

to safely operate the plant throughout the extension period via continuation of the current satisfactory licensed operator requalification program. In meeting the requirement for the administration of an annual operating test, the current plant refueling outage could be prolonged without a net benefit to safety, and would otherwise have a detrimental effect on the public interest.

IV

The Commission has determined that pursuant to 10 CFR 55.11, granting an exemption to the Washington Public Power Supply System from the requirements in 10 CFR 55.59(a)(2) is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property and is otherwise in the public interest.

Therefore, the Commission hereby grants Washington Public Power Supply System an exemption on a one-time only basis from the scheduler requirements of 10 CFR 55.59(a)(2), to allow the Washington Public Power Supply System Nuclear Project 2 current annual operating examination to be extended until February 12, 2000.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has also determined that the issuance of the exemption will have no significant impact on the environment. An Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact was noticed in the **Federal Register** on July 9, 1999 (64 FR 37173).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bruce A. Boger,

Director, Division of Inspection Program Management Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-18635 Filed 7-20-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50-456, STN 50-457, STN 50-454, STN 50-455, 50-237, 50-249, 50-373, 50-374, 50-254 and 50-265]

Commonwealth Edison Company: Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Dresden Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, LaSalle County Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Quad Cities Station, Unit Nos. 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 certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-72, NPF-77, NPF-37, NPF-66, DPR-19, DPR-25, NPF-11, NPF-18, DPR-29 and DPR-30 issued to the Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee), for operation of Braidwood Station, located in Will County, Illinois; Byron Station located in Ogle County, Illinois; Dresden Station located in Grundy County, Illinois; LaSalle County Station located in LaSalle County, Illinois; and Quad Cities Station located in Rock Island County, Illinois, respectively.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed actions would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) regarding submission of revisions to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). Under the proposed exemptions, the licensee would submit updates to the UFSARs within 24 calendar months of the previous UFSAR revision submittal. Braidwood and Byron share a common FSAR and the Dresden, Quad Cities, and LaSalle Stations maintain their own FSARs that are common to both units at each station.

The proposed actions are in accordance with the licensee's application dated May 4, 1993.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The *Code of Federal Regulations*, 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4), requires licensees to submit updates to their FSARs annually or within 6 months after each refueling outage provided that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months. Since the units for each station, and the Braidwood and Byron stations, share a common FSAR, the licensee must update the same document annually or within 6 months after a refueling outage for each unit. The underlying purpose of the rule was to relieve licensees of the burden of filing annual FSAR revisions while assuring that such revisions are made at least every 24 months. The Commission reduced the burden, in part, by permitting a licensee to submit its FSAR revisions 6 months after refueling outages for its facility, but did not provide for multiple unit facilities sharing a common FSAR in the rule. Rather, the Commission stated: "with respect to the concern about multiple facilities sharing a common FSAR, licensees will have maximum flexibility for scheduling updates on a case-by-case basis" (57 FR 39355) (1992). Allowing the exemption would maintain the

updated FSAR current within 24 months of the last revision.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed actions and concludes that they involve administrative activities unrelated to plant operation.

The proposed actions 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 actions.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed actions do not involve any historic sites. They do not affect non-radiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed actions.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with these actions.

Alternative to the Proposed Actions

As an alternative to the proposed actions, the staff considered denial of the proposed actions (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the exemptions would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed actions and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

These actions do not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements for Braidwood, Byron, Dresden, LaSalle, or Quad Cities.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 14, 1999, the staff consulted with the Illinois official, Mr. Frank Nizeolik of the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed actions. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed actions 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated May 4, 1993, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington DC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of July, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jon B. Hopkins,

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

[FR Doc. 99-18634 Filed 7-20-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-320]

GPU Nuclear, Inc. Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 50 for Facility Operating License No. DPR-73, issued to GPU Nuclear, Inc. (GPUN or the licensee), for operation of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (TMI-2), located in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would reduce the amount of onsite property insurance as required by 10 CFR 50.54(w), based on the permanently shutdown status of TMI-2 and that the plant is in a safe, inherently stable condition suitable for long-term management and any threat to the health and safety of the public has been eliminated. The requested action would allow GPUN to reduce onsite insurance coverage from \$1.6 billion to \$50 million.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated March 9, 1999.

Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed because the licensee's required insurance coverage significantly exceeds the potential cost consequences of radiological incidents possible at a permanently shutdown and defueled reactor with over 99 percent of the fuel removed.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the issuance of the proposed exemption is an administrative action and will not have any environmental impact. TMI-2 permanently ceased operations following the March 28, 1979, accident. The licensee maintains the facility in a safe, stable configuration to comply with the facility operating license and the Commission's rules and regulations.

No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluents that may be released offsite. There is no increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that 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

The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request thereby requiring the licensee to maintain insurance coverage required of an operating plant (i.e., the "no action" alternative); such an action would not enhance the protection of the environment. 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 Programmatic Final Environmental Statement Related to Decontamination and Disposal of Radioactive Wastes Resulting from the March 28, 1979, Accident—Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Supplement No. 3, issued in August 1989.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 3, 1999, the NRC staff consulted with Pennsylvania State official, Stan Miangi of the Pennsylvania Department

of Environmental Protection 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 impact 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 March 9, 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 Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of July, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Suzanne C. Black,

Deputy Director, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-18633 Filed 7-20-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311]

Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75, issued to the Public Service Electric and Gas Company (the licensee), for operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated February 2, 1999, as supplemented on April 26, 1999, for proposed amendments to the Technical Specifications (TS) to change the maximum unirradiated fuel assembly enrichment value for new fuel storage from 4.5 to 5.0 weight percent Uranium-