insertable control rods * * *'' to ''Initiate action to ''fully'' insert all insertable control rods * * *''

43. ITS 3.3.5.1, ITS Table 3.3.5.1–1, changing footnote (a) from the STS to include a citation of LCO 3.5.2 which amplifies the ECCS equipment instrumentation requirements.

44. ITS 5.5.2.b, adding a note that the provisions of SR 3.0.2 apply to integrated leak tests at 24 months.

45. ITS 3.8.8, incorporating changes to Condition A, B and C of the STS applicable to ''one or more'' Divisions and to ''one or both.''

46. ITS 3.6.4.1, incorporating wording changes that alter the meaning of containment operability with respect to meeting surveillance requirements which relates to whether the inoperability of the standby gas treatment system constitutes a failure of the surveillance of the secondary containment integrity test.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed conversion of the CTS to the ITS for NMP2, including the beyond-scope issues discussed above. Changes which are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TS. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operators' control of NMP2 in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements from the CTS to other licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may then be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 and other NRC-approved control mechanisms which will ensure continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found to be consistent with the guidelines of NUREG–1433 and NUREG–1434 and 10 CFR 50.36 does not require that the requirements be included in the TS.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to enhance plant safety.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have also been reviewed. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit, or to place an unnecessary burden on the licensee, their removal from the TS was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG, and found to be acceptable for the plant. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG–1433 and NUREG–1434, Revision 1, have been reviewed by the NRC staff and found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revisions to the TS were found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

The proposed amendment will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, will not change the quantity or types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and will not significantly increase the occupational or public radiological exposure. Also, these changes do not increase the licensed power and allowable effluents for the plant. The changes will not create any new or unreviewed environmental impacts that were not considered in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) related to the operation of NMP2, (NUREG–1085, dated May 1985). Therefore, there are no significant radiological impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed amendment involves features located entirely within the restricted area for the plant defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and does not involve any historical sites. They do not affect non-radiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact. They do not increase any discharge limit for the plant. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

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

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 NMP2, dated May 1985.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the New York State official, Jack Spath, of the New York Energy and Research Authority on November 4, 1999, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed amendment. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed amendment will not have a significant adverse 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 dated October 16, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated December 30, 1998; and May 10, June 15, July 30, August 11, 16, 19, 27, and September 10, 1999, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. Publically available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of December 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Alexander W. Dromerick,

Acting Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–32492 Filed 12–14–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–423]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO), et al., Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, Environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact (correction)

The following is a correction to the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact that was published in the **Federal Register** on September 7, 1999 (64 FR 48675). Changes are indicated by double bracketed text. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–49, issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3 (MP3) located in New London County, Connecticut. The changes correct an error made

regarding when the spent fuel storage pool at MP3 will no longer be capable of supporting a full core off-load. MP3 will continue to have full core off-load capability until after refueling outage 7, currently scheduled for early calendar year 2001.

The first paragraph under ''The Need for the Proposed Action'' is changed to read:

The Need for the Proposed Action

An increase in spent fuel storage capacity is needed to maintain the capability for a full core off-load. [[Loss of full core off-load capability will occur as a result of refueling outage 7 (RFO 7), that is scheduled to start early in calendar year 2001.]] The licensee plans to install an additional 15 high density storage racks (with the capacity to store 1,104 fuel assemblies) following RFO 6 (14 will be installed between RFO 6 and RFO 7, with the last one to be installed later if it is necessary), while keeping the existing racks in place. The additional capacity will increase the capability for a full core off-load as the unit approaches the end of its operating license (November 25, 2025).

Similarly, the first paragraph under ''Reduction of Spent Fuel Generation'' is changed to read:

Reduction of Spent Fuel Generation

Generally, improved usage of the fuel and/or operation at a reduced power level would be an alternative that would decrease the amount of fuel being stored in the pool and thus increase the amount of time before full core off-load capacity is lost. With extended burnup of fuel assemblies, the fuel cycle would be extended and fewer off-loads would be necessary. [[This is not an alternative for resolving the loss of full core off-load capability because the spent fuel pool currently has the capacity for only one more full core off-load and some of the fuel to be off-loaded following RFO 7, currently scheduled for early in calendar year 2001, will have completed its operating history in the core. With the additional fuel left in the spent fuel pool after RFO 7, MP3 will no longer have the capability to conduct a full core off-load.]] Operating the plant at a reduced power level would not make effective use of available resources, and would cause unnecessary economic hardship on the licensee and its customers. Therefore, reducing the amount of spent fuel generated by increasing burnup further or reducing power is not considered a practical alternative.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 8, 1999, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official, Mr. Denny Galloway of the Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the correction of the environmental assessment for the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated March 19, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. Publically available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, *http: www.nrc.gov* (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of December 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James W. Clifford,

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

[FR Doc. 99–32489 Filed 12–14–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97–415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97–415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from November 20, 1999, through December 3, 1999. The last biweekly notice was published on December 1, 1999 (64 FR 67330).

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be