- Diversified Workforce Initiatives,
- Construction Certification and Paper-work Reduction Review
- OSHA Form 170

Reports on construction standards updates.

Special presentations including:

- Silica,
- Construction Advisory and the ACCSH Web Page,
- Strategic Plan Update, and
- Health Standards Technical Updates.

The following ACCSH Work Groups are scheduled to meet in the Frances Perkins Building:

Musculoskeletal Disorders—9:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Tuesday, August 31, in room C55521.

Construction Certification and Paper-work Reduction Review—8:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m., Tuesday, August 31, in room C–5515 Conference Room 2.

OSHA Form 170–1–5 p.m., Tuesday, August 31, in room C–5515, Conference Room 2.

Data Collection/Targeting—8:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m., Wednesday, September 1, in room C–5521.

Subpart N—Cranes—1–5 p.m., Wednesday, September 1, in room C–5515, Conference Room 2.

Diversified Workforce Initiatives—8:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m., Wednesday, September 1, in room C–5515, Conference Room 2.

Fall Protection—1–5 p.m., Wednesday, September 1, in room C–5521.

Other workgroups may meet after the adjournment of the ACCSH meeting on September 3, 1999.

Interested persons may submit written data, views or comments, preferably with 20 copies, to Theresa Berry, at the address above. Submissions received prior to the meeting will be provided to ACCSH and will be included in the record of the meeting.

Interested persons may also request to make an oral presentation by notifying Theresa Berry before the meeting. The request must state the amount of time desired, the interest that the person represents, and a brief outline of the presentation. ACCSH may grant requests, as time permits, at the discretion of the Chair of ACCSH.

Signed at Washington, DC this 3rd day of August, 1999.

Charles N. Jeffress,

Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 99–20406 Filed 8–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–443]

North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation, et al. (Seabrook Station Unit 1); Order Approving Transfer of License and Conforming amendment

I

North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation (North Atlantic) is authorized to act as agent for the joint owners of the Seabrook Station Unit 1 (Seabrook) and has exclusive responsibility and control over the physical construction, operation, and maintenance of the facility as reflected in Operating License NPF–86. Montaup Electric Company (Montaup), one of the joint owners, holds a 2.9 percent possessory interest in Seabrook. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued Operating License NPF–86 on March 15, 1990, pursuant to Part 50 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR Part 50). The facility is located in Seabrook Township, Rockingham County, on the southeast coast of the State of New Hampshire.

II

Under cover of a letter dated September 29, 1998, North Atlantic forwarded an application by Montaup and Little Bay Power Corporation (Little Bay) requesting approval of the proposed transfer of Montaup's rights under the operating license for Seabrook to Little Bay. The application was supplemented March 8, 1999, and April 7, 1999. In addition, the application requested approval of a conforming amendment to reflect the transfer.

Little Bay is a newly formed and wholly owned subsidiary of BayCorp Holdings, Ltd., which is the holding company that also owns Great Bay Power Corporation, an existing joint owner of Seabrook. According to the application, Montaup has agreed to sell its 2.9 percent ownership interest in Seabrook to Little Bay, subject to obtaining all necessary regulatory approvals. North Atlantic would remain as the Managing Agent for the joint owners of the facility and would continue to have exclusive responsibility for the management, operation, and maintenance of Seabrook. The conforming amendment would remove Montaup from the facility operating license and would add Little Bay in its place.

Approval of the transfer and conforming license amendment was requested pursuant to 10 CFR 50.80 and 50.90. Notice of the application for approval and an opportunity for a hearing was published in the **Federal Register** on December 14, 1998 (63 FR 68801). Pursuant to such notice, joint Seabrook owners New England Power Company (NEP) and United Illuminating Company (United) filed, respectively, a timely intervention petition and hearing request, and an untimely intervention petition, and Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company (MMWEC) filed written comments. In an order dated March 5, 1999, the Commission denied United's petition and granted NEP's intervention petition and hearing request. However, NEP's petition to intervene and hearing request were subsequently withdrawn, and an order was issued on April 26, 1999, terminating the proceeding. The March 5, 1999, order also referred MMWEC's comments to the staff. MMWEC's comments are addressed in the safety evaluation.

Under 10 CFR 50.80, no license, or any right thereunder, shall be transferred, directly or indirectly, through transfer of control of the license, unless the Commission shall give its consent in writing. Upon review of the information in the application submitted by Montaup and Little Bay dated September 29, 1998, the supplements dated March 8, and April 7, 1999, and other information before the Commission, the NRC staff has determined that Little Bay is qualified to hold the license to the same extent the license is now held by Montaup and that the transfer of the license to the extent it is held by Montaup to Little Bay is otherwise consistent with applicable provisions of law, regulations, and orders issued by the Commission. The NRC staff has further found that the application for the proposed license amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I; the facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission; there is reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by the proposed license amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public and that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations; the issuance of the proposed license amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and the issuance of the

proposed amendment will be in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations, and all applicable requirements have been satisfied. The foregoing findings are supported by a safety evaluation dated August 3, 1999.

III

Accordingly, pursuant to Sections 161b, 161i, and 184 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 2201(b), 2201(i), and 2234; and 10 CFR 50.80, *it is hereby ordered* that the license transfer referenced above is approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. For purposes of ensuring public health and safety, Little Bay shall provide decommissioning funding assurance of no less than $11.8 million, after payment of any taxes, in the Seabrook Decommissioning Trust Fund maintained and administered by the State of New Hampshire under its applicable law upon the transfer of Montaup's interest in Seabrook to Little Bay.

2. After they have received all required regulatory approvals of the transfer, Montaup and Little Bay shall inform the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, in writing of the date of the closing of the transfer no later than two business days prior to the date of closing. Should the transfer not be completed by August 1, 2000, this Order shall become null and void, provided, however, on application and for good cause shown, such date may be extended.

It is further ordered that, consistent with 10 CFR 2.1315(b), a license amendment that makes changes to conform the license to reflect the subject license transfer is approved. Such amendment shall be issued and made effective at the time the proposed license transfer is completed.

This Order is effective upon issuance.

For further details with respect to this Order, see the application dated September 29, 1998, and supplements dated March 8, 1999, and April 7, 1999, which are 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 Exeter Public Library, Founders Park, Exeter, NH 03833.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3d day of August, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–20400 Filed 8–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Valley Authority

[Docket No. 50–259]

Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

Introduction

The US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, or the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption to Facility Operating License No. DPR–33, issued to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) for operation of the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN) Unit 1, located in Limestone County, Alabama.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is in response to TVA's application dated February 4, 1999, for a temporary exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.65 (Maintenance Rule). Specifically, this action would exempt TVA from the explicit scoping requirements of 10 CFR 50.65(b), and instead it would allow TVA to consider the defueled and long-term layup status of BFN Unit 1 when establishing the scope of TVA's Maintenance Rule Program. Structures, systems, and components (SSCs) that perform a required function for Unit 1 in its present defueled status or that directly support the operation of Unit 2 or Unit 3 would be included in the scope of the BFN Maintenance Rule Program, but Unit 1 systems and components not required to be operational would not be required to be included in the Maintenance Rule Program.

The Need for the Proposed Action

10 CFR 50.65(a)(1) requires, in part, that, power reactor licensees shall monitor the performance or condition of SSCs against licensee-established goals to provide reasonable assurance that the SSCs, defined in 10 CFR 50.65(b), are capable of fulfilling their intended functions.

TVA requested the exemption to resolve a 10 CFR 50.65 compliance issue that was identified during an NRC inspection at the facility (cf., NRC combined Inspection Reports 50–259/97–04; 50–260/97–04; and 50–296/97–04, (IR 97–04) dated May 21,1997). The issue relates to the acceptability of TVA's approach to addressing the SSCs required to be within the scope of the regulation as specified in 10 CFR 50.65(b). As a result of the inspection finding, the NRC informed TVA by letter dated July 30, 1997, that the scope of the BFN maintenance rule program for Unit 1 was not consistent with the requirements 10 CFR 50.65, and identified three options available to TVA to resolve the issue. One of the options identified was for TVA to request an exemption from the requirements of the rule that are not currently being met.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluent that may be released off site. There is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission concludes that granting the proposed exemption would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed exemption does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. The Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

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

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement dated September 1, 1972 for BFN Units 1, 2 and 3.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 23, 1999, the NRC staff consulted with the Alabama State official, Mr. David Walter of the State Office of Radiation Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. Mr. Walter had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon 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