

considerations are being solicited, notwithstanding the general comment procedures contained in 10 CFR 50.91.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene, and written comments with regard to the license transfer application, are discussed below.

By August 25, 1999, any person whose interest may be affected by the Commission's action on the application may request a hearing, and, if not the applicants, may petition for leave to intervene in a hearing proceeding on the Commission's action. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene should be filed in accordance with the Commission's rules of practice set forth in Subpart M, "Public Notification, Availability of Documents and Records, Hearing Requests and Procedures for Hearings on License Transfer Applications," of 10 CFR Part 2. In particular, such requests and petitions must comply with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR 2.1306, and should address the considerations contained in 10 CFR 2.1308(a). Untimely requests and petitions may be denied, as provided in 10 CFR 2.1308(b), unless good cause for failure to file on time is established. In addition, an untimely request or petition should address the factors that the Commission will also consider, in reviewing untimely requests or petitions, set forth in 10 CFR 2.1308(b)(1)–(2).

Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene should be served upon Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038 (tel: 609-339-5429, fax: 609-339-1234, and e-mail: JKeenan@PSEG.com); the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555 (e-mail address for filings regarding license transfer cases only: OGCLT@NRC.gov); and the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.1313.

The Commission will issue a notice or order granting or denying a hearing request or intervention petition, designating the issues for any hearing that will be held, and designating the Presiding Officer. A notice granting a hearing will be published in the **Federal Register** and served on the parties to the hearing.

As an alternative to requests for hearing and petitions to intervene, by September 7, 1999, persons may submit written comments regarding the license

transfer application, as provided for in 10 CFR 2.1305. The Commission will consider and, if appropriate, respond to these comments, but such comments will not otherwise constitute part of the decisional record. Comments should be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice.

For further details with respect to this action, see the applications dated July 1 and 23, 1999, and a related application dated June 4, 1999, pertaining to the Hope Creek and Salem facilities, incorporated by reference in the July 23, 1999, submittal, 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 Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 30th day of July 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. 99-20122 Filed 8-4-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70-7001]

### Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP-1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination, the staff concluded that: (1) there is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed

accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22(c)(19). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need to be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after

publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items 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.

*Date of amendment request:* March 1, 1999.

**Brief description of amendment:** The amendment proposes to revise the Technical Safety Requirements (TSRs) related to the audibility requirements for the criticality accident alarm system (CAAS) at PGDP. It is related to the CAAS audibility upgrade modifications. The revision is necessary to ensure adequate TSR coverage during the modification and system changeover. This amendment also revises related sections in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR).

**Basis for finding of no significance:**

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS at PGDP, and it does not involve any process which would change or increase the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite. Therefore, the proposed change will not result in an increase in the amounts of effluents that may be released offsite or result in any impact to the environment.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The CAAS system does not prevent criticality, thus the possibility of a criticality occurring is not increased. The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS which minimizes the consequences of a criticality accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not increase individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed change to the TSRs reflects modifications associated with the CAAS upgrade, which has been planned as a part of Compliance Plan Issues 46 and 50. The proposed change does not change the scope or expand the planned construction. Therefore, it does not result in a significant construction impact.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS which minimizes the consequences of a criticality accident. The CAAS does not change any previously analyzed accidents and does not affect the possibility of occurrence of a criticality accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The CAAS is an alarm system to warn people of criticality events. It does not initiate or contribute to an accident, and it is intended to mitigate the consequences of a criticality accident. The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS. Therefore, this change will not result in the possibility of a new or different type of accident.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS which minimizes the consequences of a criticality accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not represent a reduction in any margin of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS which minimizes the consequences of a criticality accident. Therefore, the overall effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

*Effective date:* The amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP-1 will become effective no later than 30 days after being signed by the Director, Office

of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-1: This amendment will revise the TSRs related to the audibility requirements for the criticality accident alarm system at PGDP and related sections in the SAR.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Carl J. Paperiello,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 99-20125 Filed 8-4-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-89 and 50-163]

### General Atomics TRIGA Mark I and Mark F Research Reactors; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of a license amendment to Amended Facility License No. R-38 and Facility License No. R-67, issued to General Atomics (GA or the licensee), for decommissioning of the GA TRIGA Mark I and TRIGA Mark F Research Reactors, located at General Atomics in San Diego, San Diego county, California.

### Environmental Assessment

#### *Identification of Proposed Action*

The proposed action would approve the licensee's decommissioning plan. GA submitted their decommissioning plan in accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(b) for the GA TRIGA Mark I and TRIGA Mark F Research Reactors which occupy parts of the TRIGA Reactor Facility within GA's Torrey Mesa site. The TRIGA Mark I license was amended on October 29, 1997, and the TRIGA Mark F license was amended on March 22, 1995, to remove authority to operate the reactors. Fuel from both reactors have been placed in the TRIGA Mark F fuel storage canal which is in the same pool as the TRIGA Mark F reactor. The proposed decommissioning plan would authorize immediate dismantlement of the TRIGA Mark I Research Reactor. To protect the stored fuel from potential damage due to decommissioning activities, only limited dismantlement of the TRIGA Mark F Research Reactor