

Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code), Section XI, Appendix G, limits.

To address provisions of amendments to the technical specifications' P-T limits, the licensee requested in its submittal dated November 20, 2000, as supplemented December 20, 2000, that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff exempt Limerick Unit 2 from application of specific requirements of Appendix G to 10 CFR part 50, and substitute use of ASME Code Case N-640. 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 Code, 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 Code, Section XI, Appendix G, Figure G-2210-01 (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 Appendix G to apply the Code Case would be required.

The Need for the Proposed Action

ASME Code Case N-640 is needed to revise the method used to determine the reactor coolant system (RCS) P-T limits, since 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 Code, Section XI, Appendix G, procedure, continued operation of Limerick Unit 2 with these P-T curves without the relief provided by ASME Code Case N-640 would unnecessarily require the licensee to maintain the RPV at a temperature exceeding 212 °F 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, would eliminate steam vapor hazards by allowing inspections in primary containment to be conducted at a lower coolant temperature.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would maintain an adequate margin of safety against brittle failure of the Limerick Unit 2 RPV.

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 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 for the Limerick Generating Station, Unit 2, dated April 1984.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 19, 2001, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, David Ney of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Findings 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 November 20, 2000, as supplemented December 20, 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 15th day of March 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Christopher Gratton, Sr.,

Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01-6981 Filed 3-20-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel; Meeting Notice

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of October 6, 1972 (Pub. L., 94-463, Stat. 770-776) the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), on October 2, 2000, announced the establishment of the Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel (IIEP). The IIEP functions as a cross-disciplinary oversight group to independently monitor and evaluate the results of the first year of implementation of the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP). A Charter governing the IIEP functions as a Federal Advisory Committee was filed with Congress on October 17, 2000, after consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration. The IIEP will hold its fifth meeting on April 2-3, 2001, in the Commission Conference Hearing Room O-1F16, located at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The IIEP meeting participants are listed below along with their affiliation:

- A. Randolph Blough—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- R. William Borchardt—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Kenneth Brockman—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Mary Ferdig—Ph. D. Candidate, Organization Development Program, Benedictine University; Ferdig Inc.

Organizational Research and Development
 Steve Floyd—Nuclear Energy Institute
 David Garchow—PSEG Nuclear
 Richard Hill—Southern Nuclear Operating Company
 Rod Krich—Exelon Corporation
 Robert Laurie—California Energy Commission
 James Moorman, III—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Loren Plisco—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Steven Reynolds—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 A. Edward Scherer—Southern California Edison Company
 James Setser—Georgia Department of Natural Resources
 Raymond Shadis—New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution
 James Trapp—U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 A tentative agenda of the meeting is outlined as follows:

April 2, 2001

9:00 a.m. Introduction/Meeting Objectives and Goals/Review of Meeting Minutes from February 26–27, 2001 Meeting
 9:30 a.m. Update from NRC Staff on the Reactor Oversight Process—Bill Dean/NRR
 —Self-Assessment Program
 —Results of the Internal/External Lessons Learned Workshops
 12:15 p.m. Lunch
 1:15 p.m. IIEP Members Feedback from the Reactor Oversight Process Lessons Learned Workshop
 2:00 p.m. Presentations by Invited Stakeholders
 3:00 p.m. Discussion of Consensus on Final List of Issues
 4:00 p.m. Panel Discussion of Narrative Developed in Support of IIEP Issues
 6:00 p.m. Adjourn

April 3, 2001 Meeting

8:00 a.m. Recap of Previous Day's Meeting/Meeting Objectives and Goals
 8:30 a.m. Panel Discussion of Narrative Developed in Support of IIEP Issues
 12:00 p.m. Lunch
 1:00 p.m. Panel Discussion of Narrative Developed in Support of IIEP Issues
 2:00 p.m. Agenda Planning Session/Public Comments/General Discussion
 3:00 p.m. Adjourn

Meetings of the IIEP are open to the members of the public. Oral or written views may be presented by the members of the public, including members of the

nuclear industry. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify Mr. Loren R. Plisco (Telephone 404/562–4501, e-mail LRP@nrc.gov) or Mr. John D. Monninger (Telephone 301/415–3495, e-mail JDM@nrc.gov) five days prior to the meeting date, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made to allow necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras will be permitted during this meeting.

Further information regarding topics of discussion; whether the meeting has been canceled, rescheduled, or relocated; and the Panel Chairman's ruling regarding requests to present oral statements and time allotted, may be obtained by contacting Mr. Loren R. Plisco or Mr. John D. Monninger between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. EST.

IIEP meeting transcripts and meeting reports will be available from the Commission's Public Document Room. Transcripts will be placed on the agency's web page.

Dated: March 15, 2001.

Andrew Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.
 [FR Doc. 01–6985 Filed 3–20–01; 8:45 a.m.]
BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97–415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97–415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from February 26 through March 9, 2001. The last biweekly notice was published on March 7, 2001 (66 FR 13797).

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public