

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene 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 close of business of the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to Douglas K. Porter, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Rosemead, California 91770, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated October 20, 1998 (PCN 485), as supplemented August 13, 1999, 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 Main Library, University of California, Irvine, California 92713.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of October, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**L. Raghavan,**

*Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-26488 Filed 10-8-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-155]

**Consumers Energy Company; Big Rock Point 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. DPR-6, issued to Consumers Energy Company (the licensee). The amendment would revise Appendix A Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Big Rock Point (BRP) Plant, a permanently shutdown nuclear reactor facility located in Charlevoix County, Michigan.

**Environmental Assessment**

*Identification of Proposed Action*

The proposed action would make changes to the TSs by deleting (1) the definition Site Boundary and its use throughout the TSs, (2) Figure 5.1-1, the BRP site map, (3) TS 5.1.1 paragraph numbering, and (4) other site-specific information describing the site and site boundary. The proposed action would also make editorial or administrative changes to TSs 6.6.2.5.g, h, and j and 6.6.2.6.b for the above four changes. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated May 11, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated June 3 and July 28, 1999.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would, for item (1) above, remove from the TSs a definition that is not needed because Site Boundary is defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The TSs and Part 20 definitions are equivalent. For item (2), TS Figure 5.1-1, the BRP site map, is equivalently represented in the licensee-controlled Final Hazards Summary Report (FHSR) and this type of site-specific information is not required to be in TSs under 10 CFR 50.36a requirements. Furthermore, this change to the TSs is consistent with NRC guidance in NUREG-1433, "Standard Technical Specifications, General Electric Plants, BWR/4." In concert with Section 50.36a requirements, NUREG-1433 provides guidance in determining a minimum set of standard requirements for permanently shutdown reactor facilities. Item (3) is administrative in nature in that it removes TS paragraph numbering due to the removal of site-specific information as described in Item (4). Item (4) would delete certain site-specific information from the TS description of the BRP site. Most of this site-specific information is already contained in the licensee's FHSR. This information includes distances from the reactor centerline to the nearest site boundary. The information that is not currently in the FHSR will be placed in the FHSR as committed by the licensee in its letter of July 28, 1999. Regarding the last item, editorial and

administrative changes were necessary as a result of the four changes made above.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed amendment to the BRP TSs and concludes that issuance of the proposed amendment will not have an environmental impact. The proposed change in TS site-specific information is consistent with the regulations and regulatory guidance and is considered editorial and administrative in nature. The licensee does not propose any disposal or relocation of nuclear fuel or any changes to structures, systems, components, or site boundaries.

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 historical 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 environmental reviews for the BRP plant.

*Agencies and Persons Contacted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 7 and August 9, 1999, the staff consulted with the State of Michigan official, Mr. David W. Minnaar, Chief, Radiological Protection Section, Drinking Water and Radiological Protection Division, Michigan

Department of Environmental Quality, 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 May 11, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated June 3 and July 28, 1999, 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 Commission's local public document room located in the North Central Michigan College Library, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of October, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Michael T. Masnik,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-26489 Filed 10-8-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364]

### **Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Alabama Power Company, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8, issued to Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (SNC), for operation of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Houston County, Alabama.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would fully convert SNC's current technical specifications (CTS) to Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) based on NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants,"

Revision 1, of April 1995. The proposed action is in accordance with SNC's application of March 12, 1998, supplemented by SNC's letters of April 24, 1998, August 20, 1998, November 20, 1998, February 3, 1999, February 20, 1999, April 30, 1999 (two letters), June 30, 1999, July 27, 1999, August 19, 1999, August 30, 1999, and September 15, 1999.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

Implementing ITS at Farley would benefit nuclear safety. The Commission's "NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," (52 FR 3788, February 6, 1987), and later the Commission's "Final Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," (58 FR 39132, July 22, 1993), formalized this need. Each reactor vendor owners group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS (STS) to aid in producing individual plant ITS. NRC NUREG-1432 contains the STS for Westinghouse-designed reactor plants. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements reviewed NUREG-1432, noted the safety merits of the STS, and indicated that it supported operating plants converting to the STS. SNC used NUREG-1432 as the basis for developing the Farley, Units 1 and 2, ITS.

##### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed TS conversion does not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and does not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents.

Changes that are administrative in nature have no effect on the technical content of the ITS and are acceptable. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the ITS are expected to improve the operator's control of the plant in normal and accident conditions.

Relocating CTS requirements to SNC-controlled documents does not change the requirements. SNC may make future changes to these requirements, but SNC must make the changes under 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control methods. This assures that SNC will maintain adequate requirements. All such CTS relocations conform to NUREG-1432 guidelines and the Final Policy Statement, and are therefore acceptable.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements are likely to enhance the

safety of plant operations and are acceptable.

The NRC has reviewed all changes involving less restrictive requirements. Removing CTS requirements that provide little or no safety benefit or place unnecessary burdens on SNC is justified. In most cases, TS relaxations previously granted on a plant-specific basis resulted from generic NRC action or from agreements reached during discussions with the OG and are acceptable for Farley, Units 1 and 2. The NRC reviewed the generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1432 and SNC's deviations from NUREG-1432 and determined they are acceptable for Farley, Units 1 & 2.

In summary, the NRC determined that the Farley, Units 1 and 2, ITS provide control of plant operations such that there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

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 denying 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 Farley, Units 1 and 2.

##### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 24, 1999, the staff consulted with the Alabama State