

proposed amendment will be in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations, and all applicable requirements have been satisfied. The foregoing findings are supported by a safety evaluation dated August 3, 1999.

III

Accordingly, pursuant to Sections 161b, 161i, and 184 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 2201(b), 2201(i), and 2234; and 10 CFR 50.80, *it is hereby ordered* that the license transfer referenced above is approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. For purposes of ensuring public health and safety, Little Bay shall provide decommissioning funding assurance of no less than \$11.8 million, after payment of any taxes, in the Seabrook Decommissioning Trust Fund maintained and administered by the State of New Hampshire under its applicable law upon the transfer of Montaup's interest in Seabrook to Little Bay.

2. After they have received all required regulatory approvals of the transfer, Montaup and Little Bay shall inform the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, in writing of the date of the closing of the transfer no later than two business days prior to the date of closing. Should the transfer not be completed by August 1, 2000, this Order shall become null and void, provided, however, on application and for good cause shown, such date may be extended.

It is further ordered that, consistent with 10 CFR 2.1315(b), a license amendment that makes changes to conform the license to reflect the subject license transfer is approved. Such amendment shall be issued and made effective at the time the proposed license transfer is completed.

This Order is effective upon issuance.

For further details with respect to this Order, see the application dated September 29, 1998, and supplements dated March 8, 1999, and April 7, 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 Exeter Public Library, Founders Park, Exeter, NH 03833.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3d day of August, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-20400 Filed 8-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Valley Authority

[Docket No. 50-259]

Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

Introduction

The US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, or the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption to Facility Operating License No. DPR-33, issued to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) for operation of the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN) Unit 1, located in Limestone County, Alabama.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is in response to TVA's application dated February 4, 1999, for a temporary exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.65 (Maintenance Rule). Specifically, this action would exempt TVA from the explicit scoping requirements of 10 CFR 50.65(b), and instead it would allow TVA to consider the defueled and long-term layup status of BFN Unit 1 when establishing the scope of TVA's Maintenance Rule Program. Structures, systems, and components (SSCs) that perform a required function for Unit 1 in its present defueled status or that directly support the operation of Unit 2 or Unit 3 would be included in the scope of the BFN Maintenance Rule Program, but Unit 1 systems and components not required to be operational would not be required to be included in the Maintenance Rule Program.

The Need for the Proposed Action

10 CFR 50.65(a)(1) requires, in part, that, power reactor licensees shall monitor the performance or condition of SSCs against licensee-established goals to provide reasonable assurance that the SSCs, defined in 10 CFR 50.65(b), are capable of fulfilling their intended functions.

TVA requested the exemption to resolve a 10 CFR 50.65 compliance issue that was identified during an NRC inspection at the facility (cf., NRC combined Inspection Reports 50-259/97-04; 50-260/97-04; and 50-296/97-04, (IR 97-04) dated May 21, 1997). The issue relates to the acceptability of TVA's approach to addressing the SSCs required to be within the scope of the regulation as specified in 10 CFR 50.65(b). As a result of the inspection

finding, the NRC informed TVA by letter dated July 30, 1997, that the scope of the BFN maintenance rule program for Unit 1 was not consistent with the requirements 10 CFR 50.65, and identified three options available to TVA to resolve the issue. One of the options identified was for TVA to request an exemption from the requirements of the rule that are not currently being met.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluent that may be released off site. There is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission concludes that granting the proposed exemption would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed exemption does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. The Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (no alternative action). Denial of the exemption would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed exemption and this alternative are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement dated September 1, 1972 for BFN Units 1, 2 and 3.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 23, 1999, the NRC staff consulted with the Alabama State official, Mr. David Walter of the State Office of Radiation Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. Mr. Walter had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon 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 this action, see the application for exemption dated February 4, 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 Athens Public Library, 405 E. South Street, Athens, Alabama.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William O. Long,

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

[FR Doc. 99-20399 Filed 8-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Texas Utilities Electric Company

[Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446]

Comanche Peak Steam Electric 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 license amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89, issued to Texas Utilities Electric Company (TU Electric, or the licensee), for operation of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Units 1 and 2, located in Somervell County, Texas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would change the licenses to reflect the change of the name of the CPSES licensee from "Texas Utilities Electric Company."

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to accurately reflect the legal name of the licensee. The CPSES licensee has already changed its name for business purposes.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action is solely administrative in nature and 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 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 Statement for CPSES, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 24, 1999, the staff consulted with the Texas State official, Arthur C. Tate, of the Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation 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 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 dated May 14, 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 University of Texas at Arlington Library,

702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, Texas.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of August, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert A. Gramm,

Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate IV and Decommissioning Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-20398 Filed 8-6-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NUREG-1600, Rev. 1]

Interim Enforcement Policy for Use During the NRC Power Reactor Oversight Process Pilot Plant Study

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Policy statement: Amendment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is amending its "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions," NUREG-1600, Rev. 1, by adding Appendix F. This amendment revises the treatment of violations of 10 CFR Part 50 and associated license conditions during the pilot plant study of the new NRC power reactor oversight process. The Commission is applying this new oversight process to the nine reactor sites that are part of a pilot plant study scheduled to begin in June 1999.

DATES: This amendment becomes effective on (the implementation date of the pilot plant study). Comments on this amendment should be submitted by September 8, 1999 and will be considered by the NRC as it evaluates lessons learned from the pilot plant study.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to: David L. Meyer, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: T6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Hand deliver comments to: 11545 Rockville, Maryland, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., Federal workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: R. William Borchardt, Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, (301) 415-2741.