CFR 50.54(q) are no longer required. An exemption is required from portions of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to allow the licensee to implement a revised Defueled Emergency Plan (DEP) that is appropriate for the permanently shutdown and defueled reactor facility.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. The Commission concludes that exemptions from certain portions of 10 CFR 50.54(q) are acceptable given the reduced risk and reduced consequences of an accident occurring at a permanently defueled reactor site with a substantially reduced decay heat load produced by the spent fuel held in storage.

The proposed change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off-site, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request (no-action alternative). Denial of the exemption request would not change any 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 operation of HNP issued in October 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 5, 1998, the NRC staff consulted with Mr. D. Galloway of the State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The NRC staff and the State official discussed the proposed issuance of the exemption. The State official did not object to issuance of the exemption.

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 this action, see the licensee's letters, dated May 30, September 19, September 26, October 21, and December 18, 1997, and January 22, March 25, June 19, and July 31, 1998, which are available for public review at the NRC's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, and at the Local Public Document Room at the Russell Public Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of August 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–22084 Filed 8–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–309]

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station; 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. DPR–36, a license held by the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company (MYAPCo or the licensee). The exemption would apply to the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, a permanently shutdown plant located at the MYAPCo site in Lincoln County, Maine.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption would modify emergency response plan requirements due to the permanently shutdown and defueled status of the Maine Yankee facility.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated November 6, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated June 29, 1998. The requested action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to discontinue offsite planning activities and reduce the scope of onsite emergency planning.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Maine Yankee was shut down in December 1996. By letter dated August 7, 1997, the licensee informed the Commission that it had decided to permanently cease operations at Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station and that all fuel had been permanently removed from the reactor. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(a)(2), upon docketing of the certifications in the letter of August 7, 1997, the facility operating license no longer authorizes MYAPCo to operate the reactor and to load fuel in the reactor vessel. In this permanently shutdown condition, the facility poses a reduced risk to public health and safety. Because of this reduced risk, certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) are no longer required. An exemption is required from portions of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to allow the licensee to implement a revised Defueled Emergency Plan that is appropriate for the permanently shutdown and defueled reactor facility.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

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

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The

principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request (no-action alternative). Denial of the exemption 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 resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to Operation of Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station (July 1972).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 31, 1998, the NRC staff consulted with Mr. Patrick Dostie of the State of Maine, Department of Human Services, 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 this action, see the licensee's letters, dated November 6, 1997, and June 29, 1998, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C., and at the Local Public Document Room at the Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, Post Office Box 367, Wiscasset, Maine 04578.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of August 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–22083 Filed 8–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Notice

In accordance with the purposes of Sections 29 and 182b. of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2232b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on September 2–4, 1998, in Conference Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the **Federal Register** on Thursday, November 20, 1997 (62 FR 62079).

Wednesday, September 2, 1998

8:30 A.M.—8:45 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding conduct of the meeting.

8:45 A.M.—10:15 A.M.: Power Level Increase Request for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 (Open/Closed)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNOC) and the NRC staff regarding the SNOC's application for a power level increase of 8% for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2.

[**Note:** A portion of this session may be closed to discuss General Electric Nuclear Energy proprietary information.]

10:30 A.M.—12:00 Noon: Impact of the Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Results and Insights on the Regulatory System (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the Nuclear Energy Institute regarding situation-specific cases where PRA results and insights have improved the existing regulatory system, and specific areas in which PRA can have a positive impact on the regulatory system.

1:00 P.M.—2:30 P.M.: Establishing a Benchmark on Risk During Low-Power and Shutdown Operations (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding staff activities associated with establishing a benchmark on risk during low-power and shutdown operations, and related matters.

2:45 P.M.—4:15 P.M.: Emergency Core Cooling System Strainer Blockage (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and BWR Owners Group regarding the NRC staff's safety evaluation of the BWR Owners Group Utility Resolution Guide for emergency core cooling system strainer blockage.

4:30 P.M.—7:00 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports on matters considered during this meeting. In addition, the Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports on the lessons learned from the review of the AP600 passive plant design and on the U.S. Naval Reactors program. The Committee will also discuss proposed technical papers to be presented at the October 1998 Quadripartite meeting.

Thursday, September 3, 1998

8:30 A.M.—8:35 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding conduct of the meeting.

8:35 A.M.—10:00 A.M.: Proposed Resolution of Generic Safety Issue 171, ''Engineered Safety Feature Failure from Loss of Offsite Power Subsequent to a Loss-of-Coolant Accident'' (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the proposed resolution of Generic Safety Issue 171.

10:15 A.M.—11:45 A.M.: Meeting with the Director of the NRC Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data (AEOD) (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with the AEOD Director regarding items of mutual interest, including:

- Long-term strategy for the Accident Sequence Precursor (ASP) computer codes, including Criteria for accuracy, range of application, and treatment of uncertainty.
- Methods for planning case studies. How these plans are affected by emphasis on risk-information in the regulatory process. Shaping these case studies for use in validating PRA methods.
- Strategy for encouraging greater use of AEOD studies within the NRC and within the larger reactor safety community.
- Should AEOD be collecting data etc., outside the nuclear industry? For example, should AEOD collect data on the vulnerabilities of digital electronic systems and software encountered in other industries and applications?
- AEOD activities associated with evaluating foreign event data.

11:45 A.M.—12:00 Noon: Reconciliation of ACRS Comments and Recommendations (Open)—The Committee will discuss responses from the NRC Executive Director for Operations (EDO) to comments and recommendations included in recent ACRS reports, including EDO's responses to ACRS comments and recommendations on the NRC Reactor Fuels Research Program, Draft Supplement 1 to NUREG 1552, ''Fire Barrier Penetration Seals in Nuclear Power Plants'', and on the Proposed Final Standard Review Plan Section 3.9.8 and Regulatory Guide 1.178 for Risk-Informed Inservice Inspection of Piping.