

IN 990027 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 Michigan
 MI990001 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990002 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990003 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990004 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990005 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990007 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990012 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990017 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990030 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990031 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990046 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990047 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990060 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990062 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 MI990063 (Mar. 12, 1999)

Volume V

Iowa
 IA990005 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990006 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990007 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990010 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990013 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990016 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990019 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990024 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990025 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990029 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990032 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990038 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990067 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990070 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990072 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990079 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 IA990080 (Mar. 12, 1999)

Nebraska
 NE990003 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 NE990009 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 NE990011 (Mar. 12, 1999)

Texas
 TX990009 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 TX990018 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 TX990100 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 TX990144 (Mar. 12, 1999)

Volume VI

None

Volume VII

California
 CA990002 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990004 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990009 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990029 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990030 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990031 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990032 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990033 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990034 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990035 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990036 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990037 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990038 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990039 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990040 (Mar. 12, 1999)
 CA990041 (Mar. 12, 1999)

General Wage Determination Publication

General wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts, including those noted above, may be found in the Government Printing Office (GPO) document entitled "General Wage

Determinations Issued Under The Davis-Bacon and Related Acts." This publication is available at each of the 50 Regional Government Depository Libraries and many of the 1,400 Government Depository Libraries across the country.

The general wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts are available electronically by subscription to the FedWorld Bulletin Board System of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) of the U.S. Department of Commerce at 1-800-363-2068

Hard-copy subscriptions may be purchased from: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, (202) 512-1800.

When ordering hard-copy subscription(s), be sure to specify the State(s) of interest, since subscriptions may be ordered for any or all of the seven separate volumes, arranged by State. Subscriptions include an annual edition (issued in January or February) which includes all current general wage determinations for the States covered by each volume. Throughout the remainder of the year, regular weekly updates are distributed to subscribers.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 7th day of October 1999.

Carl J. Poleskey,
Chief, Branch of Construction Wage Determinations.

[FR Doc. 99-26769 Filed 10-14-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-27-M

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

National Endowment for the Arts

Leadership Initiatives Advisory Panel

Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Leadership Initiatives Advisory Panel (Literature Section) to the National Council on the Arts will be held on October 25, 1999. The panel will meet from 11:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. via teleconference from room 704 at the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20506.

This meeting is for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendations on financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including information given in confidence to the agency. In accordance with the determination of the chairman

of May 12, 1999, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsection (c)(4), (6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Kathy Plowitz-Worden, Panel Coordinator, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C. 20506, or call (202) 682-5691.

Dated: October 12, 1999.

Kathy Plowitz-Worden,
Panel Coordinator, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 99-27093 Filed 10-14-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-247]

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.; Facility Operating License No. DPR 26; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by petition dated September 15, 1999, Mr. David A. Lochbaum, on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists (Petitioner), has requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take action with regard to the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, owned and operated by the Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. The Petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action to modify or suspend the operating license for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, operated by the Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (the licensee), to prevent the reactor from resuming operation until the five issues identified in the attachment to the Petition have been fully resolved. As an acceptable alternative in lieu of a suspension or modification of the license, the Petitioner requested that the NRC issue a confirmatory action letter or an order requiring these issues to be fully resolved before unit restart. The five issues that were raised in the Petition are (1) the apparent violation of station battery design and licensing bases, (2) the apparent failure to adequately correct circuit breaker problems, (3) the apparent unreliability of emergency diesel generators, (4) the potentially unjustified license amendment for undervoltage and degraded voltage relay surveillance intervals, and (5) the apparent errors and nonconservatisms in individual plant examinations (IPEs). Along with

the last issue, the Petitioner stated that the event on August 31, 1999, at Indian Point Unit 2 revealed potential problems with the plant-specific risk assessment developed by the licensee and now used to establish priorities for maintenance and inspections. Additionally, the Petitioner requested that a public hearing on this Petition be conducted in the vicinity of the plant before its restart is authorized by the NRC. In a transcribed telephone conversation between the Petitioner and the members of the NRC's Petition Review Board on September 22, 1999, the Petitioner clarified two of the issues in the Petition. First, the Petitioner stated that because of an apparent failure to accomplish the commitment in the NRC's safety evaluation for the license amendment mentioned in the Petition, the Petitioner was concerned that past licensing commitments may not have been implemented. Second, the Petitioner questioned whether the amount of time the licensee took to perform certain actions during the August 31 event was consistent with the times expected if a station blackout (SBO) had occurred since many of the procedures and processes in response to an SBO event were used.

As the basis for this request, the Petitioner states that the issues, if valid, have clear and direct safety implications because they involve equipment explicitly required to function to mitigate accidents. With regard to your IPE issue, the Petitioner states that, if valid, it has indirect safety implications because it involves information used by the plant's owner to schedule maintenance and inspections on equipment implicitly required to function to mitigate an accident. The Petitioner also stated that the specific problems revealed by the August 31 event were caused by systematic process breakdowns, including inadequate procedures, inadequate training, and plant configuration errors, and that the licensee's plan does not contain sufficient activities that provide reasonable assurance that problems in other safety systems are identified and corrected.

The request is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The request has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. As provided by Section 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on this Petition within a reasonable time.

By letter dated October 8, 1999, the Director denied the Petitioner's request for immediate action at Indian Point Unit 2.

A copy of the petition is available for 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 White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10610.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of October 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-26942 Filed 10-14-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 72-16]

Virginia Electric and Power Company; Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Regarding the Proposed Amendment To Revise Technical Specifications of License No. SNM-2507

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment, pursuant to 10 CFR 72.56, to the Special Nuclear Material License No. 2507 (SNM-2507) held by Virginia Electric and Power Company (Virginia Power) for the North Anna independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI). The requested amendment would revise the Technical Specifications of SNM-2507 to specifically permit the storage of burnable poison rod assemblies (BPRA) and thimble plug devices (TPD) within the TN-32 casks used at the North Anna ISFSI.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

By letter dated April 5, 1999, as supplemented by letter dated August 27, 1999, Virginia Power requested an amendment to revise the Technical Specifications of SNM-2507 for the North Anna ISFSI. The changes to the Technical Specifications would specifically permit the storage of BPRAs and/or TPDs within the TN-32 dry storage casks used at the North Anna ISFSI.

Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action will eliminate the need to physically remove BPRAs and TPDs from irradiated fuel assemblies prior to dry cask storage which would result in one consolidated source of radioactive material and

reduce exposure time to plant workers during loadings.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that granting the request for amendment to specifically allow the storage of BPRAs and TPDs within the TN-32 casks used at the North Anna ISFSI 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. With regard to radiological impacts, the addition of irradiated BPRAs and TPDs only affects the gamma source term of the cask. In the previous shielding analysis, the calculated cask surface dose rate from the design basis contents was increased by an expansion factor before calculating the estimated offsite dose to allow for future increases in fuel burnup and enrichment and possible variations in cask design. For this amendment, the Virginia Power's calculated increase in surface dose rate resulting from the added BPRAs and TPDs remains within the bounds of the previous analysis with the expansion factor and, consequently, results in no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

The amendment only affects the requirements associated with the contents of the casks and does not affect non-radiological plant effluents or any other aspects of the environment. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological 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

The alternative to the proposed action would be to deny the request for amendment (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the proposed action would result in the need to physically remove BPRAs and TPDs from each fuel assembly possessing them prior to the loading of that assembly into dry cask storage. Physical removal of irradiated BPRAs and TPDs would increase the exposure time and dose to the plant workers. In addition, it would require disposal or storage of additional radioactive material (i.e., BPRAs and TPDs) that would otherwise be safely stored if the BPRAs and TPDs are left intact with their irradiated fuel assembly and loaded into dry cask