

### Conclusions

Based on NRC staff's evaluation of the licensee's Cushing site decommissioning plan, NRC staff has determined that the proposed plan complies with NRC's public and occupational dose and effluent limits, and that authorizing the proposed activities by license amendment would not be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. NRC staff concludes that a finding of no significant impact is justified and appropriate, and that an environmental impact statement is not required. In accordance with the requirements of subpart L of 10 CFR part 2, an Opportunity for a Hearing was offered.<sup>2</sup>

### Alternative Use of Resources

The activities leading to the proposed action would result in the irreversible use of energy resources in the conduct of the proposed Cushing site remediation. In addition, a portion of the Envirocare facility will be irreversibly committed for the disposal of Cushing site waste. There is no reasonable alternative to these resource uses, and the proposed action does not involve any unreviewed conflicts concerning use of available resources.

### Agencies and Persons Consulted, and Sources Used

The Environmental Assessment on which the finding of no significant impact is based was prepared by the NRC staff in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Rockville, MD. NRC staff provided a draft of its Environmental Assessment to DEQ for review. DEQ in its letter Dated July 12, 1999, stated that they had no comments.

### Finding of No Significant Impact

Pursuant to 10 CFR part 51, NRC has prepared an environmental assessment related to the issuance of a license amendment to Materials License SNM-1999, authorizing remediation of the Cushing Refinery Site. On the basis of this environmental assessment, NRC has concluded that this licensing action would not have any significant effect on the quality of the human environment and does not warrant the preparation of an environmental impact statement. Accordingly, it has been determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

### Further Information

For further details with respect to this action, the Environmental Assessment

and other documents related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at NRC's Public Document Room at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555-0001.

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

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

**Larry W. Camper,**

*Chief Decommissioning Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 99-21730 Filed 8-20-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278]

#### **PECO Energy Co.; Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3; 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 Nos. DRP-44 and DRP-56, issued to PECO Energy Company (the licensee), for operation of the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Units 2 and 3, located in York County, Pennsylvania.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

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

The proposed action would correct existing editorial and typographical errors in the Technical Specification (TSs). Each proposed change has been verified to meet the intent of what was originally proposed by PECO Energy and approved by the NRC in previously processed amendments to the TSs. These changes are purely administrative and do not impact the operation of the facility. The proposed changes are summarized below.

1. Correct the labels for the Site Boundary and Exclusion Area Boundary on the Unit 2 and Unit 3 TS Figures 4.1-1 by reversing the labels.
2. Correct the note by replacing the word "on" with the word "or" in the Unit 3 TS Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.3.1.2.5.
3. Correct the note above TS SR 3.8.4.1 by replacing "SR 3.8.1.9" with "SR 3.8.4.9" in the Unit 3 TS Section 3.8.4.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated February 12, 1999, as supplemented by letter dated July 8, 1999.

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

When PBAPS Units 2 and 3, were converted to the Standard TSs under Amendments 210 and 214 respectively, Figure 4.1-1 of the TSs incorrectly reversed the depiction of the Site Boundary and the Exclusion Area Boundary. This mistake occurred during the licensee's conversion of the old TS Figure 3.8.1, "Gaseous and Liquid Effluent Release Points," to the new TS Figure 4.1-1, "Site and Exclusion Area Boundaries." To correct this error, the proposed TS Amendment is required to reflect that there is no change in the Exclusion Area or Site Boundaries and to correctly show that the Site Boundary resides outside of the Exclusion Area and outlines the area owned by the licensee related to PBAPS Units 2 and 3.

In PBAPS Unit 3 TS Surveillance Requirement SR 3.3.1.2.5, there is a note that reads, "Not required to be performed until 12 hours after WRNMs indicate 125E-5% power on below." There is a typographical error in the note in that the note should read "\* \* \* power or below."

In TS SR 3.8.4.1, there is a note that reads, "SR through SR 3.8.4.8 are applicable only to the Unit 3 DC electrical power subsystems. SR 3.8.1.9 is applicable only to the Unit 2 DC electrical power subsystems." There is a typographical error in that SR 3.8.1.9 should read SR 3.8.4.9 which is being corrected by the licensee's amendment application.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the modifications to the Technical Specifications are administrative in nature.

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 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 that there are no significant

<sup>2</sup> 60FR 46318 (September 6, 1995).

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 Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 14, 1999, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. David Ney of the 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 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 February 12, 1999, as supplemented by letter dated July 8, 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 Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (Regional Depository) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17150.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 12th day of August 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Bartholomew C. Buckley, Sr.,**

*Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-21731 Filed 8-20-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Laboratory Testing of Nuclear-Grade Activated Charcoal (ERRATA); Issue**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of issuance.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued the errata for a typographical error that was found in Generic Letter (GL) 99-02. GL 99-02 addresses the laboratory testing of nuclear-grade activated charcoal that is used in the safety-related air-cleaning units of engineered safety feature ventilation systems of nuclear power plants to reduce the potential onsite and offsite consequences of a radiological accident by adsorbing iodine.

The typographical error makes the sentence in which it appears technically incorrect. This sentence appears in two places, namely, in Requested Actions 2 and 3, on page 7 of the generic letter. The affected sentence reads "If the system has a face velocity greater than 10 percent of 0.203 m/s (40 ft/min), then the revised TS [technical specification] should specify the face velocity." This sentence should read "If the system has a face velocity greater than 110 percent of 0.203 m/s (40 ft/min), then the revised TS should specify the face velocity."

**DATES:** The errata was issued on August 23, 1999.

**ADDRESSEES:** Not applicable.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John P. Segala, at 301-415-1858.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The errata is available in the NRC Public Document Room under accession number 9908060152.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Scott F. Newberry,**

*Deputy Director, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-21797 Filed 8-20-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Draft Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability**

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued for public comment a proposed revision of a guide in its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information

as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the NRC's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

The draft guide, temporarily identified by its task number, DG-1080 (which should be mentioned in all correspondence concerning this draft guide), is a proposed Revision 3 of Regulatory Guide 1.149 and is titled "Nuclear Power Plant Simulation Facilities for Use in Operator Training and License Examinations." This proposed revision is being developed to update the NRC's guidance on the certification of a simulation facility consisting solely of a plant-referenced simulator.

The draft guide has not received complete staff approval and does not represent an official NRC staff position.

Comments may be accompanied by relevant information or supporting data. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Comments will be most helpful if received by October 20, 1999.

You may also provide comments via the NRC's interactive rulemaking website through the NRC home page (<http://www.nrc.gov>). This site provides the availability to upload comments as files (any format), if your web browser supports that function. For information about the interactive rulemaking website, contact Ms. Carol Gallagher, (301) 415-5905; e-mail [CAG@nrc.gov](mailto:CAG@nrc.gov). For information about the draft guide and the related documents, contact Mr. F. Collins, (301) 415-3173; e-mail [JFC1@NRC.GOV](mailto:JFC1@NRC.GOV).

Although a time limit is given for comments on this draft guide, comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Requests for single copies of draft or final guides (which may be reproduced) or for placement on an automatic distribution list for single copies of future draft guides in specific divisions should be made in writing to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Reproduction and