

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 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.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

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 N.S. Renolds, Esq., Winston & Stran, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-3502, 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).

The Commission hereby provides notice that this a proceeding on an application for a license amendment falling within the scope of section 134 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (NWSA), 42 U.S.C. 10154. Under section 134 of the NWSA, the Commission, at the request of any party to the proceeding, must use hybrid hearing procedures with respect to "any matter which the Commission determines to be in controversy among the parties." The hybrid procedures in section 134 provide for oral argument on matters in controversy, preceded by discovery under the Commission's rules, and the designation, following argument, of only those factual issues that involve a genuine and substantial dispute, together with any remaining questions of law, to be resolved in an adjudicatory hearing. Actual adjudicatory hearings are to be held on only those issues found to meet the criteria of section 134 and set for hearing after oral argument.

The Commission's rules implementing section 134 of the NWSA are found in 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart K, "Hybrid Hearing Procedures for Expansion of Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage Capacity at Civilian Nuclear Power Reactors" (published at 50 FR 41670, October 15, 1985) to 10 CFR 2.1101 *et seq.* Under those rules, any party to the proceeding may invoke the hybrid hearing procedures by filing with the presiding officer a written request for oral argument under 10 CFR 2.1109. To be timely, the request must be filed within 10 days of an order granting a request for hearing or petition to intervene. (As outlined above, the Commission's rules in 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart G, and 2.714 in particular, continue to govern the filing of requests

for a hearing or petitions to intervene, as well as the admission of contentions.) The presiding officer shall grant a timely request for oral argument. The presiding officer may grant an untimely request for oral argument only upon showing of good cause by the requesting party for the failure to file on time and after providing the other parties an opportunity to respond to the untimely request. If the presiding officer grants a request for oral argument, any hearing held on the application shall be conducted in accordance with the hybrid hearing procedures. In essence, those procedures limit the time available for discovery and require that an oral argument be held to determine whether any contentions must be resolved in adjudicatory hearing. If no party to the proceedings requests oral argument, or if all untimely requests for oral argument are denied, then the usual procedures in 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart G, apply.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated March 27, 1997, as supplemented on April 3, and November 13, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70122.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of November 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Chandu P. Patel,**

*Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-31517 Filed 12-1-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-245]

### Northeast Nuclear Energy Company; Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License No. DPR-21, issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO or the licensee), for operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Millstone Unit 1), located in New London County, Connecticut.

**Environmental Assessment***Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would allow for a one-time scheduler exemption from the containment local leak rate testing requirements of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulation* (10 CFR) part 50, Appendix J, Option A, Sections III.D.2.(a) and III.D.3. Appendix J requires these tests to be performed at every refueling outage with the interval not to exceed 2 years. The temporary scheduler exemption would extend the interval for Type B and Type C local leak rate testing (LLRT) of containment penetrations beyond the 2-year limit of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. Instead of performing the tests within the 2-year interval, NNECO would perform the tests prior to containment integrity being required for startup from the current refueling outage.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated October 16, 1997.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed to postpone testing to maximize the use of limited resources during the current outage to allow for improving the Millstone Unit 1 Appendix J program. The postponement would also allow NNECO to avoid any additional radiation exposure and expense in testing a number of penetrations and valves more than once during the current refueling outage.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The proposed exemption would postpone the next Type B and Type C tests until prior to restart from the current refueling outage (Refueling Outage Cycle 15). The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed exemption and concluded that the Type B and Type C tests are not required to ensure that offsite doses will be acceptable. This conclusion is based on the licensee's facility remaining shut down until after the Type B and Type C tests are performed. As long as Millstone Unit 1 remains shut down, containment integrity is not required and, therefore, testing for containment integrity is not required.

The change will not 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 the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental

impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

*Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. 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 for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 30, 1997, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official, Kevin Scott of the Department of Environmental Protection, Radiation Control Section, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

**Finding of No Significant Impact**

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission 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, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and at the Waterford

Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of November 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Phillip F. McKee,**

*Deputy Director for Licensing, Special Projects Office, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-31519 Filed 12-1-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION****Sunshine Act Meeting**

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

**DATE:** Weeks of December 1, 8, 15, and December 22, 1997.

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

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:***Week of December 1*

There are no meetings the week of December 1.

*Week of December 8—Tentative*

Thursday, December 11

2:00 p.m.—Briefing on Investigative Matters (Closed—Ex. 5 & 7)

3:00 p.m.—Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

Friday, December 12

9:00 a.m.—Meeting with Northeast Nuclear on Millstone (Public Meeting) (Contact: Bill Travers, 301-415-1200)

*Week of December 15—Tentative*

Wednesday, December 17

2:00 p.m.—Briefing on Integration and Evaluation of Results from Recent Lessons-Learned Reviews (including 50.59 Process Improvements) (Public Meeting) (Contact: Eileen McKenna, 301-415-2189)

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

Thursday, December 18

10:00 a.m.—Meeting with Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) (Public Meeting) (Contact: John Larkins, 301-415-7360)

*Week of December 22—Tentative*

There are no meetings the week of December 22.

\* The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short