

the Keowee Emergency Power and Engineered Safeguards Functional Test is planned.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46(b) to allow the licensee to perform the Keowee Emergency Power and Engineered Safeguards Functional Test to increase the reliability of the emergency electrical power system is appropriate.

The planned test will be performed with Unit 3 at cold shutdown and its engineered safeguards (ES) loads on the Standby Bus. The other two Oconee units will be operating and should not be affected by the test. However, in the unlikely event that a real LOCA/LOOP were to occur on either of the operating units during the simulated LOCA/LOOP on Unit 3 (probability, according to the licensee, of approximately 2E-9), the Oconee emergency power system (EPS) for Oconee Units 1, 2, and 3 could be in a condition outside its design bases. The EPS may not be capable of handling the electrical loading of two instantaneous LOCA/LOOP events without some safety-related equipment being adversely affected. However, the EPS would be able to handle the electrical loading if the two events are offset in time by approximately 10 seconds to allow the first unit's load to reach a steady-state condition prior to starting of the second unit's emergency loads. Therefore, this 10-second window of vulnerability causes an infinitesimally small, but non-zero, increase in the probability of a malfunction of equipment important to safety and the potential consequences of a LOCA/LOOP event during the performance of the test.

The exemption will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological environmental impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impacts. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant

nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (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 resources not previously considered in the "Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3," dated March 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 4, 1998, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Virgil R. Autry of the Division of Radioactive Waste Management, Bureau of Land and Waste Management, Department of Health and Environmental Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on 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 letters dated October 21 and September 17, 1998, 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 Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th of November 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herbert N. Berkow,

Director, Project Directorate II-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-30560 Filed 11-13-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-458]

Entergy Operations, Incorporated, River Bend Station, Unit 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License No. NPF-47, issued to Entergy Operations, Incorporated¹ (the Licensee), the holder of Facility Operating License No. NPF-47, which authorizes operation of the River Bend Station, Unit 1 (RBS) (the facility) located approximately 2 miles east of the Mississippi River in West Feliciana, Parish, Louisiana, approximately 2.7 miles southeast of St. Francisville, Louisiana and approximately 18 miles northwest of the city limits of Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's amended application for exemption dated May 15, 1997, as supplemented August 12, 1998, which requests an exemption from the criticality accident monitoring requirements of 10 CFR 70.24(a) specifically for areas containing incore detectors (which are not in use) and unirradiated fuel while it is handled, used, or stored. 10 CFR 70.24 requires in each area in which special nuclear material is handled, used, or stored a monitoring system that will energize clear audible alarms if accidental criticality occurs. RBS does not currently maintain instrumentation which provides criticality accident monitoring; however, the licensee does maintain gamma-sensitive radiation detection instrumentation which will energize clearly audible alarm signals if accidental criticality occurs.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of 10 CFR 70.24 is to ensure that if a criticality were to occur during the handling of special nuclear material, personnel would be alerted to that fact and would take appropriate action. At a commercial nuclear power plant, the inadvertent criticality with which 10 CFR 70.24 is concerned could

¹ Entergy Operations, Incorporated is authorized to act as agent for Entergy Gulf States, Inc. and has exclusive responsibility and control over the physical construction, operation and maintenance of the facility.

occur during fuel handling operations. The special nuclear material that could be assembled into a critical mass at a commercial nuclear power plant is in the form of nuclear fuel; the quantity of other forms of special nuclear material that is stored onsite in any given location is small enough to preclude achieving a critical mass. Because the fuel is not enriched beyond 5.0 weight percent uranium-235, and because commercial nuclear plant licensees have procedures and features that are designed to prevent inadvertent criticality, the staff has determined that it is unlikely that an inadvertent criticality could occur due to the handling of special nuclear material at a commercial power reactor. Therefore, the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24 are not necessary to ensure the safety of personnel during the handling of special nuclear materials at commercial power reactors.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that inadvertent or accidental criticality will be precluded through compliance with the RBS TSs, the design of the fuel storage racks providing geometric spacing of fuel assemblies in their storage locations, and administrative controls imposed on fuel handling procedures.

The proposed exemption would not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of accidents, affect radiological plant effluents, or result in a change in occupational or offsite dose. Therefore, there are no radiological impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

The proposed exemption would not result in a change in nonradiological effluents and will have no other nonradiological environmental impact.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed exemption, the staff considered denial of the requested exemption. Denial of the request 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 related to the operation of RBS, NUREG-1073, dated January 1985.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 21, 1998, the staff consulted with the Louisiana State Official, Dr. Stan Shaw, of the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Radiation Protection Division, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official 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 the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated August 12, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room located at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of November 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John N. Hannon,

Director, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-30561 Filed 11-13-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Privacy Act; Systems of Records

AGENCY: Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

ACTION: Annual Notice of Systems of Records.

SUMMARY: Each Federal agency is required by the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, to publish annually a description of the systems of records it maintains containing personal information. In this notice the Board provides the required information on two systems of records.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Carroll, Deputy Director, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, 2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300, Arlington, VA 22201, (703) 235-4473.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board currently maintains two systems of records under the Privacy Act. Each system is described below.

NWTRB-1

SYSTEM NAME:

Administrative and Travel Files.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:

Unclassified.

SYSTEM LOCATION:

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, 2300 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1300, Arlington, VA 22201.

CATEGORIES OF INDIVIDUALS COVERED BY THE SYSTEM:

Employees and applicants for employment with the Board, including NWTRB contractors and consultants.

CATEGORIES OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

Records containing the following information:

- (1) Time and attendance;
- (2) Payroll actions and deduction information requests;
- (3) Authorizations for overtime and night differential;
- (4) Credit cards and telephone calling cards issued to individuals;
- (5) Destination, itinerary, mode and purpose of travel;
- (6) Date(s) of travel and all expenses;
- (7) Passport number;
- (8) Request for advance of funds and voucher with receipts;
- (9) Travel authorizations;
- (10) Name, address, social security number, and birth date; and,
- (11) Employee public transit subsidy applications and vouchers.

AUTHORITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM:

Pub. L. 100-203, Part E.

ROUTINE USES OF RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE SYSTEM INCLUDING CATEGORIES OF USERS AND THE PURPOSES OF SUCH USES:

Information is used "in house." Notwithstanding the above, access may also be gained under the following conditions:

- (a) In the event that a system of records maintained by this agency to carry out its functions indicates a violation or potential violation of law, whether civil, criminal or regulatory in nature, and whether arising by general statute or particular program statute, or by regulation, rule or order issued pursuant thereto, the relevant records in the system of records may be referred, as a routine use, to the appropriate