

Commission, Washington DC 20555, Attn: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff. A copy of such statement or request should also be served on the Chairman of this Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, T3 F23, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555.

Documents relating to this proceeding are available for public inspection at the Commission's Local Public Document Room, Greenfield Community College, 1 College Drive, Greenfield, Massachusetts 01301, as well as at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L St. NW, Washington DC 20555.

Rockville, MD, April 6, 1999.

For the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

Charles Bechhoefer,

Chairman, Administrative Judge.

[FR Doc. 99-9037 Filed 4-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-029]

Yankee Atomic Electric Company; Yankee Nuclear Power Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering the issuance of an amendment to the Yankee Atomic Electric Company (YAEC or licensee) license for the Yankee Nuclear Power Station (YNPS or plant) approving the License Termination Plan (LTP). YAEC submitted the LTP by letter dated May 15, 1997, by two separate letters dated December 18, 1997, and a fourth letter dated January 23, 1998. The plant is located in Rowe Township, Franklin County, Massachusetts.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action is issuance of a license amendment approving the LTP. The LTP is required by regulations to include: (A) A site characterization; (B) identification of dismantlement activities not completed under the Post Shutdown Activities Report (PSDAR)/Decommissioning Plan at the time of submitting the LTP; (C) plans for site remediation; (D) detailed plans for the final radiation survey; (E) a description of the end use of the site, if restricted [The YAEC application does not include restrictions; therefore, this item is not included in YAEC's LRP]; (F) an updated site-specific estimate of remaining decommissioning costs; and

(G) a supplement to the environmental report describing any new information or significant environmental change associated with the licensee's proposed termination activities.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Issuance of an amendment approving the LTP will allow the licensee to implement its final radiation survey plan to allow for a determination as to whether the release criteria for unrestricted use of the site after the YAEC license is terminated have been met.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

Issuance of the amendment approving the LTP will not have any significant effect on accident risk and probability of any other environmental impact is extremely remote.

The staff's review of the four YAEC submittals of May 15, 1997, December 18, 1997 (2), and January 23, 1998, has concluded that the environmental and safety consequences of accidents that may potentially result in a radiological release are greatly decreased given the plant's permanently shutdown and defueled status and that the fuel has decayed for seven years since it was removed from the reactor.

The licensee does not propose any disposal or relocation of fuel by this action. The proposed action does not increase the probability or consequences of any 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 occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, the proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

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

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Because the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the action. 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 evaluated in previous environmental reviews for the YNPS.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

On October 22, 1998, in accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts regarding the environmental impact of the proposed actions. The Commonwealth official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the foregoing 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 four YAEC submittals, referenced above, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555, and at the local public document room at the Greenfield Community College, 1 College Drive, Greenfield, Massachusetts 01301.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, April 1, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert A. Gramm,

Acting Director, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-9042 Filed 4-9-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Draft Guidance on the Benchmark Dose Modeling for the Radiological Criteria for License Termination of Uranium Recovery Facilities

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability; opportunity for comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is soliciting comments on draft guidance for the radium benchmark dose approach, associated with the final rule, "Radiological Criteria for License