

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated July 1, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated February 8, and May 28, 1999, which are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of July, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
**Ledyard B. Marsh,**  
*Chief Events Assessment, Generic Communications and Non-Power Reactors Branch, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
 [FR Doc. 99-17747 Filed 7-12-99; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-397]

### Washington Public Power Supply System, Washington Public Power Supply System, Nuclear Project No. 2; 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-21, issued to the Washington Public Power Supply System (the licensee), for operation of the WPPSS Nuclear Project No.2 (WNP-2), located in Benton County, Washington.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise Facility Operating License No. NPF-21 to reflect the change in the licensee's name from the Washington Public Power Supply System to Energy Northwest. In addition, the facility, WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2, will now be referred to as WNP-2.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated June 3, 1999.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to change the operating license to accurately reflect the new name of the licensee.

##### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes, that the name change is administrative in nature and will not affect the operation of WNP-2.

The proposed amendment 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 Washington Public Power System Nuclear Project No.2 dated December 1981.

##### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 16, 1999, the staff consulted with the Washington State official, Mr. Crowley of the Department of Health, State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, 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 June 3, 1999, which is 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 Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Jack Cushing,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-17746 Filed 7-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Workshop on Redefining the Role of the Division of Licensing Project Management in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC is sponsoring a workshop involving the Division of Licensing Project Management in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, licensing officials representing the nuclear industry, and other stakeholders external to the NRC. The purpose of the meeting is to provide a forum for constructive dialogue on the agency's efforts to redefine the responsibilities of the Division of Licensing Project Management. This meeting is open to the public and all interested parties may attend.

#### Discussion

The Division of Licensing Project Management (DLPM), in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), is in the process of redefining its responsibilities. Previous audits and reviews had indicated that the function of project managers needed to be reevaluated, clearly defined, and communicated. In addition, the staff is attempting to correlate the functions of DLPM with the four strategic objectives of maintaining safety, reducing unnecessary regulatory burden, increasing public confidence, and increasing efficiency and effectiveness. DLPM management has determined that the project managers have responsibility for the following three major program areas: (1) Licensing authority, (2) interactions, and (3) regulatory improvements. Within each area are several specific tasks and goals regarding timeliness, effectiveness, and quality. A summary of each program area is given below. DLPM is sharing

these proposed responsibilities with external stakeholders to solicit feedback so that the responsibilities can be further refined. The purpose of this workshop is for the staff to gain insights into the stakeholders views on the functions of the projects organization. Specific questions that the staff is requesting feedback on are listed at the end of this discussion.

### **Program Areas**

#### *Licensing Authority*

Licensing Authority is the core program area for DLPM. The project manager (PM) is expected to be the single most knowledgeable member of the staff regarding the licensing agenda for a given facility. The PM is also expected to be the most informed member of the staff in matters pertaining to a facility's licensing basis and any activities undertaken to modify or change the licensing basis. The wide range of issues involving the licensing basis of power reactors require each PM to have a technical background in terms of understanding overall plant design and operating practices as well as a thorough understanding of NRC rules, processes, and licensing requirements. The PMs are therefore expected to be "generalists" in that they must have the ability to work on a diverse number of assignments, which may or may not be interrelated. This is especially relevant when DLPM assesses its contribution and mission in support of office level goals, noting that specific technical expertise resides in other NRR divisions. Having an adequate number of generalists results in routine efficiency gains as well as providing flexibility for and improving the responsiveness of the overall organization. The DLPM example can be readily compared to the regional projects organizations in which residents are viewed as generalists and technical specialists from the regional office or NRR are called upon, as necessary, to address specific issues or inspection needs.

Activities covered in this program area include all DLPM tasks associated with carrying out the regulatory requirements contained in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 50 (10 CFR Part 50) with regard to specific plant activities. These tasks include (1) licensing actions that require prior NRC approval before licensees may proceed with an activity, (2) review of licensing basis documents controlled and submitted to the NRC in accordance with specific regulations or licensee administrative controls, (3) management of NRC processes associated with these

activities, and (4) other licensing tasks required by regulation or established NRC procedures.

DLPM activities associated with completing licensing actions comprise the majority of the division's efforts in this program area. Evaluating and responding to licensee requests for amendments to their licenses, requests for reliefs from or alternatives to the requirements specified in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, and requests for exemptions from NRC regulations are examples of licensing action tasks. The tasks included in the mandated controls category include DLPM's reviews of Updated Final Safety Analysis Reports submitted in accordance with 10 CFR 50.71, descriptions of changes, tests and experiments submitted in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59, updates to the, Quality Assurance, Security, and Emergency plans submitted in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54, and regulatory commitments not addressed by specific NRC regulations.

Other licensing tasks include those items associated with NRR's role as the licensing authority for power reactors but not addressed by the aforementioned categories. DLPM tasks in this area include evaluating information received from licensees in response to requests for information (e.g., generic letters and bulletins), responding to petitions from parties requesting NRC actions pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206, and responding to requests for assistance from other NRC organizations made via the Task Interface Agreement (TIA) procedure.

Operating Reactor Licensing Assistants provide a comprehensive review and quality assurance of licensing correspondence. These reviews ensure licensing products comply with management directives, office letters, and rules in addition to improving uniformity and consistency of effort for all licensees.

The Agency and NRR benefit from having a designated point of contact for all licensing issues associated with each power reactor facility. The project management staff can assess a licensee's performance in the licensing area, evaluate licensees' efforts to make improvements in licensing submittals, and help evaluate key licensee activities that may or may not have a direct bearing on the licensing agenda for the plant. Specifically, requiring the PMs to maintain a sound awareness of the 50.59 process and to participate in NRC's evaluation of each licensee's program for determining which changes require

NRC review and approval has a clear nexus in this program area.

In assessing products and evaluating outcomes for this area, the staff has identified products primarily in the licensing action and activity categories. These products are scrutinized by a myriad of stakeholders. NRR products continue to be closely analyzed and evaluated by the industry, individual licensees, and other stakeholders, including public interest groups. Issues of paramount concern associated with these products include assuring high quality, uniformity, consistency, and timeliness. Thus, high importance is placed in assuring all products being issued by the staff can withstand close scrutiny, and are predictable and repeatable. To this end flows the conclusion that the program area of licensing authority receives high marks when weighed against the four pillars. Specifically, licensing actions have a direct bearing on maintaining and assuring safety while also reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens. The ability to process documents in a timely manner, relying on precedents and the broad-based knowledge of plant-specific project managers, is key to ensuring effective and efficient work force outputs and the associated outcomes from this program area. Enhanced public confidence is derived from the quality of NRR products that are technically sound and defensible, completed on schedule, and well communicated to all stakeholders.

#### *Interfaces*

The DLPM interface program area covers DLPM tasks involving interactions with NRC internal and external stakeholders. These DLPM interactions include the NRC regional offices, other NRR divisions, other offices at NRC Headquarters, power reactor licensees, owners groups and other industry organizations, government organizations (local, State, and Federal), and the public. From the perspective of DLPM, the interfaces are either integral to its core activity (serving as the licensing authority for power reactor facilities), directly support the licensing authority role by providing its staff with an awareness of plant issues, or result from the project managers serving as a convenient point of contact at NRC Headquarters for plant-specific information. The interface program area presents some challenges in terms of measuring performance because many of the activities do not involve a deliverable product. Feedback from stakeholders as a measure of performance may result in some

changes in or additions to NRC processes.

Project Managers in DLPM routinely interact with their counterparts in the regional offices and with inspectors at reactor sites. A common interface with regional personnel is in the form of participation by the PM in routine status calls between the resident inspectors and the projects organization in the regional office. The PMs' participation in these calls allows DLPM to maintain an awareness of plant status, operating issues, inspection issues, and significant activities being conducted or planned by licensees. This information is used to ensure that ongoing issues are considered in the management of a plant's licensing agenda and that the NRC's inspection/assessment activities can properly account for licensing activities. The project managers also maintain an awareness of, and occasionally offer insights into, licensee performance issues through routine interactions, participation in assessment processes, and reviews of various reports.

Project Managers in DLPM act as the primary interface between NRR and licensees. The primary function of the routine interactions between DLPM and licensees is to ensure that the licensing processes are working effectively. Licensees and project managers discuss plant issues, technical positions, process or procedural matters, generic activities, future licensing submittals, and the appropriate prioritization of licensing reviews. In addition to interacting with specific licensees, DLPM has recently assumed project management and interface responsibilities for licensing activities sponsored by owners groups or other collective groups of licensees (other than the Nuclear Energy Institute).

DLPM serves as the primary interface between NRC Headquarters organizations and licensees or regional offices in matters pertaining to specific power reactor facilities. The need to communicate frequently with the regional offices and the licensees as part of their core activities enables personnel within DLPM to respond to many inquiries. This limits the numbers and types of requests for information to both the regional offices and licensees from the various organizations at NRC Headquarters. DLPM also supports other Headquarters' organizations in terms of answering questions about and coordinating activities with the licensing programs. The NRC's incident response program also calls upon the DLPM staff for support due to their knowledge of plant design features and licensing basis.

Given its licensing authority responsibility and other interface functions, DLPM is often called upon to support the NRC's interactions with the public and other external stakeholders. These activities include responding to public inquiries and supporting the NRC's allegation process. DLPM will participate in the redesign of and long-term maintenance of NRC Internet web pages that provide plant-specific information to the public.

#### *Regulatory Improvements*

The regulatory improvements program area includes tasks and activities undertaken by DLPM either at the request of licensees or in response to problems identified by NRC staff. By interacting with licensees and owners' groups in various forums, DLPM has an opportunity to address those issues that result in inefficient or ineffective use of resources and unnecessary regulatory burden. A logical role for DLPM in improving regulatory processes is drawn from the routine responsibilities that DLPM has in the licensing authority program area and the associated knowledge and skills of the DLPM staff. In general, the changes in procedures, policy, and guidance documents are undertaken to simplify existing processes associated with licensing actions and other licensing tasks. As licensee and NRC resources become more scarce, these efforts will become even more important.

The Licensing Action Task Force is currently addressing issues or processes identified by industry and the NRC staff as potential areas of improvement. The improvements being pursued include changing the request for additional information (RAI) process, developing a mechanism to address minor discrepancies in the wording of requirements in the technical specifications, refining the process for issuing changes to technical specification bases sections, enhancing the process for the staff's handling of generic or repetitive licensing actions, refining the guidance for the staff's preparation of safety evaluations, and addressing miscellaneous policy issues such as limiting the use of TIAs to address generic issues. Interactions with owners' groups are invaluable in sharing technical and process information. DLPM interactions with owners' groups and management of generic topical reports facilitates improving the working relationships between licensees and NRC, resulting in a more effective and efficient regulatory process. It is expected that industry groups will play an increasing role in resolving safety concerns by undertaking voluntary

initiatives in lieu of responding to generic communications issued by the NRC. NRC resource expenditures will be reduced due to efficiency gains resulting from these interactions. Additionally, public confidence may be enhanced by the increased consistency that comes from resolving issues generically.

Licensing workshops offer a unique and invaluable way for licensees and DLPM to interact on a working level. A goal of the workshops is to improve licensing submittals and associated NRC reviews. Licensees and DLPM staff share experiences and knowledge of their own processes to improve the licensee-NRC regulatory interface. DLPM prepares revisions to existing policies, rules, and guidance documents including office letters (or provides assistance to those with the lead for these activities). DLPM's experience with the licensee-NRC interface can provide valuable insights when process changes or rules are being developed.

#### **Questions**

During the course of the July 23, 1999, public workshop, the staff would appreciate feedback from participants on the following questions. This information will be most useful as the staff proceeds with the process to define the role of the NRR/Projects licensing organization for the future.

When providing feedback on the importance of activities, it would be helpful to the staff if comments from the public could be related to the outcome goals that are used by the staff. These outcome goals are: maintaining reactor safety; reducing unnecessary regulatory burden on licensees; increasing public confidence; and increasing NRC internal efficiency and effectiveness.

1. What do you believe should be the principle role of the Projects organization?

2. Given the proposed descriptions of activities encompassed by the licensing authority, interfaces, and regulatory improvements program areas, what five activities do you consider most important for the Projects organization to perform?

3. Why do you consider the five activities identified in response to Question 2 important with respect to the staff outcome goals? If you consider these activities important for a reason not related to the staff outcome goals, what is the reason these activities are important to you?

4. Are there any activities not identified in the licensing authority, interfaces, and regulatory improvements program areas that you consider the Projects organization should perform?

5. Why do you consider the activities identified in response to Question 4 important with respect to the staff outcome goals? If you consider these activities important for a reason not related to the staff outcome goals, what is the reason these activities are important to you?

6. What types of performance indicators would be useful for the staff to employ to objectively determine its effectiveness in performing licensing activities?

7. What five activities contained in the proposed descriptions of activities encompassed by the licensing authority, interfaces, and regulatory improvements program areas do you consider least important for the Projects organization to perform?

8. Why do you consider the activities identified in response to Question 7 of less importance with respect to the staff outcome goals?

9. Identify any activities in the proposed descriptions for the licensing authority, interfaces, and regulatory improvements program areas that the Projects organization should not perform, and provide an explanation why.

10. As a customer of the licensing organization's output, the staff welcomes any additional input that you feel would be germane to the process of redefining the role of the Projects organization.

**DATES:** July 23, 1999, from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

**LOCATION:** Auditorium—Two While Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marsha Gamberoni, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Mail Stop O 13 E4, Rockville, Maryland; Telephone 301-415-3024; Internet: mkg@nrc.gov.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** For members of the public who are unable to attend the public workshop, the staff would welcome written comments by July 30, 1999. Comments should be sent to: Marsha Gamberoni, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Mail Stop O 13 E4, Rockville, Maryland 20852-2738.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**John A. Zwolinski,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-17748 Filed 7-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

### Facility Tours

**AGENCY:** Postal Rate Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of Commission visits.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission has scheduled several visits to learn about mailing logistics, technology and trends and to observe operations.

**DATES:** July 19, 1999 through July 21, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, Postal Rate Commission, Suite 300, 1333 H Street NW., Washington, DC 20268-0001, 202-789-6820.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission has scheduled the following visits: July 19, 1999—Emery Worldwide's Bethpage Priority Mail processing plant tour (Hicksville, NY); July 20, 1999—meeting with Time Warner, Inc. executives and printing facility tour; July 21, 1999—Pitney Bowes facility tours (Shelton and Stamford, CT) and briefing on new technologies.

Dated: July 8, 1999.

**Cyril J. Pittack,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-17810 Filed 7-12-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-M

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Rel. No. IC-23891; File No. 812-11678]

### Anchor National Life Insurance Company, et al.

July 7, 1999.

**AGENCY:** Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission").

**ACTION:** Notice of application for an order pursuant to Section 26(b) and Section 17(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 ("1940 Act").

**SUMMARY OF APPLICATION:** Applicants seek an order of the Commission amending a prior order granted June 9, 1999 (Release No. IC-23868, File No. 812-11450) (the "June 9 Order"), to add Phoenix Home Life Mutual Insurance Company ("Phoenix") and the Phoenix Home Life Variable Universal Life Account ("Phoenix VUL Account", together with Phoenix, the "New Applicants") to the relief granted by the June 9 Order, with respect to certain variable universal life insurance contracts issued by Phoenix through the Phoenix VUL Account. The June 9 Order approved the substitution of: (a) Shares of the Government and Quality

Bond Portfolio of the Anchor Series Trust (the "Trust") for shares of the Fixed Income Portfolio of the Trust; and (b) shares of the Strategic Multi-Asset Portfolio of the Trust for shares of the Foreign Securities Portfolio of the Trust, each in connection with the variable annuity contracts offered by the original Variable Account Applicants, as defined below. Together, the Fixed Income Portfolio of the Trust and the Foreign Securities Portfolio of the Trust are referred to as the "Replaced Portfolios"; together, the Government and Quality Bond Portfolio of the Trust and the Strategic Multi-Asset Portfolio of the Trust are referred to as the "Substituted Portfolios".

**APPLICANTS:** Anchor National Life Insurance Company ("Anchor National"), Variable Annuity Account One of Anchor National ("AN Account"), First SunAmerica Life Insurance Company ("First SunAmerica"), Variable Annuity Account One of First SunAmerica ("FS Account"), Presidential Life Insurance Company ("Presidential"), Presidential Variable Account One ("Presidential Account"), Phoenix, Phoenix VUL Account, and the Trust (applying for relief from Section 17(a) of the 1940 Act only). Together, Anchor National, First SunAmerica, Presidential, and Phoenix are referred to as "Life Company Applicants"; together, AN Account, FS Account, Presidential Account, and Phoenix VUL Account are referred to as "Variable Account Applicants".

**FILING DATE:** The application was filed on July 1, 1999.

**HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING:** An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing on this application by writing to the Commission's Secretary and serving Applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests must be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m., on July 28, 1999, and should be accompanied by proof of service on Applicants in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the Secretary of the Commission.

**ADDRESSES:** Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20549-0609. Applicants: Anchor National, AN Account, First SunAmerica, FS Account, and Trust c/o Robert M. Zakem, Esq., SunAmerica Asset