

ANSI N45.2.9–1974 provides requirements for the protection of nuclear power plant QA records against degradation. It specifies design requirements for use in the construction of record storage facilities when use of a single storage facility is desired. It includes specific requirements for protection against degradation mechanisms such as fire, humidity, and condensation. The requirements in ANSI N45.2.9–1974 have been endorsed by the NRC in Regulatory Guide 1.88, “Collection, Storage and Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plant Quality Assurance Records,” as adequate for satisfying the recordkeeping requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B. ANSI N45.2.9–1974 also satisfies the requirements of 10 CFR 72.72 by providing for adequate maintenance of records regarding the identity and history of the spent fuel in storage. Such records would be subject to and need to be protected from the same types of degradation mechanisms as nuclear power plant QA records.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action: Elimination of the requirement to store ISFSI records at a duplicate facility has no impact on the environment. Storage of records does not change the methods by which spent fuel will be handled and stored at the Columbia Generating Station and ISFSI and does not change the amount of any effluents, radiological or non-radiological, associated with the ISFSI.

Alternative to the Proposed Action: Since there are no environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, alternatives are not evaluated other than the no-action alternative. The alternative to the proposed action would be to deny approval of the exemption and, therefore, not allow storage of ISFSI spent fuel records at a single qualified record storage facility. However, the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative would be the same.

Agencies and Persons Consulted: On January 16, 2001, Mr. Richard Crowley of the Washington State Division of Radiation Protection, was contacted regarding the environmental assessment for the proposed action and had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The environmental impacts of the proposed action have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51. Based upon the foregoing EA, the Commission finds that the proposed action of granting an exemption from 10 CFR 72.72(d), so that Energy Northwest may store spent fuel records at the ISFSI in a single record storage facility which meets the

requirements of ANSI N45.2.9–1974, will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption is not necessary.

The request for exemption was docketed under 10 CFR Part 72, Docket 72–35. For further details with respect to this action, see the exemption request dated December 12, 2000, which is available for public inspection at the Commission’s Public Document Room, One White Flint North Building, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville Maryland 20852, 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/NRC/ADAMS/index.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of February 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

E. William Brach,

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

[FR Doc. 01–3953 Filed 2–15–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–389]

Florida Power & Light Company, et al.; St. Lucie Unit 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Part 54, Section 54.17(c), for Facility Operating License No. NPF–16, issued to Florida Power & Light Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the St. Lucie Unit 2, located in St. Lucie County, Florida.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirement of 10 CFR 54.17(c), which specifies that an applicant (for the purposes of license renewal the licensee is the applicant) may apply for a renewed operating license no earlier than 20 years before the expiration of the operating license currently in effect.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee’s application for an exemption dated October 30, 2000.

The Need for the Proposed Action

In accordance with 10 CFR 54.17(c), the earliest date that the applicant could apply for a renewed operating license for St. Lucie Unit 2 would be April 6, 2003. The proposed action would allow the applicant to file a license renewal application for St. Lucie Unit 2 earlier, and concurrent with the renewal application for St. Lucie Unit 1 which has less than 20 years before expiration of its current operating license on March 1, 2016. The request seeks only schedular relaxation without any other substantive reliefs.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. The exemption, if granted, will permit the applicant to apply for renewal of the St. Lucie Unit 2 license sooner than the schedule specified by 10 CFR 54.17(c). When the applicant does apply for license renewal, the environmental impacts of operating the St. Lucie units under the renewed licenses will then be submitted by the applicant and evaluated by the staff. In short, granting of the exemption will not necessitate, or lead to, changes to the as-built plant design, or to existing procedures at the two St. Lucie units.

The staff evaluated potential radiological environmental impacts associated with granting the requested exemption. Since no plant design or procedure changes will be made, no new accident causal mechanisms would be introduced.

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 the potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect any historic sites. The proposed action involves no plant design or procedure changes, it does not increase or decrease nonradiological plant effluents, and has no other environmental impact from those previously evaluated by the staff in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) for the St. Lucie Plant (NUREG–0842). Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological 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 FES.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 31, 2001, the staff consulted with Florida State official, William Passetti, Bureau of Radiation Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments or objections.

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 request for exemption dated October 30, 2000. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC’s Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. 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 12th day of February 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Kahtan N. Jabbour,

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

[FR Doc. 01-3952 Filed 2-15-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel; Meeting Notice

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L. 94-463, Stat. 770-776) the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), on October 2, 2000, announced the establishment of the Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel (IIEP). The IIEP functions as a cross-disciplinary oversight group to independently monitor and evaluate the results of the first year of implementation of the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP). A Charter governing the IIEP functions as a Federal Advisory Committee was filed with Congress on October 17, 2000, after consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration. The IIEP will hold its fourth meeting on February 26-27, 2001, in the ACRS Conference Room T-2B3, located at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The IIEP meeting participants are listed below along with their affiliation:

- A. Randolph Blough—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- R. William Borchardt—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Kenneth Brockman—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Mary Ferdig—Ph. D. Candidate, Organization Development Program, Benedictine University; Ferdig Inc. Organizational Research and Development
- Steve Floyd—Nuclear Energy Institute
- David Garchow—PSEG Nuclear LLC
- Richard Hill—Southern Nuclear Operating Company
- Rod Krich—Commonwealth Edison Company
- Robert Laurie—California Energy Commission
- James Moorman, III—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Loren Plisco—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Steven Reynolds—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- A. Edward Scherer—Southern California Edison Company
- James Setser—Georgia Department of Natural Resources
- Raymond Shadis—New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution
- James Trapp—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

A tentative agenda of the meeting is outlined as follows:

February 26, 2001

- 8 a.m.—Introduction/Meeting Objectives and Goals/Review of Meeting Minutes from January 22-23, 2001 Meeting
- 8:30 a.m.—Initial Prioritization of Issues Identified Through the Panel
- 12 p.m.—Lunch
- 1 p.m.—Presentations by Invited Stakeholders:
 - Steve Floyd of the Nuclear Energy Institute
 - Rich Janati of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
 - David Lochbaum of the Union of Concerned Scientists
- 5 p.m.—Adjourn

February 27, 2001 Meeting

- 8 a.m.—Recap of Previous Day’s Meeting/Meeting Objectives and Goals
- 8:30 a.m.—Presentations by Invited Stakeholders:
 - Victor Dricks of the NRC Office of Public Affairs
 - Scott Peterson of the Nuclear Energy Institute
 - Jenny Weil of McGraw Hill’s Inside NRC
- 12 p.m.—Lunch
- 1 p.m.—Initial Prioritization of Issues Identified Through the Panel (continued)
- 3 p.m.—Agenda Planning Session
- 4 p.m.—Public Comments/General Discussion
- 5 p.m.—Adjourn

Meetings of the IIEP are open to the members of the public. Oral or written views may be presented by the members of the public, including members of the nuclear industry. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify Mr. Loren R. Plisco (Telephone 404/562-4501, e-mail LRP@nrc.gov) or Mr. John D. Monninger (Telephone 301/415-3495, e-mail JDM@nrc.gov) five days prior to the meeting date, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras will be permitted during this meeting.

Further information regarding topics of discussion; whether the meeting has been canceled, rescheduled, or relocated; and the Panel Chairman’s ruling regarding requests to present oral statements and time allotted, may be obtained by contacting Mr. Loren R. Plisco or Mr. John D. Monninger between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. EST.

IIEP meeting transcripts and meeting reports will be available from the Commission’s Public Document Room. Transcripts will be placed on the agency’s web page.