

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention 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 amendments 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, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, 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 Bryan A. Snapp, Esquire, Assoc. General Counsel, PPL Services Corporation, Inc., 2 North Ninth St., GENTW3, Allentown, PA 18101-1179, 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 amendments 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 amendments dated October 30, 2000, and supplement dated February 5, 2001, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, 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 17th day of April 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Robert G. Schaaf,**

*Project Manager, Project Manager Section 1, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01-10094 Filed 4-23-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-331]

### **Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Duane Arnold Energy Center; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR part 50, appendix G, for Facility Operating License No. DPR-49, issued to Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC, or the licensee) for operation of the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC), located in Linn County, Iowa.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR part 50), appendix G, requires that pressure-temperature (P-T) limits be established for reactor pressure vessels (RPVs) during normal operating and hydrostatic or leak rate testing conditions. Specifically, 10 CFR part 50, appendix G, states, "The appropriate requirements on both the pressure-temperature limits and the minimum permissible temperature must be met for all conditions." Appendix G of 10 CFR part 50 specifies that the requirements for these limits are the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code), Section XI, Appendix G Limits.

To address provisions of amendments to the technical specifications (TS) P-T limits, the licensee requested in its submittal dated October 16, 2000, that the staff exempt NMC from application of specific requirements of 10 CFR part 50, appendix G, and substitute use of ASME Code Case N-640. The license amendment request is being addressed as a separate action. Code Case N-640 permits the use of an alternate reference fracture toughness ( $K_{Ic}$  fracture toughness curve instead of  $K_{Ia}$  fracture toughness curve) for reactor vessel materials in determining the P-T limits. Since the  $K_{Ic}$  fracture toughness curve shown in ASME Section XI, Appendix A, Figure A-2200-1 (the  $K_{Ic}$  fracture toughness curve) provides greater allowable fracture toughness than the corresponding  $K_{Ia}$  fracture toughness curve of ASME Section XI, Appendix G, Figure G-2210-1 (the  $K_{Ia}$  fracture toughness curve), using Code Case N-640 for establishing the P-T limits would be less conservative than the methodology currently endorsed by 10 CFR part 50, appendix G and, therefore,

an exemption to apply the Code Case would be required by 10 CFR 50.60(b).

#### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed exemption is needed to allow the licensee to implement ASME Code Case N-640 in order to revise the method used to determine the reactor coolant system (RCS) P-T limits, because continued use of the present curves unnecessarily restricts the P-T operating window. Since the RCS P-T operating window is defined by the P-T operating and test limit curves developed in accordance with the ASME Section XI, Appendix G procedure, continued operation of DAEC with these P-T curves without the relief provided by ASME Code Case N-640 would unnecessarily require the RPV to maintain a temperature exceeding 212 degrees Fahrenheit in a limited operating window during the pressure test. Consequently, steam vapor hazards would continue to be one of the safety concerns for personnel conducting inspections in primary containment. Implementation of the proposed P-T curves, as allowed by ASME Code Case N-640, does not significantly reduce the margin of safety and would eliminate steam vapor hazards by allowing inspections in primary containment to be conducted at a lower coolant temperature.

In the associated exemption, the staff has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), the underlying purpose of the regulation will continue to be served by the implementation of this Code Case.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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 offsite, 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 nonradiological environmental impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological 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 "Final Environmental Statement Relating to the Operation of the Duane Arnold Energy Center," dated March 1973.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 26, 2001, the staff consulted with the Iowa State official, Mr. D. McGhee of the Department of Public Health, 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 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 letter dated October 16, 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 17th day of April 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Carl F. Lyon,**

*Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 01-10095 Filed 4-23-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Sunshine Act Meeting; Notice**

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Weeks of April 23, 30, May 7, 14, 21, 28, 2001.

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

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

#### **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

*Week of April 23, 2001*

Tuesday, April 24, 2001

10:25 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed)

10:30 a.m. Discussion of Intragovernmental Issues (Closed-Ex. 9)

*Week of April 30, 2001—Tentative*

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of April 30, 2001.

*Week of May 7, 2001—Tentative*

Thursday, May 10, 2001

10:25 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed)

10:30 a.m. Briefing on Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES) Programs and Performance (Public Meeting) (Contact: James Johnson, 301-415-6802)

Friday, May 11, 2001

10:30 a.m. Meeting with Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) (Public Meeting) (Contact: John Larkins, 301-415-7360)

*Week of May 14, 2001—Tentative*

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of May 14, 2001.

*Week of May 21, 2001—Tentative*

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of May 21, 2001.

*Week of May 28, 2001—Tentative*

Wednesday, May 30, 2001

10:25 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: David Louis Gamberoni (301) 415-1651.

\* \* \* \* \*

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm>

\* \* \* \* \*