success criteria. For those success criteria that are intended to measure the effectiveness of the processes, and that generally do not have a quantifiable performance measure, the PPEP will serve as an ''expert panel'' to review the results and evaluate how well the success criteria were met. At the end of the pilot program, the PPEP members will provide an evaluation as to whether each of the success criteria have been met. This report will include both the consensus view of the panel, along with the dissenting views of any of the panel members. The staff will use the PPEP evaluation to determine the need for any additional process development or improvements prior to full implementation.

The Panel membership will including participants from NRC headquarters and regional management, a representative from the Nuclear Energy Institute, pilot plant licensee management representatives, a representative from the Union of Concerned Scientists (a public interest group), and a representative from the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety.

The establishment of the Panel is effective on June 30, 1999 with the filing of its charter with the Commission and with the standing committees of Congress having legislative jurisdiction over the NRC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew L. Bates, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555: telephone 301–415–1963.

Dated: June 30, 1999.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 99–17191 Filed 7–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–245]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1; Notice of Receipt and Availability for Comment of Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is in receipt of and is making available for public comment, the Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report (PSDAR) for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Millstone Unit 1), located in Waterford, Connecticut.

Millstone Unit 1 has been shut down since November 4, 1995, and the reactor has been defueled since November 19, 1995. By letter dated July 21, 1998, Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) certified to the Commission that power operations at Millstone Unit 1 had been permanently ceased and fuel had been permanently removed from the reactor vessel. By letter dated June 14, 1999, the licensee submitted its PSDAR to the Commission in accordance with the requirements of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations,* Section 50.82.

In the PSDAR, the licensee has identified the planned decommissioning activities and schedule for the Millstone Unit 1 facility, provided an estimate of expected costs, and discussed the reasons for concluding that the environmental impacts associated with site-specific decommissioning activities are bounded by the appropriate previously issued environmental impact statements. The licensee has chosen to decontaminate and dismantle selected portions of the facility and leave other portions in a safe storage status until decommissioning programs are developed for Unit 2 and Unit 3. The licensee stated, however, that it is conceivable that upon further evaluation, it may be preferable to decontaminate and dismantle Unit 1 without placing portions of the facility in safe storage. The licensee is also evaluating the feasibility of constructing an independent spent fuel storage facility on site until the fuel can be permanently transferred offsite to a Department of Energy facility.

The PSDAR is available for public inspection at the Commission's public document room located at The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and at the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut. The NRC has also placed the PSDAR on the Internet at [http://www.nrc.gov/OPA/reports/ms1061499.htm] (cover letter) and [http://www.nrc.gov/OPA/reports/1061499a.htm] (attached report).

The Commission will schedule a public meeting in the vicinity of the Millstone Unit 1 facility to solicit public comments on the Millstone Unit 1 PSDAR. A notice will be placed in the **Federal Register** and in the local media announcing the date, time, and location of the public meeting.

Comments regarding the Millstone Unit 1 PSDAR should be submitted in writing to Mr. Louis L. Wheeler, Senior Project Manager, Mail Stop O11 D–19, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, within 30 days after the date of this notice.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th of June 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Louis L. Wheeler,

Senior Project Manager, Decommissioning Section, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning Division of Licensing Project Manager, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–17192 Filed 7–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50–454, STN 50–455]

Commonwealth Edison Company; Byron Station, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66, issued to Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee) for operation of Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Ogle County, Illinois.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed amendments would delete license conditions which have been satisfied, revise others to delete parts which are no longer applicable or to revise references, and make editorial changes.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated March 14, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The NRC, as part of the original licensing process or subsequent licensing actions, may impose certain conditions on the license. The conditions are listed as part of an attachment to the license. In many cases, these conditions require certain actions by the licensee which, once completed, are no longer applicable. In order to simplify the licenses for Byron, Units 1 and 2, the licensee has proposed to delete license conditions which have been satisfied, revise others to delete parts which are no longer applicable or to revise references, and make editorial changes.

Description of the Proposed Change

The licensee proposed to modify Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(1), ''Maximum Power Level,'' to delete references to Attachment 1 to the Unit 1 operating

license. Attachment 1 describes preoperational tests, startup tests and other items that shall be completed as specified as a condition of the license.

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(3), ''Post-Fuel-Loading Initial Test Program (Section 14, SER [Safety Evaluation Report]),'' which states: ''Any changes to the Initial Test Program described in Section 14 of the FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] made in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 shall be reported in accordance with 50.59(b) within one month of such change.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(4), ''Seismic and Dynamic Qualification (Section 3.10, SSER [Supplemental Safety Evaluation Report] #5)*,'' which states: ''Prior to startup following the first refueling outage, the licensee shall completely qualify the Westinghouse 7300 Process Protection System (ESE–13), for both Nuclear Steam Supply System and Balance of Plant applications, including any hardware changes, if found necessary.'' The licensee also proposed to delete a related item from license condition 2.D. License condition 2.D. lists exemptions from 10 CFR Part 50 that were granted with the initial licensing. License condition 2.D.(b) identifies an exemption to General Design Criterion-2 (GDC–2) of Appendix A, which was granted to allow operation with license condition 2.C.(4).

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(5), ''Equipment Qualification (Section 3.11, SSER #5, SSER #6),'' which states: ''All electrical equipment within the scope of 10 CFR 50.49 must be environmentally qualified by November 30, 1985.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(7), ''Control Room Human Factors (Section 18.2, SSER #4),'' which states: ''Unless the staff determines that the test results do not support the change, the licensee shall, prior to startup following the first refueling outage, move the range and volume controls for the SOURCE RANGE nuclear instrument on Unit 1 from the nuclear instrumentation cabinet 1PM07J to the main control board 1PM05J.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(8), ''TMI Item 11.F.1,Iodine/Particulate Sampling (Section 11.5, SSER #5),'' which states: ''Prior to startup following the first refueling outage, the licensee shall demonstrate that the operating idoline/particulate sampling system will perform its intended function.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(9), ''Emergency Response Capability (NUREG–0737, Supplement #1),'' which states: ''The licensee shall complete the emergency response capabilities as required by Attachment 2 to this license, which is incorporated into this license.'' Attachment 2 lists the following five separate emergency response issues.

Number 1, ''Detailed Control Room Design Review (DCRDR),'' which states: ''The license shall submit the final summary report for the DCRDR by December 1, 1986.''

Number 2, ''Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2 Compliance,'' which states: ''The licensee shall submit by March 1, 1987, a preliminary report describing how the requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2 have been or will be met. The licensee shall submit by September 1, 1987, the final report and a schedule for implementation (assuming the NRC approves the DCRDR by March 1, 1987).''

Number 3, ''Upgrade Emergency Operating Procedures (EOPs),'' which states: ''The licensee shall submit a Procedures Generation Package within 3 months of NRC approval of Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG) Emergency Procedure Guidelines (EPG) Revision 1. The licensee shall implement the upgraded EOPs based on WOG EOPs Revision 1 within 12 months of NRC approval of WOG EPG Revision 1.''

Number 4, ''Emergency Response Facilities,'' which states: ''The licensee shall implement the Emergency Response Facility meteorological A-model by January 1, 1986.''

Number 5, ''Safety Parameter Display System (SPDS),'' which states: ''The licensee shall have SPDS operational by March 30, 1985.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(10), ''Reliability of Diesel-Generators (Section 9.5.4.1, SER, SSER #5)*,'' which states: ''Prior to startup following the first refueling outage, the controls and monitoring instrumentation on the local control panels shall be dynamically qualified for their location or shall be installed on a free standing floor mounted panel in such a manner (including the use of vibration isolation mounts as necessary) that there is reasonable assurance that any induced vibrations will not result in cyclic fatigue for the expected life of the instrument.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(11), ''Generic Letter 83–28 (Required Actions Based on Generic Implications of Salem ATWS [anticipated transient without scram] Events),'' which states: ''The licensee shall submit responses to and implement the requirements of Generic Letter 83–28 on a schedule which is consistent with that given in its letters dated November 5, 1983, February 29, 1984, June 1, 1984 and October 10, 1984.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(12), ''Formal Federal Emergency Management Agency Finding,'' which states: ''In the event that the NRC finds that the lack of progress in completion of the procedures in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's final rule, 44 CFR Part 350, is an indication that a major substantive problem exists in achieving or maintaining an adequate state of emergency preparedness, the provisions of 10 CFR Sections 50.54(s)(2) will apply.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(13), ''Control Room Ventilation System (Section 6.5.1, SSER #5, SSER #6)*,'' which states: ''Prior to July 1, 1985, the licensee shall incorporate modifications, as necessary, to ensure that the control room ventilation system may be used during an accident to protect operators within the criteria specified in 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, General Design Criteria 19.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(14), ''Turbine Missiles (Section 3.5.1.3, SSER #5),'' which states: ''The licensee shall volumetrically inspect all three low pressure turbine rotors by mevery third refueling outage, until a turbine system maintenance program based on the manufacturer's calculations of missile generation probabilities is approved by the staff.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 1 license condition 2.C.(15), ''Operating Staff Experience Requirements (Section 13.1.2.1, SSER #5),'' which states: ''The licensee shall have a licensed senior operator on each shift who has had at least six months of hot operating experience on a similar type plant, including at least six weeks at power levels greater than 20 percent of full power, and who has had start-up and shutdown experience, except as follows. For those shifts where such an individual is not available on the plant staff, an advisor shall be provided who has had at least four years of power plant experience, including two years of nuclear plant experience, and who has had at least one year of experience on shift as a licensed senior operator at a similar type facility. Use of advisors who were licensed only at the RO [reactor operator] level will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Advisors shall be trained on plant procedures, technical specifications and plant systems, and shall be examined on these

topics at a level sufficient to assure familiarity with the plant. For each shift, the remainder of the shift crew shall be trained as to the role of the advisors. These advisors shall be retained until the experience levels identified in the first sentence above have been achieved. The NRC shall be notified at least 30 days prior to the date that the licensee proposes to release the advisors from further service.''

The licensee proposed to revise Unit 1 license condition 2.D. to delete the list of exemptions from 10 CFR Part 50 and replace it with a statement that no exemptions from 10 CFR Part 50 are required.

The licensee proposed to modify Unit 2 license condition 2.C.(1), ''Maximum Power Level,'' to delete references to Attachment 1 to the Unit 1 operating license. Attachment 1 describes preoperational tests, ventilation tests and fire barrier sealing that shall be completed as specified as a condition of the license. Attachment 1, Item A., required that preoperational tests and test deficiencies documented in licensee letters dated November 3, 1986, and January 14, 1987, be completed in accordance with the licensee's schedule commitments.

The licensee proposed to revise Unit 2 license condition 2.C.(2), ''Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan,'' to delete references to Attachment 2.

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 2 license condition 2.C.(3), ''Initial Test Program,'' which states: ''Any changes to the Initial Startup Test Program described in Chapter 14 of the FSAR made in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 shall be reported in accordance with 50.59(b) within one month of such change.''

The licensee proposed to delete Unit 2 license condition 2.C.(4), ''Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2 Compliance,'' which states: ''The licensee shall submit by March 1, 1987, a preliminary report describing how the requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2 have been or will be met. The licensee shall submit by September 1, 1987, the final report and a schedule for implementation (assuming the NRC approves the DCRDR by March 1, 1987).''

The licensee proposed to revise Unit 2 license condition 2.D. to delete the list of exemptions from 10 CFR Part 50 and replace it with a statement that no exemptions from 10 CFR Part 50 are required.

The licensee also proposed certain editorial changes.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its environmental evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed amendment would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents.

The proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the ''no-action'' alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for Byron Station, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 28, 1999, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Mr. Frank Niziolek, of the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated March 14, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Byron Public Library District, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron, Illinois 61010.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of June 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Anthony J. Mendiola,

Chief, Section 2, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–17193 Filed 7–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Consolidated Guidance about Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance about Licenses of Broad Scope, dated April 1999

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the availability of NUREG–1556, Volume 11, ''Consolidated Guidance about Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance about Licenses of Broad Scope,'' dated April 1999.

ADDRESSES: Copies of NUREG–1556, Vol. 11, may be obtained by writing to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20402–9328. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161. A copy of the document is also available for inspection and/or copying for a fee in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC 20555–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Ms. Sally L. Merchant, Mail Stop TWFN 9–F–31, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone: (301) 415–7874, e-mail: slm2@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 16, 1998 (63 FR 49615), NRC announced the availability of draft