

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jan D. Broady of the Department, telephone (202) 219-8881. (This is not a toll-free number.)

H.H. Borland, Inc. Profit Sharing Plan (the Plan); Located in Downers Grove, IL

[Prohibited Transaction Exemption 99-35; Exemption Application No. D-10707]

Exemption

The sanctions resulting from the application of section 4975 of the Code, by reason of section 4975(c)(1)(A) through (E) of the Code, shall not apply to the proposed sale (the Sale) of certain improved real property (the Property) by the Plan to Henry H. Borland III and Pat Borland, the Plan trustees (the Trustees) and disqualified persons with respect to the Plan,³ provided the following conditions are met:

(a) The terms and conditions of the Sale are at least as favorable to the Plan as those obtainable in an arm's length transaction with an unrelated party;

(b) The Trustees purchase the Property from the Plan for the greater of \$200,000 or the fair market value of the Property as of the date of the transaction, as determined by a qualified, independent appraiser;

(c) The Sale is a one-time transaction for cash; and

(d) The Plan pays no fees or commissions in connection with the Sale.

For a more complete statement of the facts and representations supporting the Department's decision to grant this exemption, refer to the notice of proposed exemption published on June 25, 1999 at 64 FR 34292.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jan D. Broady of the Department, telephone (202) 219-8881. (This is not a toll-free number.)

General Information

The attention of interested persons is directed to the following:

(1) The fact that a transaction is the subject of an exemption under section 408(a) of the Act and/or section 4975(c)(2) of the Code does not relieve a fiduciary or other party in interest or disqualified person from certain other provisions to which the exemptions does not apply and the general fiduciary responsibility provisions of section 404 of the Act, which among other things require a fiduciary to discharge his

³Since Mr. Borland is the sole owner of the Plan sponsor and the only participant in the Plan, there is no jurisdiction under Title I of the Act pursuant to 29 CFR 2510.3-3(b). However, there is jurisdiction under Title II of the Act pursuant to section 4975 of the Code.

duties respecting the plan solely in the interest of the participants and beneficiaries of the plan and in a prudent fashion in accordance with section 404(a)(1)(B) of the Act; nor does it affect the requirement of section 401(a) of the Code that the plan must operate for the exclusive benefit of the employees of the employer maintaining the plan and their beneficiaries;

(2) These exemptions are supplemental to and not in derogation of, any other provisions of the Act and/or the Code, including statutory or administrative exemptions and transactional rules. Furthermore, the fact that a transaction is subject to an administrative or statutory exemption is not dispositive of whether the transaction is in fact a prohibited transaction; and

(3) The availability of these exemptions is subject to the express condition that the material facts and representations contained in each application are true and complete and accurately describe all material terms of the transaction which is the subject of the exemption. In the case of continuing exemption transactions, if any of the material facts or representations described in the application change after the exemption is granted, the exemption will cease to apply as of the date of such change. In the event of any such change, application for a new exemption may be made to the Department.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 20th day of August, 1999.

Ivan Strasfeld,

Director of Exemption Determinations, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 99-22025 Filed 8-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-P

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

August 20, 1999.

"FEDERAL REGISTER" CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: Vol. 64, No. 127, at 36,049-50, July 2, 1999.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE: 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, July 28, 1999.

PLACE: Room 6005, 6th Floor, 1730 K Street, NW, Washington, DC.

STATUS: Open.

CHANGES IN MEETING: The Commission meeting to consider and act upon Hubb Corp., Docket No. KENT 97-302, has been changed to 10:00 a.m., Thursday, September 30, 1999.

Any person attending an open meeting who requires special accessibility features and/or auxiliary aids, such as sign language interpreters, must inform the Commission in advance of those needs. Subject to 29 CFR 2706.150(a)(3) and 2706.160(d).

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFO: Jean Ellen, (202) 653-5629/(202) 708-9300 for TDD Relay/1-800-877-8339 for toll free.

Jean H. Ellen,

Chief Docket Clerk.

[FR Doc. 99-22155 Filed 8-23-99; 12:27 pm]

BILLING CODE 6735-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-344]

Portland General Electric, Trojan Nuclear Plant; 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-1 issued to Portland General Electric (PGE), the licensee, for operation of the Trojan Nuclear Plant located in Prescott, Oregon and a concurrent exemption from 10 CFR 50.54 and 10 CFR 73.55.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt PGE from the security requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(p) and 10 CFR 73.55 and delete the requirements for a security plan from the 10 CFR part 50 licensed portion of the site after the spent nuclear fuel is transferred to the part 72 licensed Trojan independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for a license amendment and exemption dated January 29, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Sections 50.54 and 73.55 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations require that licensees establish and maintain physical protection and security for activities involving nuclear fuel within the 10 CFR part 50 licensed area of a facility. The proposed action is needed because there will no longer be any nuclear fuel on the 10 CFR part 50 licensed facility to protect against radiological sabotage or diversion after the transfer of the spent nuclear fuel to the Trojan ISFSI. Subpart H of 10 CFR part 72 establishes physical protection and relies on 10 CFR 73.51 to define the

requirements for physical protection of spent nuclear fuel stored under a specific license issued pursuant to 10 CFR part 72. The Trojan ISFSI has an NRC-approved security plan to protect the spent nuclear fuel stored there from radiological sabotage and diversion as promulgated under 10 CFR part 72, subpart H. The proposed action will allow the licensee to conserve resources for decommissioning activities.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that exempting the plant from security requirements will not have any adverse environmental impact. There will be very minor savings of energy and vehicular use associated with the security force no longer performing patrols, checks, and normal security functions.

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 Statement for the Trojan Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 19, 1999, the staff consulted with the Oregon State official, Adam

Bless of the Oregon Office of Energy, 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 January 29, 1998, which is 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 Branford Price Millar Library, Portland State University, 934 S.W. Harrison Street, Portland, Oregon 97207.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 16th day of August 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

Louis L. Wheeler,

*Acting Chief, Decommissioning Section,
Project Directorate IV and Decommissioning,
Division of Licensing Project Management,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-22029 Filed 8-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-344]

Portland General Electric, Trojan Nuclear Plant; 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-1 issued to Portland General Electric Company (PGE), the licensee, for operation of the Trojan Nuclear Plant located in Prescott, Oregon and a concurrent exemption from 10 CFR 50.54, 10 CFR 50.47(b) and 10 CFR part 50, appendix E.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt PGE from the emergency plan requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q), 10 CFR 50.47(b), and 10 CFR part 50, appendix E and delete the requirements for an emergency plan from the 10 CFR part 50 licensed portion of the site after the spent nuclear fuel is transferred to

a part 72 licensed independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for a license amendment and exemption dated August 27, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed because the remaining quantities of radioactive material in the part 50 licensed facility will be less than the quantities specified in 10 CFR 30.72, "Schedule C" after the transfer of the spent nuclear fuel to the ISFSI. This represents a reduction of over 99 percent of the radioactivity existing prior to the transfer and the radioactivity remaining in the part 50 licensed plant will be below the amount requiring an emergency plan as designated in 10 CFR 30.72 above. The ISFSI which will receive the radioactive inventory has an NRC-approved emergency plan. The proposed action will allow the licensee to conserve resources for decommissioning activities.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that exempting the plant from emergency plan requirements will not have any adverse environmental impact. There will be very minor savings of energy and vehicular use associated with the reduced effort related to emergency preparedness drills.

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