

are currently available in the United States, and shipping the spent fuel overseas is impractical in light of the political, legal, and logistical uncertainties and the high cost. Shipping the DCPSP spent fuel to another nuclear power plant was also determined to be a non-viable alternative, because the receiving utility would have to be licensed to store the DCPSP spent fuel, and it is unlikely that another utility would be willing to accept it, in light of their own limitations on spent fuel storage capacity.

Other onsite storage alternatives considered by the applicant included increasing the capacity of the existing spent fuel pools by re-racking or spent fuel rod consolidation, or construction of a new spent fuel storage pool. The applicant has previously amended the DCPSP licenses to permit re-racking, and although further re-racking is possible, it could require extensive modifications to the spent fuel pools and supporting systems, and would not accommodate all of the spent fuel to be generated for the duration of the plant's current operating licenses. Spent fuel rod consolidation is also possible, but would require replacement of the existing storage racks to support the greater weight of the consolidated assemblies, and would require extensive operational resources to reconfigure all the fuel assemblies currently in storage. This alternative was also considered impractical, due to the high cost and the significant occupational exposure to be incurred. Similarly, although the applicant could construct an additional spent fuel pool, the high cost associated with constructing and maintaining such a facility and all of the necessary support equipment, coupled with the significant occupational exposures resulting from the extensive fuel handling operations, make this alternative impractical.

The no action alternative could result in the extended or permanent shutdown of both DCPSP units many years before the expiration of their current operating licenses, once the current capacity of the units' spent fuel pools is reached. The electrical generation capacity lost would likely be replaced by fossil-fueled plants, which could result in greater environmental impacts and higher costs for electricity. In the short-term, the shutdown of the DCPSP would have a negative impact on the local economy and infrastructure. For these reasons, the no action alternative is not considered a practical alternative.

As discussed in the EA, the Commission has concluded there are no significant environmental impacts

associated with the proposed Diablo Canyon ISFSI, and other alternatives were not pursued because of significantly higher costs, additional occupational exposures, and the unavailability of offsite storage options.

Agencies and Persons Contacted: Officials from the California Energy Commission (CEC), the California Office of Historic Preservation and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service were contacted in preparing the staff's environmental assessment. The CEC provided comments by letter dated August 12, 2003; these comments have been addressed in the EA.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The staff has reviewed the environmental impacts of the proposed ISFSI relative to the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51, and has prepared an Environmental Assessment. Based on the EA, the staff concludes that there are no significant radiological or non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed action and that issuance of a license for the interim storage of spent nuclear fuel at the Diablo Canyon ISFSI will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.31 and 51.32, a finding of no significant impact is appropriate and an environmental impact statement need not be prepared for the issuance of a materials license for the Diablo Canyon ISFSI.

Further details related to this proposed action are provided in the license application, dated December 21, 2001, as amended October 15, 2002, and the staff's EA, dated October 24, 2003. These documents and others related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at the Commission's Public Document Room, One White Flint North Building, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, or from the publicly available records component of NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC web site at: <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room). Persons who do not have access to ADAMS, or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail at pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of October, 2003.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James R. Hall,

Senior Project Manager, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 03-27328 Filed 10-29-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Revised Meeting Notice

The agenda for the 507th ACRS meeting, scheduled to be held on November 5-8, 2003, has been reorganized as noted below to facilitate effective use of the Committee's time. Notice of this meeting was previously published in the **FEDERAL REGISTER** on Friday, October 24, 2003 (68 FR 61020).

Wednesday, November 5, 2003

- Closed discussion of safeguards and security matters, scheduled to be held between 10:15 a.m. and 7 p.m., is now scheduled between 12:30 p.m. and 7 p.m. on the same day.

- Discussion of the Draft Final Regulatory Guide 1.32, Revision 3, "Criteria for Power Systems for Nuclear Plants," scheduled to be held between 10:45 a.m.-11:45 a.m. on *Thursday, November 6, 2003*, is now scheduled between 10:35 a.m. and 11:30 a.m., on *Wednesday, November 5, 2003*.

Thursday, November 6, 2003

- Discussion of the Regulatory Effectiveness of the Resolution of Unresolved Safety Issue (USI)-A45, scheduled to be held between 10:15 a.m. and 12 Noon, on *Friday, November 7, 2003*, is now scheduled between 10:45 a.m. and 11:45 a.m., on *Thursday, November 6, 2003*.

Friday, November 7, 2003

- Discussion of the Task Force report on Operating Experience, scheduled to be held between 3 p.m.-4 p.m. on *Friday, November 7, 2003*, is now scheduled between 10:15 a.m. and 11:15 a.m. on the same day.

All other items pertaining to this meeting essentially remain the same as previously published in the **Federal Register** on Friday, October 24, 2003 (68 FR 61020).

For further information, contact: Dr. Sher Bahadur, Associate Director for Technical Support, ACRS, (Telephone: 301-415-0138), between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., ET.