

Any lubricating oil that overflowed an oil collection tank would remain inside the containment building and would not be released to the environment. A portion of the spilled oil could flow down to lower floor elevations and eventually into the containment sump. The motor oil has a flash point of over 400°F and the containment atmosphere is nominally 80 to 100°F when the PCPs are in operation. The oil would not come in contact with hot pipes, hot equipment surfaces, or electrical ignition sources in the tank areas or on the flow paths to the sump. The oil would not become a fire hazard, since it would drain to a safe location.

Cleanup of any oil spill would generate minor amounts of waste materials requiring disposal and expose plant workers to a small amount of radioactive material. However, the waste materials and radiation exposure from cleanup would be essentially the same as from routine lubricating oil system activities associated with normal plant operation and maintenance. Routine activities which generate waste oil and cleanup materials include periodic PCP oil changes, pumpdown of oil collection tanks, PCP oil system piping and equipment repairs, and cleaning of equipment and floors.

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 offsite, 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 Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

1. Limiting the Amount of Oil in the PCP Lubrication Systems

Limiting the amount of oil in the PCP lubrication systems according to the capacity of the collection systems would violate the equipment operating requirements, which could lead to early equipment failure.

2. Modifying the Oil Collection Tank Capacity

Modifying the oil collection tank capacity would require significant resources and result in potential occupational exposure without a commensurate benefit to the environment.

3. Denying the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denying the proposed action (i.e., the "no action" alternative). Denying the application would not change the 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 related to the operation of Palisades Nuclear Generating Plant, dated June 1972, and the associated final addendum (NUREG-0343) dated February 1978.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 23, 2000, the staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Mr. Michael McCardy, 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 letters dated August 13 and November 3, 1999, and March 15, 2000, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and 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 24th day of March 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl F. Lyon,

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

[FR Doc. 00-7831 Filed 3-29-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-293]

Entergy Nuclear Generation Company; Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption for Facility Operating License No. DPR-35, issued to Entergy Nuclear Generation Company (Entergy/the licensee), for operation of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, (Pilgrim), located in Plymouth County, Massachusetts.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E, Item IV.F.2.c regarding conduct of a full-participation exercise of the offsite emergency plan biennially. Under the proposed exemption, the licensee would reschedule the Federally-observed full-participation emergency exercise from December 2001 to May 2002 and all future Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)—and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)—evaluated exercises would occur biennially from the year 2002.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated July 30, 1999, as supplemented on September 23, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulation, (10 CFR) Part 50, Appendix E, Item IV.F.2.c requires each licensee at each site to conduct an exercise of its offsite emergency plan biennially. The NRC and FEMA observe these exercises and evaluate the performance of the licensee, State, and local authorities having a role under the emergency plan.

The licensee would be required to conduct an exercise of its onsite and offsite emergency plans in December 2001, which is at the end of the required interval. To support the efficient and effective use of Federal resources, 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, the planned December 2001 exercise for Pilgrim was shifted to May 2002, which is beyond the required interval.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action involves an administrative activity (a scheduler change in conducting an exercise) unrelated to plant operations.

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 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 Related to the Operation of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Boston Edison Company," dated May 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 5, 1999, the staff consulted with the Massachusetts State official,

Mr. James Muckerhide of the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments. In addition, staff members of NRC Region I and FEMA were contacted by phone and provided favorable recommendations to approve the requested exemption.

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 July 30, 1999, as supplemented on September 23, 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 24 day of March 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Alan B. Wang,

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

[FR Doc. 00-7829 Filed 3-29-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Cumulative Report on Rescissions and Deferrals

March 1, 2000.

Section 1014(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) requires a monthly report listing all budget authority for the current fiscal year for which, as of the first day of the month, a special message had been transmitted to Congress.

This report gives the status, as of March 1, 2000, of three rescission proposals and two deferrals contained

in one special message for FY 2000. The message was transmitted to Congress on February 9, 2000.

Rescissions (Attachments A and C)

As of March 1, 2000, three rescission proposals totaling \$128 million have been transmitted to the Congress. Attachment C shows the status of the FY 2000 rescission proposals.

Deferrals (Attachments B and D)

As of March 1, 2000, \$976 million in budget authority was being deferred from obligation. Attachment D shows the status of each deferral reported during FY 2000.

Information From Special Message

The special message containing information on the rescission proposals and deferrals that are covered by this cumulative report are printed in the edition of the **Federal Register** cited below:

65 FR 9017, Wednesday, February 23, 2000

Jacob J. Lew,
Director.

Attachment A.—Status of FY 2000 Rescissions

[In millions of dollars]

	Budgetary resources
Rescissions proposed by the President	128.0
Rejected by the Congress
Currently before the Congress for less than 45 days	128.0

ATTACHMENT B.—STATUS OF FY 2000 DEFERRALS

[In millions of dollars]

	Budgetary resources
Deferrals proposed by the President	1,622.0
Routine Executive releases through February 2000 (OMB/Agency releases of \$646.3 million)	— 646.3
Overtaken by the Congress
Currently before the Congress	975.7

BILLING CODE 3110-01-C