Stop T–8A–33, Washington, D.C. 20555. Telephone (301) 415–6251.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By its submittals dated June 15, 2001, June 25, 2001, and August 3, 2001, IUSA requested that the NRC amend Materials License SUA–1358 to allow the receipt and processing of material other than natural uranium ore (i.e., alternate feed material) at its White Mesa uranium mill located near Blanding, Utah. These materials would be used as an ''alternate feed material'' (i.e., matter that is processed in the mill to remove the uranium but which is different from natural uranium ores, the normal feed material).

IUSA is requesting to receive material from the Maywood, New Jersey FUSRAP site. The site is being remediated under the authority of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This site began operations in 1895 and over the years monazite sands were processed for thorium, lanthanum, and other rare earth elements. Uranium was not extracted and remains in the process residues. The material is currently located in three pits and is also being cleaned up from off-site properties. Material in the three pits is licensed by the NRC under STC–1333 for the Stepan Chemical Company. This license covers 19,000 cubic yards of buried tailings.

The average uranium content, based on 4000 samples, ranges from non-detectable to 0.06 weight percent, with an average grade of 0.0018 percent uranium. However, IUSA is proposing to only receive material that contains higher than 0.01 percent uranium. The thorium content of the material ranges from non-detectable to 3,800 pCi/g with an average of 970 pCi/g. The thorium content is relatively low due to thorium extraction at the Maywood site. IUSA states that hazardous wastes regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) have not been identified in this material. IUSA also proposes that verification sampling at the Maywood site will be implemented to assure that the material does not contain hazardous wastes regulated under RCRA. IUSA does not have a contract to receive this material at this time and therefore, the exact mode of transporting the materials to the mill has not been determined. Transportation may be similar to that of other alternate feed materials shipped to the mill. This would consist of inter-modal containers shipped by rail then by truck. If the maximum volume requested were to be shipped to the mill, IUSA estimates that 7500 rail cars over seven years by rail and 46–86 truckloads per week would occur. It is more likely that 206,000 cubic yards would be shipped which would consist of 46 truckloads per week. IUSA does not expect there to be an impact from the transportation of these materials due to exclusive-use containers, the small increase in truck traffic (4 to 7.4 percent), and the material will be transported in lined, covered containers.

This application will be reviewed by the staff using NRC formal guidance, ''Final Position and Guidance on the Use of Uranium Mill Feed Material Other Than Natural Ores''. The NRC has approved similar amendment requests in the past for separate alternate feed material under this license.

The amendment application is available for public inspection and copying at the NRC Public Document Room, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Headquarters, Room 0–1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852.

Notice of Opportunity for Hearing

The NRC hereby provides notice of an opportunity for a hearing on the license amendment under the provisions of 10 CFR part 2, subpart L, ''Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operator Licensing Proceedings.'' Pursuant to § 2.1205(a), any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a request for a hearing. In accordance with § 2.1205(d), a request for hearing must be filed within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The request for a hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary, either:

(1) By delivery to the Docketing and Service Branch of the Office of the Secretary at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852; or

(2) By mail or telegram addressed to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.1205(f), each request for a hearing must also be served, by delivering it personally or by mail, to:

(1) The applicant, International Uranium (USA) Corporation, Independence Plaza, Suite 950, 1050 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colorado 80265; Attention: Michelle Rehmann; and

(2) The NRC staff, by delivery to the Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, or by mail addressed to the Executive Director for Operations, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

In addition to meeting other applicable requirements of 10 CFR part 2 of the NRC's regulations, a request for a hearing filed by a person other than an applicant must describe in detail:

(1) The interest of the requestor in the proceeding;

(2) How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing, with particular reference to the factors set out in § 2.1205(h);

(3) The requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and

(4) The circumstances establishing that the request for a hearing is timely in accordance with § 2.1205(d).

The request must also set forth the specific aspect or aspects of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes a hearing.

In addition, members of the public may provide comments on the subject application within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The comments may be provided to Michael Lesar, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administration Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of August 2001.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Melvyn Leach,

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

[FR Doc. 01–21291 Filed 8–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–334 AND 50–412]

Firstenergy Nuclear Operating Company, Ohio Edison Company, Pennsylvania Power Company, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (BVPS–1 and 2); Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering issuance of an amendment to Technical Specifications (TSs) for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–66 and NPF–73, issued to FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, *et al.* (the licensee), for operation of BVPS–1 and 2, located in Shippingport, Pennsylvania. Therefore, as required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal

Regulations (10 CFR), Section 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed amendments would revise the BVPS–1 and 2 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report assumptions, descriptions, and calculated radiological consequences of a postulated fuel handling accident (FHA), including implementation of a revised accident source term for a postulated FHA. These revisions would demonstrate that the consequences of an FHA, once the fuel has undergone radioactive decay for 100 hours, would result in calculated radiation exposures within the guidelines of 10 CFR 50.67, ''Accident Source Term.'' Consistent with the assumptions and description of the revised FHA analysis, the licensee proposes to revise the BVPS–1 and 2 TSs associated with the requirements for handling irradiated fuel assemblies in the reactor containment and fuel building. The proposed amendment would also revise the TSs associated with ensuring that safety analysis assumptions for a postulated FHA are met. The term ''recently irradiated'' fuel would be defined in the applicable TS Bases as ''fuel that has occupied part of a critical reactor core within the previous 100 hours'' and the term ''recently irradiated'' fuel would be added in various locations throughout the TSs. The purpose of the addition of the term ''recently irradiated'' throughout the TSs is to establish a point where operability of those systems typically used to mitigate the consequences of an FHA is no longer required to meet the radiation exposure limits of 10 CFR 50.67. This amendment would revise the TSs to eliminate TS controls over the integrity of the fuel building and the reactor containment building and the operability of the associated building's ventilation/filtration systems after the decay period of 100 hours.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated March 19, 2001 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System [ADAMS] Accession No. ML010810433), as supplemented by letters dated July 6 (ADAMS Accession No. ML011980423), and August 8 (ADAMS Accession No. ML012260302), 2001.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action involves an accepted method for implementation of a revised accident source term for postulated design basis accident analyses (such as the FHA) in accordance with 10 CFR 50.67. The proposed action would result in a reduction in an unnecessary regulatory burden and would result in greater flexibility in execution of refueling outage operations.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the revised assumptions, descriptions, and methodologies used by the licensee for a postulated FHA for BVPS–1 and 2 follow regulatory guidance and that there is reasonable assurance that, in the event of a postulated FHA, the offsite and control room doses would be well within the 10 CFR 50.67 guidelines.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of 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 potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. 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.

Environmental Impacts of the 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

The action does not involve the use of any different resource than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements for BVPS–1 and 2, dated July 31, 1973, and September 30, 1985, respectively (Nuclear Documents Systems Accession Nos. 8907200125 and 8509300559, respectively).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

On August 9, 2001, the NRC staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. Larry Ryan of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Radiation Protection, 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.

Further details with respect to the proposed action may be found in the licensee's letter dated March 19, 2001, as supplemented by letters dated July 6, and August 8, 2001. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publically available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, *http://www.nrc.gov* (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, or 301–415–4737, or by e-mail at *pdr@nrc.gov*.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of August 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Lawrence J. Burkhart,

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

[FR Doc. 01–21287 Filed 8–22–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket Nos. 50–369 and 50–370

Duke Energy Corporation, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Process

Duke Energy Corporation (Duke) has submitted an application for renewal of