

those sites addressed by the siting study grants), and listed potential environmental issues for analysis. Subsequent to the Notice of Intent, DOE held public scoping meetings near the sites that were under consideration and in Washington, DC.

DOE received approximately 14,000 comment letters/e-mails and oral comments related to the scope of the GNEP PEIS. The major scoping comments related to the purpose and need, the alternatives that were being considered, the various resource areas that should be addressed in the PEIS, and proliferation risk.

In response to public comments and as the programmatic analysis developed, DOE determined that to make project-specific or site-specific decisions regarding any of the three originally proposed facilities would be premature. The programmatic decisions to be made would influence the size and type of facilities required for implementing an alternative fuel cycle (the originally proposed nuclear fuel recycling center and advanced recycling reactor) as well as the facility needed to support research, development, and deployment (an Advanced Fuel Cycle Facility). As a result, no project-specific or site-specific proposals are being made at this time.

The GNEP PEIS assesses the following six domestic programmatic alternatives:

*No Action Alternative—Existing Once-Through Uranium Fuel Cycle:* The United States would continue to rely upon a once-through or “open” fuel cycle, in which commercial light water reactors (LWRs) generate and store SNF until DOE could accept the SNF for disposal in a geologic repository.

*Fast Reactor Recycle Fuel Cycle Alternative:* The United States would pursue a domestic closed fuel cycle in a system that processes LWR SNF in one or more nuclear fuel recycling centers and would recycle some of the recovered materials in one or more fast reactors. The SNF from the advanced recycling reactors (i.e., fast reactors) would also be processed to recover materials for repeated recycle in advanced recycling reactors. High-level wastes (HLW) from separations would be disposed of in a geologic repository.

*Thermal/Fast Reactor Recycle Fuel Cycle Alternative:* This closed fuel cycle alternative would be similar to the Fast Reactor Recycle Alternative, but it would recycle some of the recovered materials in thermal reactors prior to recycling in advanced recycling reactors. HLW from separations would be disposed of in a geologic repository.

*Thermal Reactor Recycle Fuel Cycle Alternative:* The United States would pursue a domestic closed fuel cycle that

processes LWR SNF and recycles some of the recovered materials in thermal reactors. The following three options are assessed: Option 1—Recycle LWR SNF to produce a mixed oxide uranium plutonium (MOX-U-Pu) fuel for use in LWRs; Option 2—Recycle LWR SNF to produce fuel for use in heavy water reactors (HWRs); and Option 3—Recycle LWR SNF to produce a transuranic fuel for use in high temperature gas-cooled reactors (HTGRs). Option 1 would be a closed fuel cycle, in which HLW would be disposed of in a geologic repository. Options 2 and 3, which include recycling of LWR SNF, would dispose of HLW and SNF in a geologic repository.

*Once-Through Fuel Cycle Alternative Using Thorium:* The United States would pursue a thorium once-through or “open” fuel cycle, in which commercial reactors would be fueled with thorium/uranium-based fuels. Because thorium-based fuels would be compatible with existing LWRs, the Thorium Alternative could also be characterized as representing a “new fuel design.” The SNF would be stored until DOE could accept it for disposal in a geologic repository.

*Once-Through Fuel Cycle Alternative using Heavy Water Reactors (HWRs) or High Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactors (HTGRs):* The United States would pursue a domestic once-through or “open” fuel cycle that uses either HWRs or HTGRs. For the HWR/HTGR Alternative, two options are assessed: Option 1—Use HWRs only; and Option 2—Use HTGRs only. In either case, the SNF would be stored until DOE could accept it for disposal in a geologic repository.

These domestic programmatic alternatives are not mutually exclusive. That is, DOE could decide to pursue implementation of one or more domestic programmatic alternatives.

In general, the analyses in the GNEP PEIS indicate that the closed fuel cycle alternatives offer a greater opportunity, relative to the open fuel cycle alternatives, to reduce the capacity requirements for a future geologic repository, and to reduce the hazards associated with the disposal of spent fuel or high-level radioactive waste. However, the closed fuel cycle alternatives require more disposal capacity for other radioactive wastes than is required under the open fuel cycle alternatives. Furthermore, transportation and associated health impacts from the closed fuel cycle alternatives would be generally higher during the operational period than those from the open fuel cycle alternatives (except for the Once-Through Fuel

Cycle using High Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactors).

Following completion of the GNEP PEIS, DOE will be in a position to decide whether to pursue a closed fuel cycle. The GNEP PEIS is a first, important step in deciding whether and how to recycle spent nuclear fuel. A decision to go forward with recycling could trigger additional proposals and research to achieve DOE’s programmatic goal. Subsequent DOE policies and actions could also affect decisions by the U.S. commercial utility industry, which would ultimately determine whether and how to implement any changes in the domestic fuel cycle. Any DOE proposals would be subject to appropriate NEPA review.

The PEIS also discusses international aspects of the GNEP Program, but does not evaluate any proposed actions or alternatives. Consequently, DOE would not make any decisions related to international activities based on the GNEP PEIS.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 10, 2008.

**Dennis R. Spurgeon,**

*Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy.*

[FR Doc. E8–24669 Filed 10–16–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 12585–002]

#### Golden Gate Energy Company; Notice of Intent To File License Application, Filing of Draft Application, Request for Waivers of Integrated Licensing Process Regulations Necessary for Expedited Processing of a Hydrokinetic Pilot Project License Application, and Soliciting Comments

October 10, 2008.

a. *Type of Filing:* Notice of Intent to File a License Application for an Original License for a Hydrokinetic Pilot Project.

b. *Project No.:* 12585–002.

c. *Dated Filed:* September 30, 2008.

d. *Submitted By:* Golden Gate Energy Company.

e. *Name of Project:* San Francisco Bay Tidal Energy Pilot Project.

f. *Location:* Within San Francisco Bay, in San Francisco and Marin Counties, California. The Proposed project site extends from beyond the western side of the Golden Gate Bridge into the Bay and around Angel and Alcatraz Islands before ending well short of the BART tunnel. No federal lands are occupied by

the proposed project works or located within the proposed project boundary.  
g. *Filed Pursuant to:* 18 CFR 5.3 of the Commission's regulations.

h. *Potential Applicant Contact:* Mike Hoover, Golden Gate Energy Company, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW., Suite 100, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 494-9232.

i. *FERC Contact:* Matt Buhyoff (202) 502-6824; or e-mail at [matt.buhyoff@ferc.gov](mailto:matt.buhyoff@ferc.gov).

j. *Golden Gate Energy Company has filed with the Commission:* (1) A notice of intent to file an original hydrokinetic pilot project license application and a draft license application with monitoring plan; (2) a request for waivers of the integrated licensing process regulations necessary for expedited processing of a hydrokinetic project pilot license application; (3) a proposed process plan and schedule; (4) a request to be designated as the non-federal representative for sections 7 of the Endangered Species Act consultation; and (5) a request to be designated as the non-federal representative for section 106 consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act (collectively the Pre-Filing materials).

k. With this notice, we are soliciting comments on the Pre-Filing materials from paragraph j above, including the draft license application and monitoring plans. All comments should be sent to the address above in paragraph h. In addition, all comments (original and eight copies) must be filed with the Commission at the following address: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. All filings with the Commission must include on the first page, the project name (San Francisco Bay Tidal Energy Pilot Project) and number (P-12585-002), and bear the heading "Comments on the proposed San Francisco Bay Tidal Energy Pilot Project." Any individual or entity interested in submitting comments on the Pre-filing Materials must do so by October 30, 2008.

Comments may be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. See 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site (<http://www.ferc.gov>) under the "e-filing" link.

l. This notice does not constitute the Commission's approval of Golden Gate Energy Company's request to use the Pilot Project Licensing Procedures. Upon its review of the project's overall characteristics relative to the pilot project criteria, the draft application

contents, and any comments filed, the Commission may seek additional information needed to continue processing the Pilot Project or reject the NOI, draft application, and Golden Gate Energy Company's request for waiver/process plan for an original hydrokinetic pilot project license.

m. The proposed San Francisco Bay Tidal Energy Pilot Project would be implemented in a four-phase deployment, including removal of hydrokinetic electrical power generators and associated hardware in San Francisco Bay, California. The final design of each phase would be dependent upon results of the previous phase. In Phase 1, dependent upon final design, the project would consist of: (1) A 51-foot-long floating barge supporting; (2) up to three experimental hydrokinetic units approximately 2-3 meters in diameter; and (3) appurtenant facilities. Phase 2 would consist of: (1) An anchored jack-up barge supporting; (2) hydrokinetic units approximately 5-7 meters in diameter; and (3) appurtenant facilities. Phase 3 would consist of (1) a 12kV transmission cable approximately 1.25 miles in total length. Approximately 0.75 mile of the cable would be buried in the marine environment and the remaining 0.5 mile of the cable would follow an existing on shore right-of-way; and (2) appurtenant facilities. Phase 4 consists of project removal and site restoration. The applicant estimates that the total average capacity of less than 1 megawatt.

n. A copy of the draft application and all Pre-filing Materials are available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site (<http://www.ferc.gov>), using the "eLibrary" link. Enter the docket number, excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support at [FERCONlineSupport@ferc.gov](mailto:FERCONlineSupport@ferc.gov) or toll free at 1-866-208-3676, or for TTY, (202) 502-8659. A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in paragraph h.

o. Pre-filing process schedule. The pre-filing process will be conducted pursuant to the following tentative schedule. Revisions to the schedule may be made as appropriate.

Milestone	Date
Comments on Pre-filing Materials due.	Oct. 30, 2008.
Issuance of Meeting Notice (if appropriate).	Nov. 14, 2008.

Milestone	Date
Public Meeting/technical Conference (if appropriate).	Dec. 12, 2008.
Issuance of notice concluding Pre-filing process.	Dec. 29, 2008.
Issuance of ILP Waiver request determination.	Dec. 29, 2008.

p. Register online at <http://ferc.gov/esubscribenow.htm> to be notified via e-mail of new filing and issuances related to this or other pending projects. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E8-24664 Filed 10-16-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

#### Combined Notice of Filings #1

October 9, 2008.

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric corporate filings:

*Docket Numbers:* EC09-2-000.

*Applicants:* Black Hills Wyoming, Inc.

*Description:* Black Hills Wyoming Inc submits an application for approval for transaction to sell a 23.5% undivided ownership interest in an electric generating facility etc.

*Filed Date:* 10/06/2008.

*Accession Number:* 20081008-0154.

*Comment Date:* 5 p.m. Eastern Time on Monday, October 27, 2008.

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

*Docket Numbers:* ER01-1071-012; ER06-9-007; ER05-1281-007; ER03-34-011; ER06-1261-006; ER03-1104-008; ER03-1105-008; ER06-1392-005; ER08-197-005; ER07-904-003; ER98-3566-017; ER98-4222-013; ER98-2076-015; ER08-250-002; ER07-174-006.

*Applicants:* Badger Windpower, LLC; FPL Energy Burleigh County Wind, LLC; FPL Energy Duane Arnold, LLC; FPL Energy Hancock County Wind, LLC; FPL Energy Mower County, LLC; FPL Energy North Dakota Wind, LLC; FPL Energy North Dakota Wind II, LLC; FPL Energy Oliver Wind, LLC; FPL Energy Oliver Wind II, LLC; FPL Energy Point Beach, LLC; FPL Energy Power Marketing, Inc.; Hawkeye Power Partners, LLC; Lake Benton Power Partners II, LLC; Langdon Wind, LLC; Osceola Windpower, LLC