The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By December 16, 1999, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, *http://www.nrc.gov* (the Electronic Reading Room). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

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 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 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 Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037, 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).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated November 8, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and 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 9th day of November, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jack N. Donohew,

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

[FR Doc. 99–29841 Filed 11–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–412]

Duquesne Light Co., Ohio Edison Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Toledo Edison Co., Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 2; 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. NPF–73, issued to Duquesne Light Company (the licensee), for operation of the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 2 (BVPS–2), located in Beaver County, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would authorize changes to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) for the facility. Specifically, the proposed action would authorize changes to the UFSAR to reflect revisions to the radiological dose calculations for the locked rotor accident (LRA) analysis. The BVPS–2 UFSAR would be revised as follows: in Table 15.0–11, atmospheric dispersion values for the LRA analysis would be added; in Table 15.0–12, the Exclusion Area Boundary (EAB) thyroid dose would be revised from 32.5 REM to 37 REM, the EAB Gamma (whole body) dose would be revised from 3.41 REM to 3.6 REM, and the EAB Beta dose would be revised from 2.09 REM to 2.2 REM; in Table 15.0–12, the Low Population Zone (LPZ) thyroid dose would be revised from 14.4 REM to 16 REM, the LPZ Gamma dose would be revised from .348 REM to .36 REM, and the LPZ Beta dose would be revised from .217 REM to .23 REM; the control room dose for the LRA in Table 15.0–12 would be changed so that thyroid dose would be revised from 1.1 REM to 1.7 REM, Gamma dose would be revised from .011 REM to .016 REM, and the Beta dose would be revised from .15 REM to .23 REM; additionally, Table 15.3–3 would be revised to include control room ventilation flow rates assumed in the LRA analysis.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated January 29, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated November 9, 1998, and June 14, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

As a result of issues involving control room habitability, the licensee re-evaluated Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2 (BVPS–1 and BVPS–2) control room dose calculations for Design Basis Accidents (DBA) which credited isolation of the control room during DBA. When analyses associated with the BVPS–2 LRA were reviewed, the licensee identified the need to incorporate more conservative assumptions into the control room dose calculations as well as the calculations for the EAB and LPZ. Therefore, it is necessary to revise the analysis and the BVPS–2 UFSAR. Pursuant to 10 CFR part 50, Section 59, the licensee determined the proposed revisions to be an unreviewed safety question and requested NRC approval of the proposed changes.

The change is not the result of hardware changes to the plant or a change in operating practices. It reflects corrected analysis results only and allows correction of the licensing basis to reflect conservative assumptions used in the revised dose analysis for the LRA.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the assumptions and methodology used by the licensee in the reanalysis are acceptable and that there is reasonable assurance, in the event of a postulated LRA, that the postulated LPZ and EAB doses would continue to be well within the 10 CFR part 100 guidelines, and the control room operator doses would continue to be less than the 10 CFR part 50, appendix A, General Design Criterion 19 guidelines.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents (although the revisions result in slightly higher calculated doses for the EAB, LPZ, and control room as discussed above), 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 potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission 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 for the BVPS–2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 27,1999, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. M. Murphy of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Bureau, Division of Nuclear Safety, 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 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 January 29, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated November 9, 1998, and June 14, 1999, which are 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 B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of November 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Daniel S. Collins,

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

[FR Doc. 99–29840 Filed 11–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Workshop on License Renewal

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of public workshop.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has scheduled a public workshop to gather comments from stakeholders on programs for managing the effects of aging on nuclear power plants for license renewal. The agency is developing a Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) report that will document the basis for determining when existing aging management programs are adequate and when they should be modified or augmented for license renewal.

DATES: December 6, 1999, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held in the NRC's Auditorium at Two White