• Link to other federal initiatives such as the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative, Gang Resistance Education and Training Program, Weed and Seed program, Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative, and Partnerships to Reduce Juvenile Gun Violence;

• Facilitate access to technical support and expertise through a federal champion;

• Support consolidated planning on the community level and provide greater flexibility in administering grant funds with related goals as allowed under current law;

• Provide assistance in assessing factors contributing to gun violence in each community and tailoring strategies and tactics to address them; and

• Help communities and local law enforcement agencies measure results and obtain expert advice in devising strategies for collecting, analyzing, and using data to achieve results.

Who Can Apply To Be a Local Partner?

Expressions of Interest can be submitted by the head of a community-based partnership, local government, network of local governments, state or local law enforcement agency, or network of state or local law enforcement agencies. Where state funds or agencies are involved or where federal funds flow through the state, there must be clear evidence of state partnership.

How Does My Community Express Interest in the SafeCities?

Potential partners should submit a brief Expression of Interest. To minimize any burden, submissions should be under ten pages in length. Communities are encouraged to use existing plans and documents wherever possible.

Selection Criteria

The National Steering Committee will select local partners based on:

• Existence of a partnership with a comprehensive plan to reduce gun violence using a balance of prevention, intervention, and enforcement strategies;

• Existence of explicit community goals or report card for public safety and a demonstrated commitment by the partners to use data to plan, implement, and evaluate strategies to reduce gun violence;

• Effective leadership and participation of key stakeholders such as federal, state, and local law enforcement officials, education officials, faith community representatives, business leaders, or other key community members;

• Readiness and commitment of partners to work together, cut red tape, coordinate operations, use current funding more effectively, and achieve better results;

• Potential impact of proposed performance partnership on the reduction of gun violence and time frame provided in the Expression of Interest; and

• Balance in terms of geography, demographic characteristics, and areas of focus.

National Partners

The SafeCities Network will be supported by a Steering Committee that will include the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice, The Department of the Treasury, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the National Partnership for Reinventing Government, the White House Office of Management and Budget, and private sector partners.

Expressions of Interest

Expressions of Interest in partnerships must be received by close of business on August 15, 1999. They may be submitted by mail, fax or electronically to: SafeCities, National Partnership for Reinventing Government, Suite 200, 750 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20007, Fax: (202) 632–0390, SafeCities @npr.gov

More Information

For questions or additional information, please call:

Jeff Slowikowski, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, (202) 307–5929

Malcolm Brady, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, (202) 927–7890

Pamela Johnson/Wesley Dickerson, National Partnership for Reinventing Government, (202) 694–0001

Pamela Johnson,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 99–17811 Filed 7–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3115–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[DOCKET NO. 50–160]

Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia Tech Research Reactor; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of a license amendment to Facility Operating License No. R–97, issued to the Georgia Institute of Technology (the licensee) that would allow decommissioning of the Georgia Tech Research Reactor (GTRR) located in Atlanta, Georgia.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The GTRR is on the 330-acre campus of the Georgia Institute of Technology. The campus is just north of the center of downtown Atlanta in a residential and commercial area. The GTRR is in a containment building at the Neely Nuclear Research Center. The Neely Nuclear Research Center also has a high bay area, and a laboratory and office building.

The high bay area contains a hot cell facility, radio-chemistry laboratory, decontamination room and storage facility. The three-story laboratory and office building adjoins the containment building. The GTRR is designed for isolation from the rest of the Neely Nuclear Research Facility.

The heavy water moderated, cooled and reflected GTRR was licensed and first operated in 1964. The 5-megawatt thermal reactor was shut down on November 17, 1995. This shutdown was in preparation to remove the high-enriched uranium fuel. All fuel was removed by the end of February 1996, to allow conversion to low-enriched uranium fuel. Also, the reactor was defueled during the Olympic Games which were held in Atlanta, in the summer of 1996. Since that time no new GTRR fuel has been received. By letter dated July 1, 1997, the Georgia Institute of Technology informed the NRC that the GTRR would be permanently shut down. The licensee applied for a possession only status on August 7, 1997. By License Amendment No. 12 on April 2, 1998, the NRC removed the authority to operate and authorized possession of the residual radioactive materials.

The licensee submitted a decommissioning plan in accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(b) on July 1, 1998, as supplemented on February 8, 1999. Decommissioning, as described in the

plan, will consist of transferring licensed radioactive equipment and material from the site, and decontamination of the facility to meet unrestricted release criteria (this is called the DECON option). After the Commission verifies that the release criteria have been met, the reactor license will be terminated.

A ''Notice and Solicitation of Comments Pursuant to 10 CFR 20.1405 and 10 CFR 50.82(b)(5) Concerning Proposed Action to Decommission Georgia Institute of Technology Georgia Tech Research Reactor'' was published in the **Federal Register** on February 1, 1999, (64 FR 4902). It was also published in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution on February 14, 1999, and in the Georgia Technique on February 12, 1999. Comments were received from an individual and from the Georgians Against Nuclear Energy. The NRC staff plans to consider and respond to these comments.

Further, 10 CFR 51.53(d) provides that each applicant for a license amendment to authorize decommissioning of a production or utilization facility shall submit an environmental report that reflects any new information or significant environmental change associated with the proposed decommissioning activities. By letter dated May 28, 1999, the Georgia Institute of Technology provided their environmental report.

Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is necessary because of Georgia Institute of Technology's 1997 decision to cease operations permanently. As specified in 10 CFR 50.82, any licensee may apply to the NRC for authority to surrender a license voluntarily and to decommission the affected facility. The Georgia Institute of Technology is planning to use the area for other purposes once it is released for unrestricted use.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed the environmental assessment of the proposed action and concludes that the associated radiological effects of the decommissioning will be acceptable. As noted in section 3.1.5 of the Decommissioning Plan submitted on July 1, 1998, the collective total effective dose equivalent to all onsite workers for the entire decommissioning program is estimated to be 7.74 person-rem. The licensee established controls to ensure occupational exposure remains below NRC regulatory limits for decommissioning personnel. No estimated exposure to the public from the proposed action was provided, but the licensee established that decommissioning activities will not exceed 10 CFR 20.1301, ''Dose Limits for Individual Members of the Public,'' and established an As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) program to minimize exposure. Further, the only potential radiological accident scenarios involve contaminations that could occur during decontamination and decommissioning activities. These scenarios would not result in release of radioactive material outside the facility nor in occupational exposures greater than 10 CFR part 20 limits.

Occupational and public exposure may result from offsite disposal of the low-level residual radioactive material from the GTRR. The handling, storage, and shipment of this radioactive material are specified to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 20.2006, ''Transfer for Disposal and Manifest,'' 49 CFR parts 100–177, ''Transportation of Hazardous Materials,'' 10 CFR part 61, ''Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste,'' 40 CFR part 261 ''Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste,'' and applicable disposal site license conditions. Experience with such disposal has shown that occupational and public exposure associated with such disposal is minimal.

Based on the review of the specific proposed activities associated with the dismantling and decontamination of the GTRR, the Commission has determined that 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, no significant radiological environmental impacts are 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, no significant non-radiological environmental impacts are associated with the proposed action.

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

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The three alternatives to the proposed action for the GTRR are SAFSTOR, ENTOMB, and no action. SAFSTOR is the alternative in which the nuclear facility is placed and maintained in a condition that allows the nuclear facility to be safely stored and subsequently decontaminated (deferred decontamination) to levels that permit release for unrestricted use. ENTOMB is the alternative in which radioactive contaminants are encased in a structurally long-lived material, such as concrete, the entombed structure is appropriately maintained and continued surveillance is carried out until the radioactivity decays to a level permitting release of the property for unrestricted use. The no action alternative would leave the facility in its present configuration. However, the regulations in 10 CFR 50.82(b) only allow a limited time for this condition to exist.

The radiological impacts of SAFSTOR would be less because of radioactive decay prior to DECON. The ENTOMB option would result in lower radiological exposure but continued use of resources. Georgia Institute of Technology has determined that the proposed action (DECON) is the most efficient use of the existing facility, since it wants to use the space that will become available for other academic purposes. The SAFSTOR, ENTOMB and no action alternatives would entail continued surveillance and physical security measures to be in place and continued monitoring by licensee personnel.

Alternative Use of Resources

The action does not involve the use of resources different from those previously committed for construction and operation of the GTRR.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, the NRC staff consulted with the State of Georgia. In response to the NRC's notice and solicitations for comments on the GTRR decommissioning, Thomas E. Hill, Manager of the Radioactive Materials Program for the Georgia Department of Natural Resources wrote, in part, that ''[w]e fully support Georgia Tech's goal of decommissioning the facility to provide for license terminations and release of the facility for unrestricted use.''

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 NRC 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 July 1, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated February 8, and May 28, 1999, which are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of July, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Ledyard B. Marsh,

Chief Events Assessment, Generic Communications and Non-Power Reactors Branch, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–17747 Filed 7–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–397]

Washington Public Power Supply System, Washington Public Power Supply System, Nuclear Project No. 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–21, issued to the Washington Public Power Supply System (the licensee), for operation of the WPPSS Nuclear Project No.2 (WNP–2), located in Benton County, Washington.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise Facility Operating License No. NPF–21 to reflect the change in the licensee's name from the Washington Public Power Supply System to Energy Northwest. In addition, the facility, WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2, will now be referred to as WNP–2.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated June 3, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to change the operating license to accurately reflect the new name of the licensee.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes, that the name change is administrative in nature and will not affect the operation of WNP–2.

The proposed amendment 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 the Washington Public Power System Nuclear Project No.2 dated December 1981.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 16, 1999, the staff consulted with the Washington State official, Mr. Crowley of the Department of Health, State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, 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 June 3, 1999, 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 Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jack Cushing,

Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–17746 Filed 7–12–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Workshop on Redefining the Role of the Division of Licensing Project Management in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The NRC is sponsoring a workshop involving the Division of Licensing Project Management in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, licensing officials representing the nuclear industry, and other stakeholders external to the NRC. The purpose of the meeting is to provide a forum for constructive dialogue on the agency's efforts to redefine the responsibilities of the Division of Licensing Project Management. This meeting is open to the public and all interested parties may attend.

Discussion

The Division of Licensing Project Management (DLPM), in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), is in the process of redefining its responsibilities. Previous audits and reviews had indicated that the function of project managers needed to be reevaluated, clearly defined, and communicated. In addition, the staff is attempting to correlate the functions of DLPM with the four strategic objectives of maintaining safety, reducing unnecessary regulatory burden, increasing pubic confidence, and increasing efficiency and effectiveness. DLPM management has determined that the project managers have responsibility for the following three major program areas: (1) Licensing authority, (2) interactions, and (3) regulatory improvements. Within each area are several specific tasks and goals regarding timeliness, effectiveness, and quality. A summary of each program area is given below. DLPM is sharing