Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would make a number of administrative clarifications and corrections, title changes, and typographical corrections to the Technical Specifications.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated August 15, 1996, as supplemented March 19 and October 12, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would provide clarity and administrative correctness to the Technical Specifications.

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 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 Impact Statement for Monticello.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 12, 1998, the staff consulted with the Minnesota State official, Mr. M. McCarthy of the Department of Public Service, 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 August 15, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated March 19 and October 12, 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 Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of December, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl F. Lyon,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III–1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–34119 Filed 12–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–397]

Washington Public Power Supply System; Nuclear Project No. 2; 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 No. NPF–21, issued to the Washington Public Power Supply System (the licensee) for operation of the Nuclear Project No. 2 (WNP–2) located in Benton County, Washington.

Environmmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would change Facility Operating License No. NPF–21 to authorize the storage of byproduct, source, and special nuclear materials at the WNP–2 site which are specifically not intended for use at the site. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated October 10, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated November 9, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is necessary because certain licensed materials previously acquired as part of the deferred WNP–1 and WNP–3 projects are being controlled at WNP–2, but are not required for use at the WNP–2 site. The WNP–1 materials are under the scope of Materials License 46–17694–02 and the WNP–3 materials are under the scope of Facility Operating License NPF–21. The licensee, however, has given notice that the WNP–1 and WNP–3 projects are being terminated and a formal request has been filed for termination of the WNP–3 Construction Permit.

The licensee has determined that there is currently no market for the materials and has determined that permanent disposal is economically impractical. Storage under the WNP–2 Operating License which currently provides for possession and use of these types of materials as required for WNP–2, is the remaining option. This option does not present WNP–2 with any significant burden because operation of WNP–2 involves a continuing use and storage of these types of licensed materials.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment. The amendment would permit certain byproduct, source and special nuclear material already present at the site to be stored at the site.

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. 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 WNP–2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on December 17, 1998, the staff consulted with the Washington State official, Mr. R. Cowley of the Department of Health, State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, 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 October 10, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated November 9, 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 Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mel B. Fields,

Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–2, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–34124 Filed 12–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

PRESIDIO TRUST

Letterman Complex, The Presidio of San Francisco, California; Notice of Intent to Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: The Presidio Trust.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement for the proposed development and occupancy of 900,000 square feet of new mixed use space within the Letterman Complex, the Presidio of San Francisco.

SUMMARY: The Presidio Trust will prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement (EIS) for the development and occupancy of approximately 900,000 square feet of new, low- to mid-rise mixed use space within the 60-acre Letterman Complex, located in the northeast corner of the Presidio of San Francisco, California. The development scenario includes deconstruction of the outdated 451,000-square-foot Letterman Army Medical Center (LAMC) and 356,000-square-foot Letterman Army Institute of Research (LAIR), and several other non-historic structures located within the Letterman Complex.

DATES: Comments concerning this notice must be received by February 15, 1999. A public workshop to solicit comment regarding the range of alternatives and the specific impacts to be evaluated in the supplemental EIS will be held on January 27, 1999, from 6 to 9 p.m., at the Presidio Golden Gate Club, Fisher Loop, the Presidio of San Francisco, California.

ADDRESSES: Written comments concerning this notice must be sent to John Pelka, NEPA Compliance Coordinator, The Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, CA 94129–0052. Fax: 415–561–5315. E-mail: jpelka@presidiotrust.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Pelka, NEPA Compliance Coordinator, The Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, CA 94129–0052. Telephone: 415–561–5300.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The supplemental EIS will tier from the 1994 Presidio General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) final EIS pursuant to 40 CFR 1508.28. The GMPA EIS analyzed alternative development concepts for the future of the Presidio, including a specific proposal for the Letterman Complex. Because the proposed development within the Letterman Complex would involve deconstruction, new construction, ground disturbance and potential uses that were not previously examined in the GMPA EIS, the Presidio Trust has concluded that additional analysis is appropriate and will further the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Alternatives

The supplemental EIS will evaluate the following alternative development concepts for the site:

1. Research/Education (Presidio GMPA Alternative)
2. Office/Education/Housing/Inn/Retreat
3. Office/Conference Center/Hotel
4. Office/Housing
5. Office/Education
6. No Action

These concepts are based in part on the proposals received and shortlisted by the Presidio Trust in response to its Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for use of the site. The concepts differ primarily with regard to their size and type of project, proposed activities, programs and occupants, community support services and housing opportunities, and access and circulation. The Presidio Trust will identify a preferred alternative following its review of the supplemental EIS and other information.

Public Comment

In order to facilitate public input regarding the range of potential uses at the site, the Presidio Trust conducted a series of public meetings during the RFQ response period (August 14, 1998 through October 12, 1998). These public meetings included two public workshops and one formal meeting of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Advisory Commission. A front-page article describing the RFQ process for the Letterman Complex was also featured in the September issue of Presidio, the monthly publication of the Presidio Trust.

The Presidio Trust will announce the release of the draft supplemental EIS for public comment by notice in the **Federal Register** and in local news media. The Presidio Trust also anticipates that the GGNRA Advisory Commission will place this item on the agenda of an upcoming public meeting, which will be announced in the **Federal Register** and in local news media.

Dated: December 18, 1998.

Karen A. Cook,

General Counsel.

Reference: 40 CFR 1508.22.

[FR Doc. 98–34098 Filed 12–23–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–4R–U