

to operate within their design requirements. More frequent operation of these systems may lead to a slight increase in solid and liquid production.

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that 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 historic sites. With regard to thermal discharges to the Squaw Creek Reservoir, a small increase in the circulating water discharge temperature is expected due to the proposed 1 percent power uprate. The increase is expected to be approximately .01 degree Fahrenheit, and therefore, insignificant. Existing administrative controls ensure the conduct of adequate monitoring such that appropriate actions can be taken to preclude exceeding National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitted limits. No additional monitoring requirements or other changes relative to the NPDES permit are required as a result of the power uprate.

Therefore, as described in the preceding discussions, the 1 percent uprate of Unit 2 does not have a significant environmental impact on the Squaw Creek Reservoir.

No other nonradiological impacts are associated with the proposed action.

Based upon the above, the Commission concludes that the proposed action 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 CPSES.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 19, 1999, the staff consulted with the Texas State official, Mr. Athur 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 for license amendment December 21, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated April 23 and May 14, 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 University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, Texas.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of August, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Robert A. Gramm,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-20685 Filed 8-10-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Pilot Program Evaluation Panel; Meeting Notice**

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L., 94-463, Stat. 770-776) the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) announced the establishment of the Pilot Program Evaluation Panel (PPEP). The PPEP will function as a management-level Oversight group to monitor and evaluate the success of the Commission's Reactor Oversight Process Improvements program. A Charter governing the PPEP functions as a

Federal Advisory Committee was filed with Congress on June 30, 1999, after consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration. The PPEP will hold its second meeting on August 17, 1999, in the Two White Flint North Auditorium, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The PPEP meeting participants are listed below along with their affiliation:

Frank P. Gillespie—Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mohan C. Thadani—Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
James T. Wiggins—Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Heidi Hahn—LANL  
Bruce Mallet—Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Geoffrey Grant—Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Kenneth E. Brockman—Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
James Lieberman—Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Steve Floyd—Nuclear Energy Institute  
David Garchow—Public Service Electric and Gas  
Masoud Bajestani—Tennessee Valley Authority  
George Barnes—Commonwealth Edison Company  
James Chase—Omaha Public Power District  
Gary Wright—Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety  
David Lochbaum—Union of Concerned Scientists

A tentative agenda of the meeting is outlined as follows:

9:00–9:30 a.m. Introduction and opening remarks

- Noticing requirements
- Public participation

9:30–11:00 a.m. Discuss conduct of panel and rules of operation

- Location of meetings
- Approach to report generation

11:00 a.m.–12:00 n. Staff presentation on initial results of pilot plant inspections

- Final criteria and measurement approach for criteria

12:00 n.–1:00 p.m. Lunch

1:00–2:00 p.m. NEI Presentation—topic to be determined

2:00–3:00 p.m. Panel discussion on need for any additional data or analyses

3:00 p.m. Discussion and public presentations

- Future invited speakers
- Open discussion

4:00 p.m. Meeting Adjourned

Meetings of the PPEP are open to the members of the public. Oral or written

views may be presented by the members of the public, including members of the nuclear industry. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify Mr. Frank P. Gillespie (Telephone 301/415-1004, e-mail FPG@nrc.gov) or Mr. Mohan C. Thadani (Telephone 301/415-1476, e-mail MCT@nrc.gov) five days prior to the meeting date, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras will be permitted during this meeting.

Further information regarding topics of discussion; whether the meeting has been canceled, rescheduled, or relocated; and the Panel Chairman's ruling regarding requests to present oral statements and time allotted, may be obtained by contacting Mr. Frank P. Gillespie or Mr. Mohan C. Thadani between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. EDT.

PPEP meeting transcripts and meeting reports will be available from the Commission's Public Document Room. Transcripts will be placed on the agency's web page when a web site for PPEP is established.

Dated: August 5, 1999.

**Andrew L. Bates,**

*Advisory Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 99-20656 Filed 8-10-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Weeks of August 9, 16, 23, and 30, 1999.

**PLACE:** Commissioner's Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

*Week of August 9*

Thursday, August 12

11:30 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed).

*Week of August 16—Tentative*

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of August 16.

*Week of August—Tentative*

Tuesday, August 24

2:00 p.m. Briefing by Executive Branch (Closed—ex. 1)

3:30 p.m. Briefing on Threat Assessment (Closed—ex. 1)

*Wednesday, August 25*

9:55 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed)

*Week of August 30—Tentative*

Wednesday, September 1

9:25 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed)

2:00 Briefing on PRA Implementation Plan (Public Meeting) (Contact: Tom King, 301-415-5790)

\* The schedule for Commission meeting is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings call (recording)—(301)-415-1292. Contact person for more information: Bill Hill (301) 415-1661.

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm>

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, DC 20555 (301-415-1661). In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the Internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to [wmh@nrc.gov](mailto:wmh@nrc.gov) or [dkw@nrc.gov](mailto:dkw@nrc.gov).

Dated: August 6, 1999.

**William M. Hill, Jr.,**

*SECY, Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-20906 Filed 8-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## 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 July 17, 1999, through July 30, 1999. The last biweekly notice was published on July 28, 1999 (64 FR 40903).

### 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 and Directives Branch, Division of Administration Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-