NRC action on the basis of assessment results, and communicating results to licensees and the public. Other staff activities to improve the enforcement process were coordinated with these three task groups to ensure that changes to the enforcement process were properly evaluated in the framework structure and that changes to the inspection and assessment programs were integrated with the changes to the enforcement program.

The task groups completed their work between October and December 1998, and developed recommendations to be presented to the Commission. On January 20, 1999, the staff briefed the Commission on the staff's proposal as described in SECY–99–007, ''Recommendations for Reactor Oversight Improvements.''

The follow-up recommendations for an integrated oversight process are presented in SECY–99–007A, ''Recommendation for Reactor Oversight Process Improvements (Follow-Up to SECY–99-007)'' dated March 22, 1999, and its attachments. This paper includes further information on the development of the Significance Determination Process (SDP) and the revised enforcement policy.

Scope of the Public Comment Period

This public comment period will focus on obtaining industry and public views on the new oversight process as implemented during the Pilot Program and any additional issues that need to be addressed prior to full implementation of the new oversight process. To assist respondents the following questions are included as a guide. Comments should be as specific as possible and the use of examples is encouraged.

1. Does the new oversight process provide adequate assurance that plants are being operated safely?

2. Does the new oversight process enhance public confidence by increasing the predictability, consistency, clarity and objectivity of the NRC's oversight process?

3. Does the new oversight process improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the regulatory process focusing agency resources on those issues with the most safety significance?

4. Does the new oversight process reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on licensees?

5. The new oversight process does not currently provide an overall assessment of performance of an individual safety cornerstone other than a determination that the cornerstone objectives have or have not been met. However, it does identify regulatory actions to be taken for degraded performance within the safety cornerstones. Is an overall safety cornerstone assessment warranted or appropriate?

6. Licensee findings as well as NRC inspection findings are candidates for being evaluated by the significance determination process. Does this serve to discourage licensees from having an aggressive problem identification process?

7. In the new oversight program, positive inspection observations are not included in NRC inspection reports and the plant issues matrix (PIM) due to a lack of criteria and past inconsistencies and subjectivity in identifying such issues. Previous feedback on this issue indicated that the vast majority of commenters believed positive inspection findings should not be factored into the assessment process. Does the available public information associated with the revised reactor oversight process, including the NRC's web page which includes information on performance indicators and inspection findings, provide an appropriately balanced view of licensee performance? If not, should positive inspection findings be captured and incorporated into a process to reach an overall inspection indicator for each cornerstone?

8. The staff has established several mechanisms such as public meetings held in the vicinity of the plants, this **Federal Register** Notice, and the NRC's website to solicit public feedback on the Pilot Program. Are there any other appropriate means by which the agency could solicit stakeholder feedback, in a structured and consistent manner, on the Pilot Program?

9. Are there any additional issues that the agency needs to address prior to full implementation of the new oversight process at all sites?

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William M. Dean,

Chief, Inspection Program Branch, Division of Inspection Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–18983 Filed 7–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Severe Accident Management; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Severe Accident Management will hold a meeting on August 9–10, 1999, Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Monday, August 9, 1999—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

Tuesday, August 10, 1999—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will review: (1) The proposed final revision of the Source Term Rule and draft versions of the associated regulatory guide and Standard Review Plan Section; (2) the proposed revision to Regulatory Guide 1.78, ''Assumptions for Evaluating the Habitability of a Nuclear Power Plant Control Room During a Postulated Hazardous Chemical Release''; and (3) the status of issues associated with the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research Severe Accident Research Program. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman. Written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, and other interested persons regarding this review. Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, the scheduling of sessions which are open to the public, and the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor, can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff engineer, Mr. Paul A. Boehnert (telephone 301/415–8065) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above

named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: July 20, 1999.

Richard P. Savio,

Associate Director for Technical Support, ACRS/ACNW.

[FR Doc. 99–18982 Filed 7–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Cumulative Report on Rescissions and Deferrals

July 1, 1999.

This report is submitted in fulfillment of the requirement of Section 1014(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93–344). Section 1014(e) requires a monthly report listing all budget authority for the current fiscal year for which, as of the first day of the month, a special message had been transmitted to Congress.

This report gives the status, as of July 1, 1999, of three rescission proposals and three deferrals contained in two special messages for FY 1999. These messages were transmitted to Congress on October 22, 1998, and February 1, 1999.

Recissions (Attachments A and C)

As of July 1, 1999, three rescission proposals totaling $35 million have been transmitted to the Congress. Attachment C shows the status of the FY 1999 rescission proposals.

Deferrals (Attachments B and D)

As of July 1, 1999, $682 million in budget authority was being deferred from obligation. Attachment D shows the status of each deferral reported during FY 1999.

Information from Special Messages

The special messages containing information on the rescission proposals and deferrals that are covered by this cumulative report are printed in the editions of the **Fedeal Register** cited below:

63 FR 63949, Tuesday, November 17, 1998
64 FR 6721, Wednesday, February 10, 1999

Jacob J. Lew,

Director.

Attachment A

STATUS OF FY 1999 RESCISSIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Budgetary resources
Recisions proposed by the President	35.0
Rejected by the Congress	.....
Amounts rescinded by P.L. 106–31, the FY 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act	−16.8
Currently before the Congress	18.2

Attachment B

STATUS OF FY 1999 DEFERRALS

[In millions of dollars]

	Budgetary resources
Deferrals proposed by the President	1,680.7
Routine Executive releases through June 1999 (OMB/Agency releases of $1,082.3 million, partially offset by a cumulative positive adjustment of $83.6 million)	−998.7
Overturned by the Congress	* * * * * * * *
Currently before the Congress	682.0

BILLING CODE 3110–01–P