storage cask materials must begin promptly.

The Wesflex System CoC application is under consideration by the Commission. It is anticipated that, if approved, the CoC would be issued in early 2001.

The proposed procurement and fabrication exemption will not authorize use of the Wesflex System to store spent fuel. That will occur only when, and if, a CoC is issued. NRC approval of the procurement and fabrication exemption request should not be construed as an NRC commitment to favorably consider BFS's application for a CoC. BFS will bear the risk of all activities conducted under the exemption, including the risk that the 14 storage casks that BFS plans to construct may not be usable because they may not meet specifications or conditions placed in a CoC that NRC may ultimately approve.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Environmental Assessment for the final rule, ''Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel in NRC-Approved Storage Casks at Nuclear Power Reactor Sites'' (55 FR 29181 (1990)), considered the potential environmental impacts of casks which are used to store spent fuel under a CoC and concluded that there would be no significant environmental impacts. The proposed action now under consideration would not permit use of the Wesflex System, but only procurement and fabrication. There are no radiological environmental impacts from procurement or fabrication since the storage cask material procurement and fabrication does not involve radioactive materials. The major non-radiological environmental impacts involve use of natural resources due to fabrication. Each W150 storage cask weighs approximately 127 tons and is made of reinforced concrete and steel. The amount of steel required for these storage casks is expected to have very little impact on the steel industry. Fabrication of the steel liner and guide rails would be at a metal fabrication facility, not at the reactor site. Fabrication of the storage casks is insignificant compared to the amount of metal fabrication performed annually in the United States. If the storage casks are not usable, they could be disposed of or recycled. The amount of material disposed of is insignificant compared to the amount of steel that is disposed of annually in the United States. Based upon this information, the procurement of materials and fabrication of the storage cask will have no significant impact on the environment since no radioactive materials are involved, and the amount of natural resources used is minimal.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact are not evaluated. The alternative to the proposed action would be to deny approval of the exemption and, therefore, not allow procurement of materials and fabrication of the storage cask until a CoC is issued. This alternative would have the same, or greater, environmental impact.

Given that there are no significant differences in environmental impacts between the proposed action and the alternative considered and that the applicant has a legitimate need to procure materials and fabricate prior to certification and is willing to assume the risk that any material procured or any storage cask fabricated may not be approved or may require modification, the Commission concludes that the preferred alternative is to approve the procurement and fabrication request and grant the exemption from the prohibition on fabrication prior to receipt of a CoC.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

Mr. Lou Brandon, an official from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, was contacted on February 2, 2000, about the EA for the proposed action and had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The environmental impacts of the proposed action have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51. Based upon the foregoing EA, the Commission finds that the proposed action of granting an exemption from 10 CFR 72.234(c) so that BFS may procure materials for and fabricate 14 Wesflex W150 storage casks prior to issuance of a CoC for the Wesflex System will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

The request for the exemption from 10 CFR 72.234(c) was filed by BFS on January 14, 2000. For further details with respect to this action, see the application for a CoC for the Wesflex System, dated February 3, 1998, as supplemented. The exemption request and CoC application are docketed under 10 CFR part 72, Docket 72–1026. The exemption request and the non-proprietary version of the CoC application are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of February 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Susan F. Shankman,

Deputy Director, Licensing and Inspection Directorate, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 00–4889 Filed 2–29–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–315 and 50–316]

Indiana Michigan Power Company and Donald C. Cook, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License No. DPR–58 and No. DPR–74, issued to the Indiana Michigan Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant (D. C. Cook), Units 1 and 2, located in Berrien County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would delete Technical Specification (TS) 5.4.2, ''Reactor Coolant System Volume,'' regarding the reactor coolant system (RCS) volume information. This information is not required to be in the TS for compliance with 10 CFR 50.36(c)(4). Information concerning the RCS volume is included in the D. C. Cook Updated Final Safety Analysis Report and any changes to the information are controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59. In addition, format changes are proposed to TS page 5–5 for both Unit 1 and Unit 2.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated December 22, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is necessary to correct the plant Technical Specifications. This information is not required to be in the TS for compliance with 10 CFR 50.36(c)(4) and is redundant to information contained in the D. C. Cook Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the removal of the RCS volume from the TSs and the associated format changes to the TS pages do not impact any other requirements.

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 nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC 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 D. C. Cook Nuclear Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 18, 2000, the staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Mr. David Minnaar of the 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 NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC 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 December 22, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23d day of February 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stang,

Senior Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00–4885 Filed 2–29–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission

DATE: Weeks of February 28, March 6, 13, 20, 27, and April 3, 2000

PLACE: Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland

STATUS: Public and Closed

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of February 28

Tuesday, February 29

1:30 p.m. Briefing on Draft 50.59 Regulatory Guide (Public Meeting) (Contact: Eileen McKenna, 301–415–2189)

Thursday, March 2

9:25 a.m. Affirmation/discussion and Vote (Public Meeting)

(a) Private Fuel Storage L.L.C., Docket No. 72–22–ISFSI, Memorandum and Order (Denying Request for Admission of Late-Filed Amended Contention Utah C), LBP–99–43, 50 NRC 306 (November 4, 1999)

(b) In the Matter of Michel A. Philippon (Denial of Senior Reactor Operator License Application), LBP–99–44 (December 9, 1999)

9:30 a.m. Meeting with ACRS on Risk Informing Part 50 (Public Meeting) (Contact: John Larkins, 301–415–7360)

Friday, March 3

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Calvert Cliffs License Renewal (Public Meeting) (Contact: Chris Grimes, 301–415–1183)

Week of March 6—Tentative

Monday, March 6

1:30 p.m. Meeting with NARUC (Public Meeting)

Tuesday, March 7

1:00 p.m. Briefing on Improvements in the Reactor Oversight Process (Public Meeting) (Contact: Bill Dean, 301–415–1257)

Week of March 13—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of March 13.

Week of March 20—Tentative

Wednesday, March 22

9:25 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Risk-Informed Regulation Implementation Plan (Public Meeting) (Contact: Tom King, 301–415–5790)

Friday, March 24

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Evaluation of the Requirement for Licensee to Update Their Inservice Inspection and Inservice Testing Program Every 120 Months (Public Meeting) (Contact: Tom Scarbrough, 301–415–2794)

Week of March 27—Tentative

Thursday, March 30

8:55 a.m. Affirmation/Discussion and Vote (Public Meeting) (If needed)

9:00 a.m. Briefing on EEO Program (Public Meeting) (Contact: Irene Little, 301–415–7380)

Week of April 3—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of April 3.

* THE SCHEDULE FOR COMMISSION MEETINGS IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE ON SHORT NOTICE. TO VERIFY THE STATUS OF MEETINGS CALL (RECORDING)—(301) 415–1292. CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Bill Hill (301) 415–1661.

* * * * *

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: By a vote of 5–0 on February 22, the Commission determined pursuant to U.S.C. 552b(e) and § 9.107(a) of the Commission's rules that ''Discussion of Management Issues'' (Closed-Ex. 2 & 6) be held on February 22, and on less than one week's notice to the public.

* * * * *

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm

* * * * *

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, DC 20555 (301–415–1661). In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the Internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to wmh@nrc.gov or dkw@nrc.gov.