

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 BVPS-1.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 25, 1999, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. M. Murphy of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Bureau, Division of Nuclear Safety, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### **Findings 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 January 17, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated February 10, 1998, November 9, 1998, February 8, 1999, and February 26, 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 B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 15001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of April 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Daniel S. Collins,**

*Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-9749 Filed 4-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-289]

### **GPU Nuclear, Inc., Et Al.; Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix R for Facility Operating License No. DPR-50 issued to GPU Nuclear, Inc., *et al.*, (GPU or the licensee), for operation of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1), located in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

Section III.G.2.c of Appendix R to 10 CFR part 50 requires the enclosure of cable and equipment and associated non-safety circuits of one redundant train of systems necessary to achieve and maintain safe shutdown in a fire barrier having a 1-hour rating. In addition, fire detectors and an automatic fire suppression system shall be installed in the fire area. The licensee is seeking an exemption from these requirements for 10 fire areas/zones: AB-FZ-3, AB-FZ-4, AB-FZ-5, AB-FZ-7, CB-FA-1, FH-FZ-1, FH-FZ-2, FH-FZ-6, ISPH-FZ-1 and ISPH-FZ-2.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated December 31, 1996, as supplemented September 8 and December 30, 1997; May 21, October 14, November 25, and December 23, 1998.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The licensee is requesting an exemption from Appendix R, Section III.G.2.c because modifications to achieve full compliance would cost approximately \$1.0 million. The proposed action is needed to reduce the financial hardship of modifying existing barriers to achieve a 1-hour fire rating, which modification would provide minimal safety benefit according to the licensee.

##### *Environment Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that reasonable assurance has been provided in fire zones/areas AB-FZ-4, CB-FA-1, FH-FZ-1, FH-FZ-6, IPSH-FZ-1, and ISPH-FZ-2, that one division of components necessary to achieve safe shutdown will remain free

of fire damage. Although the installed Thermo-Lag barriers in these fire zones/areas have less than a 1-hour fire endurance rating, they do have some significant resistance to fire. Additionally, the areas where most of the subject barriers are located have a low combustible loading, have manual suppression capability and are equipped with automatic detection and suppression. The licensee has committed to install automatic suppression in fire zone FH-FZ-6. Additionally, the licensee has committed to install combustible gas detectors in fire area CB-FA-1, which would provide prompt identification of an acetylene gas leak and allow isolation of the gas at its source prior to reaching the explosive limit. The staff has determined that the combination of these features and circumstances provides a level of protection adequate to meet the underlying purpose of the rule. The Commission has determined that the exemption for fire zones AB-FZ-3, AB-FZ-5, AB-FZ-7, and FH-FZ-2 should be denied because an adequate level of fire safety would not be achieved.

The proposed action (hereinafter to mean the granting of an exemption for fire zones/areas AB-FZ-4, CB-FA-1, FH-FZ-1, FH-FZ-6, ISPH-FZ-1, and ISPH-FZ-2) 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 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 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 Three Mile Island Nuclear Station.

### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 13, 1999, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. Stan J. Maingi, of the Bureau of Radiation Protection, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, 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 letter dated December 31, 1996, as supplemented September 8 and December 30, 1997; May 21, October 14, November 25, and December 23, 1998, 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 LAW/Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (Regional Depository) Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, P.O. Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of April 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. 99-9747 Filed 4-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Planning and Procedures; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Planning and Procedures will hold a meeting on May 5, 1999, Room T-2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of

a portion that may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (2) and (6) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of ACRS, and information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, May 5, 1999—10:00 a.m. until the conclusion of business.

The Subcommittee will discuss proposed ACRS activities and related matters. It may also discuss the status of appointment of a new member to the ACRS. 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 person named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions open to the public, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, 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 person, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone: 301/415-7360) 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 changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: April 12, 1999.

#### Richard P. Savio,

*Associate Director for Technical Support, ACRS/ACNW.*

[FR Doc. 99-9750 Filed 4-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Safety Research Program; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Safety Research Program will hold a meeting on May 4, 1999, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

#### Tuesday, May 4, 1999—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will review various elements of the NRC Safety Research Program and gather information for use in preparing report to the Commission on the NRC Safety 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.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, 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, Dr. Medhat El-Zeftawy (telephone 301/415-6889) 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 in the proposed agenda, etc., that may have occurred.