and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, ET 10H, 400 East Summit Hill Drive, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated June 7, 2000, as supplemented June 23 and August 24, 2000, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically through the ADAMS Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of August 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert E. Martin,

Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate II–2, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00–22958 Filed 9–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Meeting on 10 CFR Part 70—Standard Review Plan

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: NRC will host a public meeting in Rockville, Maryland. The meeting will provide an opportunity for discussion on the revised Standard Review Plan (SRP) Chapter 11 and Nuclear Energy Institute's (NEI) revised Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA) Summary guidance document. The revised SRP can be reviewed on the Internet at the following website: http://techconf.llnl.gov/cgi-bin/library?source=*&library=Part_70—lib_file.

The web site can also be reached by the following method:

1. Go the main NRC web site at: http://www.nrc.gov
2. Scroll down towards the bottom of that page and click on the word ''Rulemaking.''
3. Scroll down on the Rulemaking page till you see the words ''Technical Conference.'' Click on those words.
4. On the page titled ''Welcome to the NRC Technical Conference Forum,'' click where it says to participate in Technical Conferences.
5. Scroll down to the topic ''Draft Standard Review Plan and Guidance on Amendment to 10 CFR Part 70.''
6. Select ''Document Library.''

PURPOSE: This meeting will provide an opportunity to discuss any comments on the staff's recently revised Chapter 11.

DATES: The meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 12, 2000, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The meeting is open to the public.

ADDRESSES: Technical Training Center T–3B–43 at Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. Visitor parking around the NRC building is limited; however, the meeting site is located adjacent to the White Flint Station on the Metro Red Line.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Heather Astwood, Project Manager, Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle and Safeguards, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone: (301) 415–5819, e-mail *hma@nrc.gov.*

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 31st day of August, 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Philip Ting,

Chief, Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 00–22957 Filed 9–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Notice of Public Meeting to Present Draft Plan for Using Risk Information in NMSS—Case Studies

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

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 draft plan for using risk-informed approaches in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS). The plan includes case studies to examine the use of risk information in NMSS. The purpose of the case studies is (1) to illustrate what has been done and what could be done in NMSS to alter the regulatory approach in a risk-informed manner, and (2) to establish a framework for using a risk-informed approach in NMSS. The purpose of the meeting is to communicate the draft plan to the public and receive feedback. The meeting is open to the public and all interested parties may attend and provide comments.

DATES: The meeting will be held on September 21, 2000, from 9 a.m. to 12 noon, in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory

Commission Auditorium, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Marissa Bailey, Mail Stop T–8-A–23, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Telephone: (301) 415–8531; Internet: MGB@NRC.GOV.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Draft Plan for Using Risk Information in NMSS—Case Studies

Background

In SECY–99–100, ''Framework for Risk-informed Regulation in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards,'' dated March 31, 1999, the NRC staff proposed a framework for risk-informed regulation in NMSS. 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 NMSS, 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 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.

Purpose

The purpose of the case studies is (1) to illustrate what has been done and what could be done in NMSS to alter the regulatory approach in a risk-informed manner, and (2) to establish a framework for using a risk-informed approach in NMSS 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 NMSS regulatory applications.

The case studies will also be used to begin the process of developing safety goals for NMSS applications. Specifically, safety goal parameters (*e.g.*, public, worker, acute fatality, latent fatality, injury, property damage, environment damage, safeguards, absolute vs. relative) should be identified in each study. Each case study will determine the feasibility of safety goals in that area. If feasible, a first draft of safety goals will be developed.

All case studies will have these general objectives. However, certain case studies may have specialized objectives. For example, as one type of test of the screening criteria, a case study will be chosen in an area that the staff intuitively feels might not pass the screening criteria. These additional objectives are discussed in the case study outline which is included in this plan.

The intent of the case studies is not to reopen or reassess previous decisions made by the staff and the Commission. The information gained by performing the case studies may impact future decisions to be made by the staff and the Commission.

Questions have been developed for each case study to answer. Answering these questions will guide the case studies to meet the objectives outlined below. Each case study will be of limited scope, but collectively, the case studies will cover a broad spectrum of NMSS regulatory applications. The case studies have been selected in areas that the staff believes would specifically help in establishing a framework, as well as areas that would help to set the groundwork for establishing safety goals.

Objectives

Case studies will have the following objectives: (1) Objective 1—Produce a final version of the NMSS screening criteria. (2) Objective 2—Illustrate how the application of risk information has improved or could improve a particular area of the NMSS regulatory process. (3) Objective 3—Determine the feasibility of safety goals in a particular area. If feasible, develop safety goal parameters, and a first draft of safety goals. If infeasible, document the reasons.

Draft Screening Criteria

Draft screening criteria were published in the **Federal Register** Notice (65 FR 14323, March 16, 2000) announcing the April 2000 workshop. On the basis of comments received at the workshop and discussions with the NMSS Risk Steering Group, the criteria have been revised. The revised draft screening criteria are as follows:

1. Would a risk-informed regulatory approach help to resolve a question with respect to maintaining or improving the activity's safety?
2. Could a risk-informed regulatory approach improve the efficiency or the effectiveness of the NRC[1] regulatory process?
3. Could a risk-informed regulatory approach reduce unnecessary regulatory burden for the applicant or licensee?
4. Would a risk-informed approach help to effectively communicate a regulatory decision or situation?

If the answer to any of the above is yes, proceed to additional criteria; if not, the activity is considered to be screened out.

5. Do information (data) and analytical models exist that are of sufficient quality or could they be developed to support risk-informing a regulatory activity?

If the answer to criterion 5 is yes, proceed to additional criteria; if not, the activity is considered to be screened out.

6. Can startup and implementation of a risk-informed approach be realized at a reasonable cost to the NRC,[1] applicant or licensee, and/or the public, and provide a net benefit? The net benefit

[1] For those regulatory processes in which Agreement States are involved, this criterion is applicable to Agreement States.

will be considered to apply to the public, the applicant or licensee, and the NRC. [1] The benefit to be considered can be improvement of public health and safety, improved protection of the environment, improved regulatory efficiency and effectiveness, improved communication to the public, and/or reduced regulatory burden (which translates to reduced cost to the public.)

If the answer to criterion 6 is yes, proceed to additional criteria; if not, the activity is considered to be screened out.

7. Do other factors exist (e.g., legislative, judicial, adverse stakeholder reaction) which would preclude changing the regulatory approach in an area, and therefore, limit the utility of implementing a risk-informed approach?

If the answer to criterion 7 is no, a risk-informed approach may be implemented; if the answer is yes, the activity may be given additional consideration or be screened out.

Measures of Success

Success of the case studies will be measured by the following: (1) If, based on the testing of the draft screening criteria, final screening criteria are established, the case studies will, collectively, meet Objective 1; (2) if a case study can illustrate how the application of risk information has affected or could affect and improve a particular area of the regulatory process, the case study will meet Objective 2; and (3) if a case study can determine the feasibility of establishing safety goals, and if feasible, develop the necessary safety goal parameters and a first draft of goals, the case study will meet Objective 3.

When completed, the staff will present the results of the spectrum of case studies to the Commission.

Case Study Outline

I. Revise draft screening criteria based on workshop and other suggestions (completed prior to September 21, 2000, meeting).

II. Meet with the NRC historian.

III. Review tables from the NRC–EPA risk harmonization effort and other sources such as the National Academy of Sciences study to uncover any implicit objectives (goals) under the existing regulatory framework. Glean insights on any potential underlying safety goals.

IV. Case Study Areas.

A. Gas Chromatographs (new and old designs, the line between general licenses and specific licenses for almost identical devices is unclear—illustrate how the application of risk information could improve a particular area of the regulatory process)

B. Fixed Gauges (some are specifically licensed, and others are under a general license; regulatory criteria for general versus specific license are not based on risk—illustrate how the application of risk information could improve a particular area of the regulatory process; also, this could be a test case for a safety goal on property damage)

C. Site Decommissioning—the study may focus on certain well decommissioning incidents and certain selected sites (elements of implied safety goals may be found in Commission decisions)

D. Uranium Recovery Facilities (gaps in the regulations may be found; helpful in testing the screening criteria; if determined to be a good candidate for using risk, develop and use risk information for new Part 41 rulemaking effort)

E. Radioactive Material Transportation (elements of existing, implicit safety goals may be found in Commission decisions; public confidence and communication issue)

F. Part 76 (decide to use expanded risk information for gaseous diffusion plants or document the reasons why risk information will not improve the regulatory process in this area—contrast with new Part 70 approach; this decision-making process will be a good test for the draft screening criteria and will help establish consistency in applying risk information across NMSS programs; also, possibly an area to look at chemical risks.)

G. Spent Fuel Interim Storage (study probabilistic hazards analysis exemptions and proposed rulemaking—implicit safety goals may be found; public confidence issues and burden considerations)

H. Static Eliminators (public confidence issue; risk communication issue—regulatory changes were made even though perceived risk was low)

V. Case Study Structure.

A. Develop a set of questions for all case studies to answer.

B. Select a case-specific contact in each NMSS Division; obtain agreement with the Divisions on participation.

C. Public meeting to announce our plan for case studies (September 21, 2000).

D. Make any necessary revisions to plan based on input from public meeting.

E. Develop detailed approach and timeline for each case study including the need and level of involvement of contractor support.

F. Begin work on case studies.

G. Test screening criteria for each case study.

H. Answer all questions for each case study.

I. Meet with case-specific stakeholders as input to case studies.

J. Develop recommendations for safety goals (will be done in parallel with above).

K. Document results.

L. Conduct public meeting to present results of case studies.

M. Inform Commission of results.

VI. Assess the Outcome and Develop a Plan to Move Forward.

Draft Questions for Case Studies

A. Screening criteria analysis/risk analysis questions:

1. What risk information is currently available in this area? (Have any specific risk studies been done?)

2. What is the quality of the study? (Is it of sufficient quality to support decision-making?)

3. What additional studies would be needed to support decision-making and at what cost?

4. How is/was risk information used and considered by the NRC and licensee in this area?

5. What is the societal benefit of this regulated activity?

6. What is the public perception/acceptance of risk in this area?

7. What was the outcome when this application was put through the draft screening criteria? Did this application pass any of the screening criteria? Does the outcome seem reasonable? Why or why not?

B. Safety goal analysis questions:

1. What is the basis for the current regulations in this area (*e.g.,* legislative requirements, international compatibility, historical events, public confidence, undetermined, etc.)?

2. Are there any explicit safety goals or implicit safety goals embedded in the regulations, statements of consideration, or other documents (an example would be the acceptance of a regulatory exemption based in part on a risk analysis and the outcome)?

3. What was the basis for the development of the strategic goals, performance goals, measures and metrics? How are they relevant/applicable to the area being studied and how do they relate/compare with the regulatory requirements? How would they relate to safety goals in this area?

4. Are there any safety goals, limits, or other criteria implied by decisions or evaluations that have been made that are relevant to this area?

5. If safety goals were to be developed in this area, would tools/data be available for measurement?

6. Who are/were the populations at risk?

7. What are/were, and what could be/have been, the various consequences to the populations at risk?

8. What parameters should be considered for the safety goals (*e.g.,* workers vs. public, individual vs. societal, accidents vs. normal operations, acute vs. latent fatality or serious injury, environmental and property damage)?

9. On the basis of the answers to the questions above, would it be feasible to develop safety goals in this regulatory area?

10. What methods, data results, safety goals, or regulatory requirements would be necessary to make it possible to risk-inform similar cases?

C. Questions upon development of draft safety goals:

1. Are the current regulations sufficient in that they reflect the objectives of the draft goals? Would major changes be required?

2. Would the regulations need to be tightened?

3. Are the regulations overly conservative and/or too prescriptive with respect to the goals?

4. If these were the safety goals, what decisions would be made?

5. Would these goals be acceptable to the public?

The meeting will include a presentation of the draft plan and an opportunity for interested government agencies, organizations, and individuals to provide comments on the draft plan. Persons who wish to attend the meeting should contact Marissa Bailey no later than September 19, 2000.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 31st day of August, 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Lawrence E. Kokajko,

Section Chief, Risk Task Group, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 00–22956 Filed 9–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Human Interaction With Reused Soil: A Literature Search; Draft NUREG–1725 for Public Comment

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Extension of public comment period for Draft NUREG–1725.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is extending the public comment period for Draft NUREG–1725 ''Human Interaction with Reused Soil: A Literature Search.''

DATES: Submit comments by November 17, 2000. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Mail written comments to: David L. Meyer, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T–6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Copies of the Draft NUREG report can be obtained through the NRC website address: *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/NUREGS/SR1725/index.html* (please note the URL is case sensitive) or by request to the NRC staff contact, Thomas J. Nicholson.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas J. Nicholson; e-mail: *tjn@nrc.gov.* telephone: (301) 415–6268; Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Mail Stop T–9F31, USNRC, Washington DC 20555–0001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued Draft NUREG–1725 ''Human Interaction with Reused Soil: A Literature Search'' on July 19, 2000 for a 60-day public comment period (closing date was originally September 18, 2000). Copies of the report were sent to Land-Grant University and selected Federal Agency libraries for review and comment. This activity is a joint effort by the NRC Staff and the National Agricultural Library (NAL) staff of the U.S. Department of Agriculture working under an Interagency Agreement with the NRC. The comment period is being extended for an additional 60 days to allow for responses from the Land-Grant University and Federal Agency libraries. The report presents the literature and INTERNET search strategies for identifying documented information sources on types of soil reuse. The report discusses how this information will be used to establish the technical bases for evaluating possible dose impacts from the reuse of soils from NRC-licensed facilities. Information received through the public comment process will assist the NRC staff in developing technical bases for characterizing soil reuse practices and related dose assessment scenarios.

Specifically, the NRC staff is seeking information through comments on Draft NUREG–1725 regarding potential uses of soil which may be excavated and transported offsite from NRC-licensed facilities for use in commerce or by the general public. This information will assist in developing a reasonably complete characterization of relevant usages for these reused soils. The soil reuse scenarios would include, but not be limited to, soil processing, construction and agricultural uses, and other commercial and residential uses of reused soil and soil-related products. The goal of the solicitation of comments on the Draft NUREG–1725 report is to further the development of technical bases and the supporting documentation that could be used to characterize the soil reuse scenarios.

Electronic Access: Information on draft NUREG–1725 for public comment can be accessed using the following NRC website address: *http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/NUREGS/SR1725/index.html* (please note the URL is case sensitive) or by notifying the NRC staff contact, Thomas J. Nicholson.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of August 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Cheryl A. Trottier,

Chief, Radiation Protection, Environmental Risk and Waste Management Branch, Division of Risk Analysis and Applications, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 00–22959 Filed 9–6–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 35–27225]

Filings Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended (''Act'')

September 1, 2000.

Notice is hereby given that the following filing(s) has/have been made with the Commission pursuant to provisions of the Act and rules promulgated under the Act. All interested persons are referred to the application(s) and/or declaration(s) for complete statements of the proposed transaction(s) summarized below. The application(s) and/or declaration(s) and any amendment(s) is/are available for public inspection through the Commission's Branch of Public Reference.

Interested persons wishing to comment or request a hearing on the application(s) and/or declaration(s) should submit their views in writing by September 22, 2000, to the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC 20549–0609, and serve a copy on the relevant applicant(s) and/or declarant(s) at the address(es) specified below. Proof of service (by affidavit or, in the case of an attorney at law, by certificate) should be filed with the request. Any request for hearing should identify specifically the issues of facts or law that are disputed. A person