

findings from associated baseline inspections in attributes not fully measured or not measured at all by the indicators, should provide a broad sample of data on which to assess licensee performance in those important attributes. One reason these specific indicators were proposed is because they are readily available and can be implemented in a short period of time. Other indicators will be developed and included in the oversight process as their ability to measure licensee performance is determined.

Will these PIs, along with inspection findings, be effective in determining varying levels of licensee performance?

4. Other Comments

Are there any other comments related to the oversight framework, PIs, or thresholds?

B. Risk-Informed Baseline Inspections

1. Inspectable Areas

The proposed baseline inspection program is based on a set of inspectable areas that, in conjunction with the PIs, provides enough information to determine whether the objectives of each cornerstone of safety are being met. Are there any other areas not encompassed by the inspectable areas that need to be reviewed to achieve the same goal?

2. Other Comments

Are there any other comments related to the proposed baseline inspection program?

C. Assessment Process

1. Frequency of Assessments

The proposed assessment process provides four levels of review of licensee performance: continuous, quarterly, semiannual, and annual. Each successive level is performed at a higher organizational level within the NRC. The semiannual and annual periods would coincide with an annual inspection planning process and the NRC's budgeting process. Are the proposed assessment periods sufficient to maintain a current understanding of licensee performance?

2. Action Decision Model

An action matrix was developed to provide guidance for consistently considering those actions that the NRC needs to take in response to the assessed performance of licensees. The actions are categorized into four areas (management meeting, licensee action, NRC inspection, and regulatory action) and are graded across five ranges of licensee performance. The decision to

take an action would be determined directly from the threshold assessments of PIs and inspection areas. As changes in performance become more significant, more significant actions would be considered.

The action matrix is not intended to be absolute. It establishes expectations for NRC-licensure interactions, licensee actions, and NRC actions and does not preclude taking less action or additional action, when justified.

Will the use of the action matrix and underlying decision logic reasonably result in timely and effective action?

3. Communicating Assessment Results

The proposed assessment process includes several methods for communicating information to licensees and the public. First, the information being assessed (PIs and inspection results) will be made public as the information becomes available. Second, the NRC will send each licensee a letter every 6 months that describes any changes in the NRC's planned inspections for the upcoming 6 months on the basis of licensee performance. Third, each licensee will receive an annual report that includes the NRC's assessment of the licensee's performance and any associated actions taken because of that performance. In addition to issuing the annual assessment report, the NRC will hold an annual public meeting with each licensee to discuss its performance. Finally, a public meeting with the Commission will be held annually to discuss the performance at all plants. Do these reports and meetings provide sufficient opportunity for licensees and the general public to gain an understanding of performance and to interact with the NRC?

4. Other Comments

Are there any other comments related to the proposed assessment process?

E. Implementation

1. Transition Plan

The Commission paper includes a transition plan that identifies important activities needed to complete and implement the proposed processes. Are there other major activities not identified on the plan that if not accomplished could prevent successful implementation of the proposed processes?

2. Other Comments

Are there any other comments related to implementing the new processes?

F. Additional Comments

In addition to the previously mentioned issues, commenters are invited to give any other views on the NRC assessment process that could assist the NRC in improving its effectiveness.

Correction

One of the performance indicators is incorrectly stated in two places in the attachments to SECY-99-007. On page 3 of attachment 1 and page 11 of attachment 2, the indicator for Occupational Radiation Safety reads “* * * personnel exposures exceeding 10% of the stochastic or 2% of the nonstochastic limits.” It should read “* * * personnel exposures exceeding 2% of the stochastic or 10% of the nonstochastic limits.”

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of January 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank P. Gillespie,

Chief, Inspection Program Branch, Division of Inspection & Support Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-1486 Filed 1-21-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATE: Weeks of January 19, 25, February 1 and 8, 1999.

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

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of January 18

Tuesday, January 19

2:00 p.m. Briefing on Status of Third Party Oversight of Millstone Station's Employee Concerns Program and Safety Conscious Work Environment (Public Meeting) (Contact: Bill Dean, 301-415-7380)

Wednesday, January 20

9:25 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If Needed)

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Reactor Inspection, Enforcement And Assessment (Public Meeting) (Contact: Frank Gillespie, 301-415-1275)

Week of January 25—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of January 25

Week of February 1—Tentative

Tuesday, February 2

3:30 p.m. Affirmative Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

Wednesday, February 3

2:00 p.m. Meeting with Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) (Public Meeting) (Contact: John Larkins, 301-415-7360)

Week of February 8—Tentative

Monday, February 8

2:00 p.m. Briefing on HLW Program Viability Assessment (Public Meeting)

Tuesday, February 9

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Fire Protection (Public Meeting)

11:00 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

*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: January 15, 1999.

William M. Hill, Jr.,

SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-1586 Filed 1-20-99; 2:43 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M'

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Cumulative Report on Rescissions and Deferrals

January 1, 1999.

This report is submitted in fulfillment of the requirement of Section 1014(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-344). Section 1014(e) 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 January 1, 1999, of the two deferrals contained in the first special message for FY 1999. The message was

transmitted to Congress on October 22, 1998.

Deferrals (Attachments A and B)

As of January 1, 1999, \$167.6 million in budget authority was being deferred from obligation. Attachment B shows the status of each deferral reported during FY 1999.

Information From Special Message

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

63 FR 63949-50, Tuesday, November 17, 1998

Jacob J. Lew,
Director.

Attachments

ATTACHMENT A—STATUS OF FY 1999 DEFERRALS

[in millions of dollars]

| | Budgetary resources |
|---|---------------------|
| Deferrals proposed by the President | 167.6 |
| Routine Executive releases through January 1, 1999 (OMB/Agency releases of \$0) | |
| Overtaken by the Congress | |
| Currently before the Congress | 167.6 |

BILLING CODE 3110-01-P