 10, 1981.
Mahlon E. Gates,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy.
[FR Doc. 81-14490 Filed 5-13-81; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Civil Uses of Atomic Energy; Proposed Subsequent Arrangement Between the United States and Republic of Turkey

Pursuant to section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160) notice is hereby given of a proposed "subsequent arrangement" under the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Turkey Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, as amended.

The subsequent arrangement to be carried out under the above mentioned agreement involves approval for the shipment of enriched uranium/aluminum alloy fuel containing approximately 15 kilograms of uranium from Turkey to the DOE Savannah River facility for reprocessing and storage of recovered uranium.

In accordance with section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, it has been determined that this subsequent arrangement will not be inimical to the common defense and security. This arrangement for returning U.S. origin highly enriched uranium (HEU) to the U.S. is consistent with U.S. non-proliferation policy in that it serves to reduce the amount of HEU abroad.

This subsequent arrangement will take effect no sooner than May 20, 1981.

Dated: May 8, 1981.
For the Department of Energy.
Fred McGoldrick,
Deputy Director for Nuclear Affairs, International Nuclear and Technical Programs.
[FR Doc. 81-14493 Filed 5-13-81; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Economic Regulatory Administration

Greenwood Utilities; Notice and Issuance of an Order Granting a Permanent Exemption Pursuant to Section 312 of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act

The Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) of the Department of Energy hereby gives notice of its issuance of an Order granting a permanent exemption, pursuant to the authority granted it by section 312(h) of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978, 42 U.S.C. 8301 *et seq.* (FUA or the Act), and the implementing regulations thereunder (10 CFR 501.60 and 10 CFR Part 504), from the natural gas use prohibitions of section 301(a) of the Act to the following powerplant:

Docket No.	Petitioner	Generating station	Powerplant identification
51166-2063-02-42	Greenwood Utilities.	Wright.....	No. 2

The Order is set forth following this Notice and has been sent by certified mail to the Petitioner.

The petitioner filed for this permanent exemption pursuant to 10 CFR 504.60 (Exemption for Use of Natural Gas by Powerplant with Capacity of Less Than 250 Million Btu's per hour, August 12, 1980, 45 FR 53709). Notices of the acceptance of this petition and the availability of a Tentative Staff Analysis were published in the Federal Register on December 19, 1980 (45 FR 83652) and April 3, 1981 (46 FR 20266), respectively, presenting an opportunity for public comments and for interested persons to request a hearing relating to the petition and the Tentative Staff Analysis. No comments were received.

The existing electric powerplant listed above, Wright unit No. 2 (Unit W-2), is a 5.0 MW electric powerplant that uses natural gas and is prohibited by section 301(a)(1) of FUA from using natural gas as a primary energy source on or after January 1, 1990. Section 301(a) (2) and (3) of FUA prohibits this powerplant from using natural gas as a primary energy source unless such powerplant burned natural gas as a primary energy source in 1977, and then in no proportion greater than the average yearly proportion which the powerplant used in calendar years 1974 through 1976, unless an exemption has been granted by ERA.

Statement of Reasons

Eligibility and evidentiary requirements governing the permanent exemption for use of natural gas by a powerplant with capacity of less than 250 million Btu's per hour are set forth at 10 CFR 504.60. Under 10 CFR 504.60(a), a petitioner may show eligibility for this exemption by making certain certifications. Greenwood has made the following certifications in its petition:

(1) Unit W-2 has a design capability of consuming fuel at a fuel heat input rate of less than 250 million Btu's per hour;

(2) Unit W-2 was a baseload powerplant on April 20, 1977;

(3) Unit W-2 is not capable of burning solid coal, and no suitable coal derivative is available; and

(4) Use of a mixture of an alternate fuel and natural gas or petroleum for which an exemption would be available is not technically or economically feasible in Unit W-2.

The ERA staff has examined the foregoing certifications made by Greenwood and has determined that they fulfill the requirements of 10 CFR 504.60(a). Accordingly, ERA is granting Greenwood the requested exemption for Wright Unit No. 2. This exemption will be subject to the terms and conditions specified in the Decision and Order.

Any questions regarding this permanent exemption should be directed to Mr. James W. Workman, Director, Powerplants Conversion Division, Office of Fuels Conversion, Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy, Room 3002F, 2000 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20461, (202) 653-4266.

Decision and Order

The Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) of the Department of Energy hereby issues this Decision and Order granting a permanent exemption from the prohibitions of section 301(a) (1), (2) and (3) of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978, 42 U.S.C. 8301 *et seq.* (FUA or the Act). This Decision and Order is issued pursuant to section 312(h) of FUA, 10 CFR 501.60 and 10 CFR 504.60 to the petitioner who owns or operates the powerplant listed in the table below.

Docket No.	Petitioner	Generating station	Powerplant identification
51166-2063-02-42	Greenwood Utilities.	Wright.....	No. 2

Effective Date of Decision and Order

Wright Unit No. 2 is currently allowed to burn natural gas until October 31, 1981, under a special temporary public interest exemption which ERA granted to Greenwood Utilities pursuant to 10 CFR Part 508. This Decision and Order shall become effective upon the expiration of the present special temporary public interest exemption on October 31, 1981.

Terms and Conditions

Pursuant to section 314 of FUA, and 10 CFR 504.60(b), the permanent exemption granted under this Decision and Order is conditioned upon, and shall remain in effect, so long as the petitioner, its successors and assigns, complies with the following terms and conditions: