

Based on the above, the NRC staff concludes that there are no significant changes in the environmental impact related to the uranium fuel cycle due to the proposed extended operation of Palisades.

Nonradiological Impacts

The NRC relies upon the State of Michigan, Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), for regulation of nonradiological matters involving water quality and aquatic biota. The State of Michigan has reviewed and considered the environmental impacts of Palisades' water discharge in its issuance of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and renewals. The NPDES permit contains requirements necessary to comply with State and Federal water pollution control laws, and is audited by MDEQ and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. On October 1, 1999, MDEQ renewed the NPDES permit for Palisades (NPDES Permit No. MI0001457) with an effective date of November 1, 1999, and an expiration date of October 1, 2003. The licensee expects the MDEQ to renew and issue NPDES permits about every 4 years until expiration of the Operating License. Because the licensee will continue to abide by the NPDES permits, there will be no significant nonradiological impact on the environment with regard to liquid discharges from Palisades as a result of extending the expiration date of the Operating License. Also, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. Therefore, the NRC concludes that 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 NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action (*i.e.*, the "no action" alternative). Denial of the application would result in no significant improvement in environmental impacts, but could result in nonradiological environmental effects due to airborne effluents from nonnuclear plants that would be required to operate in order to replace the power supplied by Palisades. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are otherwise similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the FES, as supplemented, for Palisades.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the NRC staff consulted with the Michigan State official 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 April 27, 2000. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. 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 31st day of October 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Darl S. Hood,

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

[FR Doc. 00-28494 Filed 11-6-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATE: Weeks of November 6, 13, 20, 27, December 4, and 11, 2000.

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

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of November 6

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of November 6.

Week of November 13—Tentative

Wednesday, November 15, 2000

10:00 a.m. Briefing by the Executive Branch (Closed-Ex. 1)

Friday, November 17

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)

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—www.nrc.gov/live.html

Week of November 20—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of November 20.

Week of November 27—Tentative

Monday, November 27, 2000

9:00 a.m. (Briefing by DOE on Plutonium Disposition Program and MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility Licensing (Public Meeting) (Contact: Drew Persinko, 301-415-6522)

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—www.nrc.gov/live.html

Week of December 4—Tentative

Monday, December 4

1:55 p.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed)

2:00 p.m. Briefing on License Renewal Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) Report, Standard Review Plan (SRP), and Regulatory Guide (Public Meeting) (contact: Chris Grimes, 301-415-1183)

This meeting will be webcast live at the Web address—www.nrc.gov/live.html

Week of December 11—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of December 11.

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.

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, D.C. 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.

Dated: November 3, 2000.

William M. Hill, Jr.,

SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-28669 Filed 11-3-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Draft Regulatory Guides; Issuance, Availability

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Availability; Correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a notice relating to the availability of Draft Regulatory Guides DG-1102 and DG-1103, appearing in the **Federal Register** on October 31, 2000 (65 FR 65024). This action is necessary to correct the accession numbers listed in the notice for viewing the electronic copies of the draft guides.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John P. Segala, Division of Systems Safety and Analysis, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone 301-415-7162 (e-mail: jps1@nrc.gov).

In the **Federal Register** dated October 31, 2000, page 65024, second column, third paragraph, fourth sentence, the third and fourth lines are corrected to read as follows: ML003756180 for DG-1102 and ML003756467 for DG-1103.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of November, 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David L. Meyer,

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-28497 Filed 11-6-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Plan for Using Risk Information in the Materials and Waste Arenas: Case Studies

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is developing an approach for using risk information

in the nuclear materials regulatory process. As part of this effort, the NRC staff has developed a plan for using risk-informed approaches in the nuclear materials and waste arenas. The plan employs case studies to examine the use of risk information in the nuclear materials and waste arenas.

The purpose of the case studies is: (1) To illustrate what has been done and what could be done in the materials and waste arenas to alter the regulatory approach in a risk-informed manner; and (2) to establish a framework for using a risk-informed approach in the materials and waste arenas. A draft of the plan was published in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 54323, September 7, 2000). On September 21, 2000, the NRC staff held a public meeting to communicate the draft plan to the public and to receive feedback. The meeting was open to the public and all interested parties were welcomed to attend and provide comments. The meeting was held from 9 a.m. to 12 noon in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Auditorium in Rockville, Maryland. Based on the comments received at the public meeting and on comments from members of the Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards Risk Steering Group, the NRC staff has revised and finalized the plan. The final plan is provided below in its entirety.

Plan for Using Risk Information in the Materials and Waste Arenas: Case Studies

1. Background

In SECY-99-100, "Framework for Risk-Informed Regulation in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS)," dated March 31, 1999, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff proposed a framework for risk-informed regulation in the materials and waste arenas. On June 28, 1999, the Commission approved the staff's proposal. In the associated staff requirements memorandum, the Commission approved the staff's recommendation to implement a five-step process consisting of:

- (1) Identifying candidate regulatory applications that are amenable to expanded use of risk assessment information;
- (2) Making a decision on how to modify a regulation or regulated activity;
- (3) Changing current regulatory approaches;
- (4) Implementing risk-informed approaches; and
- (5) developing or adapting existing tools and techniques of risk analysis to

the regulation of nuclear materials safety and safeguards.

Step one of the five-step process will be accomplished by applying screening criteria to regulatory application areas as a means to identify the candidate regulatory applications. To be a candidate for expanded use of risk information in the materials and waste arenas, regulatory application areas must meet the screening criteria.

As part of the staff's effort to use an enhanced public participatory process in developing the framework, the staff held a public workshop in Washington, DC, on April 25 and 26, 2000. The staff published draft screening criteria in a **Federal Register** Notice (65 FR 14323, March 16, 2000) announcing the workshop. The purpose of the first part of the workshop was to solicit public comment on the draft screening criteria and their applications. The purpose of the second part of the workshop was to solicit public input for the process of developing safety goals for nuclear materials and waste applications.

The workshop included participation by representatives from NRC, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Energy, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Organization of Agreement States, Health Physics Society, Nuclear Energy Institute, environmental and citizen groups, licensees, and private consultants. A consensus among the workshop participants was that case studies and iterative investigations would be useful for the following purposes: (1) To test the screening criteria; (2) to show how the application of risk information has affected or could affect a particular area of the regulatory process; and (3) to develop safety goal parameters and a first draft of safety goals for each area.

2. Purpose

The purpose of the case studies is: (1) To illustrate what has been done and what could be done in the materials and waste arenas to alter the regulatory approach in a risk-informed manner; and (2) to establish a framework for using a risk-informed approach in the materials and waste arenas by testing the draft screening criteria, and determining the feasibility of safety goals. Once the screening criteria have been tested using a spectrum of case studies, the criteria can be modified as appropriate, placed in final form, and established as part of the framework for prioritizing the use of risk information in materials and waste regulatory applications.

The case studies will be used to begin the process of developing safety goals