

that have been satisfied or that are obsolete. No actual plant equipment, regulatory requirements, operating practices, or analyses are affected by these proposed amendments.

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 amendments are approved. No changes will be made to the design and licensing bases, and applicable procedures at Vogtle Units 1 and 2 will remain the same. Other than the recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or requirements, no other changes will be made to the FOLs, including the Technical Specifications.

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 historical 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 Statement for the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 17, 1999, the staff consulted with the Georgia State official, Mr. J. Setzer of the Department of Natural 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 October 15, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated November 11, 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 Burke County Library, 412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of March 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herbert N. Berkow,

Director, Project Directorate II-2, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-7028 Filed 3-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-482]

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (Wolf Creek Generating Station); Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-42, issued to Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Wolf Creek Generating Station located in Coffey County, Kansas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 4.7.3b, "Plant Systems—Component Cooling Water System—Surveillance Requirements," by deleting the requirement to perform the specified surveillances during shutdown. A change to the applicable Bases would also be included.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated May 15, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated June 30,

August 5, August 28, September 24, October 16, October 23, November 24, December 2, December 17, and December 21, 1998, and January 15, 1999.

Need for the Proposed Action

By letter dated May 15, 1997, Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (the licensee) proposed a conversion of the current TSs for Wolf Creek to the Improved Technical Specifications (ITSs). When the TS-required 18-month testing (during shutdown) of the component cooling water system (CCWS) was last conducted, a portion of the required testing was not completed for one pump in each train of the CCWS. The proposed action, an amendment to modify the TSs to allow testing during power operations, would avert a plant shutdown to complete this testing.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

With regard to potential radiological impacts to the general public, the amendment under consideration involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR part 20. It does not affect the potential for radiological accidents and does not affect radiological plant effluents. No safety limits will be changed or setpoints altered as a result of the TS revision. 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 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. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and would have 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.

Alternative 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 Operation of Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit No. 1" dated June 1982.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 8, 1999, the staff consulted with the Kansas State official, Mr. Vick Cooper, of the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, 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 amendment dated May 15, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated June 30, August 5, August 28, September 24, October 16, October 23, November 24, December 2, December 17, and December 21, 1998, and January 15, 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 rooms located at Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801, and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of March 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Kristine M. Thomas,

Project Management, Project Directorate IV-2, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-7031 Filed 3-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Workshop To Provide Information on the Pilot Plant Performance Indicators

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) will hold a public

workshop to provide information to selected NRC inspectors and licensee staff of the Reactor Oversight Process Pilot Program. This meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The workshop will be held from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. April 12 through April 15, 1999. The first two hours of the workshop on April 12 will be dedicated to check-in procedures.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held at the Holiday Inn, 1250 Roosevelt road, Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: August Spector at 301-415-2140 or Lee Miller at 423-855-6510, Mail Stop: O-5H4, Inspection Program Branch, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 8, 1999, the staff issued SECY-99-007, forwarding the staff's recommendations for a new reactor oversight process. On January 20, 1999, the staff briefed the Commission on the staff's proposal described in SECY-99-007. The following issues represent a brief summary of the concepts presented in SECY-99-007.

Over the last 10 years, commercial nuclear power plants have been operated safely and overall plant performance has improved. This improvement in plant performance can be attributed, in part, to successful regulatory oversight. Despite this success, the agency has noted that the current reactor oversight process (1) is at times not clearly focused on the most safety important issues, (2) consists of redundant actions and outputs, and (3) is frequently subjective, with NRC action taken in a manner that is at times neither scrutable nor predictable.

In the new regulatory oversight process:

- There will be a risk-informed baseline inspection program that establishes the minimum direct inspection effort for all licensees.
- Thresholds will be established for licensee safety performance, below which increased NRC interaction would be warranted.
- Adequate assurance of licensee performance will require assessment of both performance indicators (PIs) and inspection findings.
- Both PIs and inspection findings will be evaluated against risk-informed thresholds, where feasible.
- Crossing a PI threshold and an inspection threshold will have the same meaning with respect to safety significance and required NRC interaction.

- The baseline inspection program will cover those risk-significant attributes of licensee performance not adequately covered by PIs.

- The baseline inspection program will also verify the accuracy of PI data collection and analysis and provide for event response, as appropriate.

- Enforcement actions will be focused on issues that are risk significant.

- Guidelines will be established for identifying and responding to unacceptable licensee performance.

Additionally, the staff will pilot the new reactor oversight process during a 6-month period beginning in June 1999. The purpose of the pilot program is to exercise the new processes (PI reporting, inspection, assessment, and enforcement), to identify process and procedure problems and make appropriate changes and, to the maximum extent possible, evaluate the effectiveness of the new process. Full implementation of the new oversight process will commence pending successful completion of the pilot program, as measured against pre-established success criteria. A notable feature of the pilot program is the use of the Pilot Program Evaluation Panel, consisting of NRC, NEI, industry, public, and State representatives, to aid in evaluating the effectiveness of the pilot program. This workshop will focus on the pilot plant participants and specifically address performance indicator reporting requirements.

Scope of the Public Workshops

The NRC will hold a four day workshop from April 12-15, 1999 to provide information on the new performance indicator reporting requirements to selected NRC inspectors and licensee staff participating in the Reactor Oversight Process Pilot Program. In order to meet the objectives of the workshop, active participants will be limited to 48 NRC and licensee personnel who will be participating in the pilot program. Other interested parties may observe, up to a total of 150 additional individuals. NRC and licensee staff may choose to rotate cognizant individuals into the active participant ranks as applicable. 18 slots will be reserved for the nine pilot plants, 25 for the regional offices, and five seats reserved for NRC Headquarters and Regional Senior Reactor Analysts. The pilot plants are: Hope Creek, Salem Units 1 and 2, Fitzpatrick, Prairie Island Units 1 and 2, Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Shearon Harris, Sequoyah Units 1 And 2, Ft. Calhoun, and Cooper.

The agenda for the workshop will consist of the following: