

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE****Drug Enforcement Administration****Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application**

Pursuant to section 1301.33(a) of title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on October 19, 1999, Norac Company, Inc., 405 S. Motor Avenue, Azusa, California 91702, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk of manufacturer of tetrahydrocannabinols (7370), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule I.

The firm plans to manufacture medication for the treatment of AIDS wasting syndrome and as an antiemetic.

And other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substance may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than April 3, 2000.

Dated: December 22, 1999.

**John H. King,**

*Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-2153 Filed 2-1-00 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-09-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE****Immigration and Naturalization Service**

[INS No. 2033-99]

**Notice of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Implementation of Operation Rio Grande for the United States Border Patrol, McAllen, TX**

**AGENCY:** Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent to Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

**SUMMARY:****Proposed Action**

In furtherance of its mission to gain and maintain control of the border, in August 1997, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), U.S.

Border Patrol, McAllen, Texas, implemented Operation Rio Grande to prevent illegal entry and drug trafficking along the Rio Grande corridor between the United States and Mexico.

Operation Rio Grande involves five project actions within the Border Patrol Stations of Rio Grande City, McAllen, Mercedes, Harlingen, Brownsville, and Port Isabel. Specifically, the project will enhance the mission of the U.S. Border Patrol along the Rio Grande corridor fencing, lighting, boat ramps, road improvements, and remote video surveillance systems.

These actions are intended to reduce, detect, and deter the influx of illegal entry and drugs into the McAllen Sector, especially into nearby towns, as well as to increase apprehensions, increase community safety, and provide increased safety of operations for agents. Also, this initiative will help reduce the risk of drowning as undocumented aliens attempt to swim across the river and irrigation canals.

In February 1998, the INS began to conduct an Environmental Assessment (EA) regarding Operation Rio Grande and in October 1998, a Draft EA was released for public comment. Due to the public's concerns regarding Operation Rio Grande's impacts to the Lower Rio Grande Valley, the INS agreed to prepare an environmental Impact Statement.

**Alternatives**

In developing the DEIS, the options of no action and alternatives for Operation Rio Grande will be fully and thoroughly examined.

**Scoping Process**

During the preparation of the DEIS, there will be numerous opportunities for public involvement in order to determine the issues to be examined. A scoping meeting will be held at a location convenient to the citizens of the Lower Rio Grande Valley. The meeting will be well publicized and held at a time which will make it possible for the public and interested agencies or organizations to attend. In addition, a number of informal meetings have already been held and will be continued by representatives of the INS with interested community leaders, officials, and citizens.

**DEIS Preparation**

Public notice will be given in the **Federal Register** concerning the availability of the DEIS for public review and comment.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Manny Rodriguez, Chief Policy and Planning, Immigration and

Naturalization Service, Facilities and Engineering Division, 425 I Street, NW, Washington, DC 20536, Room 2060, Attn: Debra Hood, Telephone: 202-353-4386, or Eric Verwers, INS Architect and Engineering Resource Center, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Fort Worth District, P.O. Box 17300, Fort Worth, Texas, 76102-0300, Telephone: 817-978-0202.

Dated: January 18, 2000.

**Doris Meissner,**

*Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service.*

[FR Doc. 00-2233 Filed 02-01-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-10-M**

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION****Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing**

[Docket No. 50-271]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-28 issued to Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation (the licensee) for operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station located in Vernon, Vermont.

The proposed amendment would redefine the functional testing criteria for the noble gas activity monitor instrumentation in the Augmented Off-Gas (AOG) system.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its

analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change standardizes requirements and establishes consistency with other current TS [technical specifications] provisions. Since reactor operation under the revised Specification is unchanged, no design or analytical acceptance criteria will be exceeded. As such, this change does not impact initiators of analyzed events or assumed mitigation of accident or transient events. The structural and functional integrity of plant systems is unaffected. Thus, there is no significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated.

2. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not affect any parameters or conditions that could contribute to the initiation of any accident. No new accident modes are created. No safety-related equipment or safety functions are altered as a result of these changes. Because it does not involve any change to the plant or the manner in which it is operated, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change does not affect design margins or assumptions used in accident analyses, and has no effect on any initial condition. The capability of safety systems to function and limiting safety system settings are similarly unaffected as a result of this change. Thus, the margins of safety required for safety analyses are maintained.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change

during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By March 3, 2000, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request

and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) The nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) The possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

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 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 Mr. David R. Lewis, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037-1128, 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 amendment dated January 20, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of January 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Richard P. Croteau,**

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

[FR Doc. 00-2232 Filed 2-1-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[50-461]**

### **Amergen Energy Company, LLC; Clinton Power Station; 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-62, issued to AmerGen Energy Company, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Clinton Power Station, located in DeWitt County, Illinois.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

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

The proposed action would approve changes to the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) concerning design requirements for physical protection from tornado missiles for safety-related equipment.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated March 1, 1999.

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

During reviews of safety-related targets susceptible to tornado missile damage, it was identified that some building penetrations, ventilation openings, doors, and piping connected to the reactor core isolation cooling storage tank are not protected from tornado missiles. An analysis was performed to demonstrate that the probability of damage due to tornado missiles striking safety-related equipment is acceptably low. Therefore, the proposed action is needed to avoid unnecessary construction of tornado missile protection.

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

The Commission has evaluated the proposed action and concludes that there will be no physical change to the plant as-built; therefore, there will be no environmental impacts due to construction.

With regard to plant design, the proposed action will not significantly 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 Clinton Power Station.

##### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on December 28, 1999, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Joseph Brittin, of the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, 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 March 1, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of January 2000.