is scheduled for implementation beginning in April 2000.

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC World Wide Web site (http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/PUBLIC/OMB/index.html). The document will be available on the NRC Home Page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by September 10, 1999. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given to comments received after this date.

**Erik Godwin,**

*Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150– ), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.*

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3087.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, 301–415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of August 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Beth C. St. Mary,**

*Acting NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 99–20658 Filed 8–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Licensing Support System Advisory Review Panel

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of amendment of the Charter of the Licensing Support Network Advisory Review Panel (LSNARP).

**SUMMARY:** The Licensing Support System Advisory Review Panel was established by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission as a Federal Advisory Committee in 1989. Its purpose was to provide advice to (1) the Department of Energy (DOE) on the fundamental issues of design and development of an electronic information management system to be used to store and retrieve documents relating to the licensing of a geologic repository for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste, and (2) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the operation and maintenance of the system. This electronic information management system was known as the Licensing Support System (LSS). In 1998 the Commission approved amendments to 10 CFR Part 2 to provide for a Network based electronic information management system and the Licensing Support System Advisory Review Panel was renamed as the Licensing Support Network Advisory Review Panel and the Charter was amended to reflect other changes made in the rule.

The Commission recently decided to place the LSN Administrator under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Judge (CAJ) of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel and to have the LSNARP report to the CAJ. To accommodate the change minor modifications to the Charter have been made.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has determined that amendment of the charter is in the public interest in connection with duties imposed on the Commission by law. This action is being taken in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Andrew L. Bates, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555: Telephone 301–504–1963.

Dated: August 5, 1999.

**Andrew L. Bates,**

*Advisory Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 99–20655 Filed 8–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket Nos. 50–445 and 50–446]**

### Texas Utilities Electric Company; Comanche Peak Steam Electric 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 license amendments to Facility Operating License (FOL) Nos. NPF–87 and NPF–89, issued to Texas Utilities Electric Company (TU Electric or the licensee), for operation of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Units 1 and 2, located in Somervell County, Texas.

### Environmental Assessment

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed license amendments would allow the licensee to increase the licensed thermal power level of CPSES, Unit 2, from 3411 to 3445 megawatts thermal (MWt), which represents a 1 percent increase in allowable thermal power. This facility was authorized for power production at 3411 MWt with issuance of the FOL on April 6, 1993.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for license amendment dated December 21, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated April 23 and May 14, 1999. Section V, of Attachment 2, to the licensee's May 14, 1999, supplement, contains the licensee's detailed environmental evaluation of the proposed licensing action.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action will allow an increase in power generation at CPSES, Unit 2, to provide additional electrical power for distribution to the grid. Power uprate has been widely recognized by the industry as a safe and cost-effective method to increase generating capacity.

### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has previously evaluated the environmental impact of operation of CPSES, Units 1 and 2, as described in the ''Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2,'' NUREG–0775, September 1981. With regard to consequences of postulated accidents, the licensee has reanalyzed the design-basis accident doses for the exclusion area boundary, low population zone, and the control room dose to the operators and determined that there will be a small increase in these doses; however, the analysis presented in NUREG–0775 postulates these doses resulting from releases at 104.5 percent of the currently licensed power level. Thus, the increase in postulated doses due to design-basis accidents is bounded by the previous evaluation presented in NUREG–0775. No increase in the probability of these accidents is expected to occur.

With regard to normal releases, calculations have been performed that show the potential impact on the radiological effluents from the proposed 1 percent increase in power level of CPSES Unit 2. For the 1 percent uprating calculations, the offsite doses from normal effluent releases remain significantly below the bounding limits of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Part 50, Appendix I. Normal annual average gaseous release remains limited to a small fraction of 10 CFR Part 20 limits for identified mixtures. Solid and liquid waste processing systems are expected

to operate within their design requirements. More frequent operation of these systems may lead to a slight increase in solid and liquid production.

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes 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, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. With regard to thermal discharges to the Squaw Creek Reservoir, a small increase in the circulating water discharge temperature is expect due to the proposed 1 percent power uprate. The increase is expected to be approximately .01 degree Fahrenheit, and therefore, insignificant. Existing administrative controls ensure the conduct of adequate monitoring such that appropriate actions can be taken to preclude exceeding National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitted limits. No additional monitoring requirements or other changes relative to the NPDES permit are required as a result of the power uprate.

Therefore, as described in the preceding discussions, the 1 percent uprate of Unit 2 does not have a significant environmental impact on the Squaw Creek Reservoir.

No other nonradiological impacts are associated with the proposed action.

Based upon the above, the Commission concludes that the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological 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 CPSES.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 19, 1999, the staff consulted with the Texas State official, Mr. Authur Tate of the Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control, 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 application for license amendment December 21, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated April 23 and May 14, 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 University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, Texas.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of August, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Robert A. Gramm,**

*Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99–20685 Filed 8–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

---

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Pilot Program Evaluation Panel; Meeting Notice

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L., 94–463, Stat. 770–776) the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) announced the establishment of the Pilot Program Evaluation Panel (PPEP). The PPEP will function as a management-level Oversight group to monitor and evaluate the success of the Commission's Reactor Oversight Process Improvements program. A Charter governing the PPEP functions as a Federal Advisory Committee was filed with Congress on June 30, 1999, after consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration. The PPEP will hold its second meeting on August 17, 1999, in the Two White Flint North Auditorium, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The PPEP meeting participants are listed below along with their affiliation:

Frank P. Gillespie—Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mohan C. Thadani—Nuclear Regulatory Commission
James T. Wiggins—Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Heidi Hahn—LANL
Bruce Mallet—Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Geoffrey Grant—Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Kenneth E. Brockman—Nuclear Regulatory Commission
James Lieberman—Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Steve Floyd—Nuclear Energy Institute
David Garchow—Public Service Electric and Gas
Masoud Bajestani—Tennessee Valley Authority
George Barnes—Commonwealth Edison Company
James Chase—Omaha Public Power District
Gary Wright—Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety
David Lochbaum—Union of Concerned Scientists

A tentative agenda of the meeting is outlined as follows:

9:00–9:30 a.m. Introduction and opening remarks
- Noticing requirements
- Public participation

9:30–11:00 a.m. Discuss conduct of panel and rules of operation
- Location of meetings
- Approach to report generation

11:00 a.m.–12:00 n. Staff presentation on initial results of pilot plant inspections
- Final criteria and measurement approach for criteria

12:00 n.–1:00 p.m. Lunch

1:00–2:00 p.m. NEI Presentation—topic to be determined

2:00–3:00 p.m. Panel discussion on need for any additional data or analyses

3:00 p.m. Discussion and public presentations
- Future invited speakers
- Open discussion

4:00 p.m. Meeting Adjourned

Meetings of the PPEP are open to the members of the public. Oral or written