require divestiture of securities issued by nuclear industry entities, or discontinuance of industry-funded research contracts or grants.

Copies of a résumé describing the educational and professional background of the candidate, including any special accomplishments, professional references, current address and telephone number should be provided. All qualified candidates will receive careful consideration.

Appointment will be made without regard to such factors as race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disabilities. Candidates must be citizens of the United States and be able to devote approximately 50–100 days per year to Committee business. Applications will be accepted until November 30, 1999.

Dated: September 14, 1999.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 99–24383 Filed 9–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–369 and 50–370]

Duke Energy Corporation; McGuire Nuclear 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 exemptions from Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF–9 and NPF–17, issued to Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Mecklenberg County, North Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, from certain requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion (GDC) 57, regarding isolation of main steam branch lines penetrating the containment. The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated April 20, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee requested an exemption from GDC 57 for Containment Penetrations M261 and M393. GDC 57 imposes isolation requirements on lines that penetrate primary reactor containment and are neither part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary nor connected directly to the containment atmosphere. These are penetrations on main steam branch lines. These lines penetrate the containment and are not part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary or connected directly to the containment atmosphere. Outside of containment, these lines branch into various separate, individual lines before reaching the respective main steam isolation valves. From each of these main steam lines, one branch supplies main steam to the turbine-driven auxiliary feedwater (TDCA, using the licensee's abbreviation) pump.

Valves SA–1, SA–2, SA–77, and SA–78 are locally operated, locked open, manual gate valves. Valves SA–5 and SA–6 are stop check valves. All of these valves are located in the branch lines that supply main steam to the TDCA. Valves SA–1, SA–2, SA–77, and SA–78 are required to be open, and SA–5 and SA–6 are required to be capable of opening for Engineered Safety Features (ESF) operations of the TDCA pump by Technical Specifications (TS). The TDCA is also part of the ESF. Valves SA–1, SA–2, SA–77, and SA–78 are not identified as Containment Isolation Valves in the TS or the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, but perform that function. To comply literally with GDC 57, the licensee would have to add motor operators to valves SA–1, SA–2, SA–77, and SA–78, such that they become automatic or capable of remote operation. The licensee has requested an exemption from literal compliance with GDC 57. The licensee would rely instead on manual action to close the valves SA–1, SA–2, SA–77, and SA–78, or valves SA–5, and SA–6. The time needed to do so has been factored into the accident analyses. Further, the applicable design-basis accident scenarios and consequences continue to be bounding.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there is no significant environmental impact if the exemptions are granted. No changes will be made to the as-built design, and existing applicable procedures at the two units at the McGuire Nuclear Station will remain the same.

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 offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual 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. It 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 Impact Statement related to the McGuire Nuclear Station.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 13, 1999, the staff consulted with the North Carolina State official, Mr. John James, of the Bureau of Land and Waste Management Department of Health and Environmental 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 exemptions 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 request for the exemptions dated April 20, 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 J. Murrey Atkins Library, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of September 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank Rinaldi,

Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing and Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–24381 Filed 9–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–245, 50–336, and 50–423]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO), et al., Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of exemptions from Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–21, DPR–65, and NPF–49, issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO/the licensee), for operation of Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 (Millstone), located in New London County, Connecticut.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E, Item IV.F.2.c regarding conduct of a full participation exercise of the offsite emergency plan every 2 years. Under the proposed exemption, the licensee would reschedule the Federally-observed full-participation emergency exercise from September 1999 to March 2000 and all future Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)—and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)—evaluated exercises would occur biennially from the year 2000.

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

The Need for the Proposed Action

Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulation, (10 CFR) Part 50, Appendix E, Item IV.F.2.c requires each licensee at each site to conduct an exercise of its offsite emergency plan biennially. The NRC and FEMA observe these exercises and evaluate the performance of the licensee, State and local authorities having a role under the emergency plan.

The licensee had initially planned to conduct an exercise of its onsite and offsite emergency plans in September 1999, which is at the end of the required interval. To support the efficient and effective use of Federal resources, as discussed during the annual NRC Region I and FEMA (Regions I, II, and III) exercise scheduling meeting held in White Plains, New York, in December 1998, the planned September 1999 exercise for Millstone was shifted to March 2000, which is beyond the required interval.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action involves an administrative activity (a schedular change in conducting an exercise) unrelated to plant operations.

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 Related to the Continuation of Construction of Unit 2 and the Operation of Units 1 and 2, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Millstone Point Company,'' dated June 1973 or ''Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3,'' dated December 1984 (NUREG–1064).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 5, 1999, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official, Mr. Fred Scheuritzel of the Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments. In addition, by letter dated July 14, 1999, from Ms. Vanessa Quinn, the Federal Emergency Management Agency indicated support for rescheduling the exercise.

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 August 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 rooms located at the Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Public Library, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of September 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John A. Nakoski,

Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–24380 Filed 9–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Notice

In accordance with the purposes of Sections 29 and 182b. of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2232b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on September 30–October 2, 1999, in Conference Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the **Federal Register** on Wednesday, November 18, 1998 (63 FR 64105).