organizations. These drills are in excess of what the regulation requires and provide a benefit by allowing more opportunities for training of response personnel. The staff considers that these measures are adequate to maintain an acceptable level of emergency preparedness during this period, satisfying the underlying purpose of the rule. Therefore, the special circumstances of 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) are satisfied.

Only temporary relief from the regulation is provided by the requested schedular exemption since an exercise will be conducted at a future date. The licensee has made a good faith effort to comply with the regulation. The exemption is being sought by the licensee in voluntary response to a request by the NRC to accommodate an adjustment in exercise scheduling that affects multiple agencies, as discussed during the annual NRC Region I and FEMA (Regions I, II, and III) exercise scheduling meeting held in White Plains, New York, in December 1998. At this meeting, representatives of the States of Connecticut and New York concurred with rescheduling the NRC/FEMA evaluated exercise for the Millstone site. The revised exercise schedule allows for better balance in the use of federal resources. The exercise will be conducted in a time frame that is within generally accepted policy. In FEMA's letter to the NRC dated July 14, 1999, FEMA Region I and FEMA Headquarters concurred with the change in exercise date. Also, NRC Region I, who would be involved in evaluating the onsite activities during these exercises, supported the schedule change due to the need to relieve resource demands. The staff, having considered the schedule and resource issues within FEMA and the NRC, and the proposed licensee compensatory measures, believes that the exemption request meets the special circumstances of 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(v) and should be granted.

IV

The Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR part 50, appendix E, this exemption is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. Further, the Commission has determined, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), that special circumstances of 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) and 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(v) are applicable in that application of the regulation is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule, and the exemption would provide only temporary relief from the applicable regulation and the licensee has made good faith efforts to comply with the regulation. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants the exemption from Section IV.F.2.c of Appendix E to 10 CFR part 50.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment (64 FR 50840).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of October, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John A. Zwolinski,

Director, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–27365 Filed 10–19–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–272 and 50–311]

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DRP–70 and DRP–75, issued to Public Service Electric and Gas Company (the licensee) for operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would make administrative and editorial changes to correct errors in the Technical Specifications (TSs) that have either existed since initial issuance or were introduced during subsequent changes. In addition, surveillance requirements would be added that should have been incorporated within the TSs when the applicable amendment to the TSs was approved by the NRC.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated November 14, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated August 25, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would correct administrative and editorial errors in the TSs. These changes can generally be described as:

a. Revisions to the index to reflect correct page numbers of corresponding sections,

b. Revisions to the section titles used in the TS sections, Bases, and Tables, as well as the correction and addition of subtitles to obtain standardization between both Salem units' TSs,

c. Revision to the TS references that refer to other TS sections and tables to either provide the correct reference or to provide more specificity by reference to actual subsections,

d. Spelling and grammatical corrections such as elimination of duplicate or extraneous words, proper pluralization, more standard abbreviations,

e. Renumbering of TS Tables,

f. Capitalize terms found in TS 1.0 when used in other TS sections,

g. Add units of measure that were missing from acceptance criterion,

h. Other administrative changes.

The proposed action would also revise various surveillance requirements for instrumentation such as including the correct operational mode applicability and adding channel functional tests and channel checks that should have been incorporated when prior amendments were issued.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the administrative and editorial changes correct errors that currently exist in the TSs and add surveillance requirements that should have been included in prior amendments. The proposed action does not modify the facility or affect the manner in which the facility is operated. Further, the addition of missing surveillance requirements would better demonstrate the operability of the affected plant components.

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 Salem Nuclear Generating Station dated April 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 14, 1999, the staff consulted with the New Jersey State official, Mr. Dennis Zannoni, Chief of the Bureau of Nuclear Engineering, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments with respect to the environmental impact of the proposed action. However, the State commented that certain proposed corrections were no longer relevant due to previous amendments.

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 November 14, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated August 25, 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 Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of October, 1999.

Patrick D. Milano, Sr.,

Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–27361 Filed 10–19–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Workshop On Revising The Reactor Safety Goal Policy

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of public workshop.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering modifying the reactor Safety Goal Policy Statement that was issued in 1986. Modifications are being considered for three reasons: (1) To change or add to the basic policy established in the statement; (2) to clarify the role of safety goals in the NRC's regulatory process; and (3) to make the policy statement consistent with our current agency practices. NRC is soliciting public comments on modifications that are being considered.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NRC's Safety Goal Policy Statement was originally published in 1986 after several years of consideration. The Commission provided additional guidance in a Staff Requirements Memorandum issued June 15, 1990. The current Safety Goal Policy contains two qualitative safety goals defined as follows:

- Individual members of the public should be provided a level of protection from the consequences of nuclear power plant operation such that individuals bear no significant additional risk to life and health.
- Societal risks to life and health from nuclear power plant operation should be comparable to or less than the risks from generating electricity by viable competing technologies and should not be a significant addition to other societal risks.

Two quantitative health objectives (QHOs) associated with the qualitative goals are also provided and are defined as:

- The risk to an average individual in the vicinity of a nuclear power plant of prompt fatalities that might result from reactor accidents should not exceed one-tenth of one percent (0.1 percent) of the sum of prompt fatality risks resulting from other accidents to which members of the U.S. population are generally exposed.
- The risk to the population in the area near a nuclear power plant of cancer fatalities that might result from nuclear power plant operation should not exceed one-tenth of one percent (0.1 percent) of the sum of cancer fatality risks resulting from all other causes.

In the document SECY–98–101 dated May 4, 1998 (available from the NRC web site at *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/COMMISSION/SECYS/1998–101scy*), the staff discussed several issues relevant to changing the Safety Goal Policy Statement. The descriptions of these issues are provided below. The NRC is soliciting feedback regarding these issues, specifically with respect to:

- Should the policy statement be revised to address these issues?
- What are the benefits of such revisions?
- What are the detriments of such revisions?
- What alternatives should be considered to address these issues?

Other specific questions will be made available on the NRC web site at (*http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/wwwforms.html*) two weeks prior to the workshop.

Changes or Additions to Basic Policy Established in the Statement

1. Core damage frequency is now considered a subsidiary objective to the quantitative health objectives (QHOs). It may be appropriate to elevate it to a fundamental safety goal.

2. The second qualitative goal and QHO deal with societal risk. However, these measures of societal risk differ in two key respects from the societal risk calculations performed in other areas:

- The policy statement defines a 10-mile radius for calculating societal impacts, while the Regulatory Analysis Guidelines and environmental impact analyses use a 50 mile radius.
- The calculational process used by the staff for comparison with the QHO is an average-individual risk, while the Regulatory Analysis Guidelines and environmental analyses use a summed risk (over all individuals).

Should the Safety Goal Policy be revised to better reflect societal risk?

3. The goals and QHOs are described in terms of health risks; no goal has been established with respect to potential land contamination or other environmental impacts. As evidenced by the Chernobyl accident, this can be a major societal impact of accidents involving core damage and containment failure. Should such a goal be added?

4. The QHOs are expressed in terms of annual average frequencies. It may be appropriate to also provide a quantitative goal on risks during temporary plant configurations such as during PWR mid-loop operations, where risk can be substantially higher for a short period of time. Should such a goal be included in the Safety Goal Policy Statement?

Clarifications on the Role of Safety Goals in NRC's Regulatory Process

5. In a June 15, 1990, SRM, the Commission provided guidance to the