

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(c).

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

1. The licensee, Schott Glass Technologies, Inc., Attention: Thomas McDonald, Manager, Environmental and Safety, 400 York Avenue, Duryea, Pennsylvania 18642; and

2. The NRC staff, by delivery to the Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852-2738 or by mail, addressed to the Executive Director for Operations, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

For further details with respect to this action, the application for amendment request is available for inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555 or at NRC's Region I offices located at 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406. Persons desiring to review documents at the Region I Office should call Ms. Sheryl Villar at (610) 337-5239 several days in advance to assure that the documents will be readily available for review.

Dated at King of Prussia, Pennsylvania this 6th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

A. Randolph Blough,

Director, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety Region I.

[FR Doc. 98-6824 Filed 2-16-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-029-LA; ASLBP No. 98-736-01-LA]

Yankee Atomic Electric Company; Establishment of Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972, published in the **Federal Register**, 37 F.R. 28710 (1972), and Sections 2.105, 2.700, 2.702, 2.714, 2.714a, 2.717, 2.721 of the Commission's Regulations, all as amended, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is being established to preside over the following proceeding.

Yankee Atomic Electric Company, Yankee Nuclear Power Station

This Board is being established pursuant to the requests for hearing

submitted by petitioners, the New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution, the Citizens Awareness Network, the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, and the Franklin Regional Council of Governments. The requests were submitted in response to an amendment request of the Yankee Atomic Electric Company. The NRC has made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The amendment considered by the staff is the License Termination Plan for the Yankee Rowe Nuclear Power Station submitted for consideration on May 15, 1997. The findings of the staff is published in the **Federal Register** (63 F.R. 4308, 4328).

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges:

James P. Gleason, Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Thomas D. Murphy, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Thomas S. Elleman, 704 Davidson Street, Raleigh, NC 27609

All correspondence, documents and other materials shall be filed with the Judges in accordance with 10 CFR 2.701.

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of March 1998.

B. Paul Cotter, Jr.,

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 98-6782 Filed 3-16-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 72-20]

Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the U.S. Department of Energy To Construct and Operate an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation To Store the Three Mile Island Unit 2 Spent Fuel at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory

Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has published a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) (NUREG-1626) regarding the U.S. Department Of Energy's (DOE) proposed construction and operation of an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) to store the Three Mile Island Unit 2 (TMI-2) spent fuel at

the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL).

As part of its overall spent nuclear fuel (SNF) management program, the DOE has prepared a final programmatic environmental impact statement that provides an overview of the spent fuel management proposed for INEEL, including the construction and operation of the TMI-2 ISFSI (the DOE SNF EIS). In addition, the DOE—Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID) has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) to describe the environmental impacts associated with the stabilization of the Test Area North (TAN) storage pool and the construction/operation of the ISFSI at the Idaho Chemical Processing Plant (ICPP). As provided in NRC's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures outlined in 10 CFR Part 51, Appendix A to Subpart A, a FEIS of another Federal agency may be adopted in whole or in part in accordance with the procedures outlined in 40 CFR 1506.3 of the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Under 40 CFR 1506.3(b), if the actions covered by the original EIS and the proposed action are substantially the same, the agency adopting another agency's statement is not required to recirculate it except as a final statement.

The NRC has determined that its proposed action of issuing a license authorizing the construction and operation of the TMI-2 ISFSI is substantially the same as actions considered in 2 DOE's environmental documents referenced above and, therefore, has elected to adopt the DOE documents as the NRC FEIS. The NRC staff has independently reviewed the DOE SNF EIS and the DOE-ID EA to determine that they are current and that NRC NEPA procedures have been satisfied. The format used has been to excerpt from the DOE NEPA documents a description of the proposed action, an evaluation of alternative actions, a description of the affected environment, and an evaluation of the impacts of both construction and operation of the ISFSI. The NRC staff concludes that the facility can be constructed and operated with small and acceptable effects on the public and the existing environment at the INEEL.

The FEIS is available for public inspection and copying at the Commission's Public Document Room at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC and at the Local Reading Room at the INEEL Technical Library, 1776 Science Center Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Dr. Edward Y. Shum, Spent Fuel Licensing Section, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone 301-415-8545.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Charles J. Haughney,

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

[FR Doc. 98-6780 Filed 3-16-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-331]

IES Utilities Inc., Central Iowa Power Cooperative, Corn Belt Power Cooperative, and Duane Arnold Energy Center; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-49 issued to IES Utilities Inc., (the licensee), for operation of the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC), located in Linn County, Iowa.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed amendment will revise the existing Technical Specifications (TS) in their entirety and incorporate the guidance provided in NUREG-1433, Revision 1, "Standard Technical Specifications, General Electric Plants BWR/4," dated April 1995. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated October 30, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated June 10, September 5, 17, 25, and 30, October 16, November 18 and 21, December 8 and 15, 1997, January 2, 5, 12, 22 and 23, and February 10 and 26, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all plants would benefit from improvement and standardization of TS. The "NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," (52 FR 3788) contained proposed criteria for defining the scope of technical specifications. Later, the "NRC Final Policy Statement on TS Improvement for Nuclear Power Reactors," (58 FR 39132) incorporated lessons learned

since publication of the interim policy statement and formed the basis for recent revision to 10 CFR 50.36. The "Final Rule" (60 FR 36953) codified criteria for determining the content of technical specifications. To facilitate the development of standard TS, each vendor owners' group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the STS, made note of its safety merits, and indicated its support of conversion by operating plants to the STS. For DAEC, the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) are NUREG-1433, Revision 1, "Standard Technical Specifications, General Electric Plants BWR/4," dated April 1995. This document formed the basis for DAEC Improved TS (ITS) conversion.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed revision to the TS is based on NUREG-1433, and on guidance provided in the Final Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the existing TS. Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding. The Bases section has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG-1433, portions of the existing TS were also used as the basis for the development of the DAEC ITS. Plant-specific issues (unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed at length with the licensee.

The proposed changes from the existing TS can be grouped into four general categories. These groupings are characterized as administrative changes, technical changes—relocations, technical changes—more restrictive, and technical changes—less restrictive. They are described as follows:

1. Administrative changes are those that involve restructuring, renumbering, rewording, interpretation, and rearranging of requirements and other changes not affecting technical content or substantially revising an operational requirement. The reformatting, renumbering, and rewording processes reflect the attributes of NUREG-1433 and do not involve technical changes to the existing TSs. The proposed changes include (a) providing the appropriate numbers, etc., for NUREG-1433 bracketed information (information that must be supplied on a plant-specific basis, and which may change from plant to plant), (b) identifying plant-specific wording for system names, etc., and (c) changing NUREG-1433 section wording to conform to existing licensee

practices. Such changes are administrative in nature and do not affect initiators of analyzed events or assumed mitigation of accident or transient events.

2. Technical changes—relocations are those changes involving relocation of requirements and surveillances from the existing TS to licensee-controlled documents, for structures, systems, components, or variables that do not meet the criteria for inclusion in the Improved Technical Specifications. Relocated changes are those existing TS requirements that do not satisfy or fall within any of the four criteria specified in the Commission's Final Policy Statement and 10 CFR 50.36, and may be relocated to appropriate licensee-controlled documents.

The licensee's application of the screening criteria is described in Volume 1 of its October 30, 1996, application titled, "Duane Arnold Energy Center Improved Technical Specifications Split Report and Relocated CTS Pages." The affected structures, systems, components, or variables are not assumed to be initiators of events analyzed in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) and are not assumed to mitigate accident or transient events analyzed in the UFSAR. The requirements and surveillances for these affected structures, systems, components, or variables will be relocated from the existing TS to administratively controlled documents such as the UFSAR, the BASES, or other licensee-controlled documents. Changes made to these documents will be made pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59 or other appropriate control mechanisms. In addition, the affected structures, systems, components, or variables are addressed in existing surveillance procedures which are also subject to 10 CFR 50.59.

3. Technical Changes—more restrictive are those changes that involve more stringent requirements for operation of the facility or eliminate existing flexibility. These more stringent requirements do not result in operation that will alter assumptions relative to mitigation of an accident or transient event. Also, other more restrictive technical changes have been made to achieve consistency, correct discrepancies, and remove ambiguities from the specification.

4. Technical changes—less restrictive are changes where current requirements are relaxed or eliminated, or new flexibility is provided. The more significant "less restrictive" requirements are justified on a case-by-case basis. When requirements have