

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.

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, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice

period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to William H. Bateman, Director, Project Directorate IV-2, MS O-13-E-18, Washington, D.C. 20555: petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to M.H. Philips, Jr., Esq., Winston & Strawn, 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).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated October 26, 1995, 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 Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
James W. Clifford,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-4943 Filed 3-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425]

**Georgia Power Company, et al.; Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-68 and NPF-81, issued to Georgia Power Company, et al. (the licensee) for operation of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (Vogtle), Units 1 and 2, located at the licensee's site in Burke County, Georgia.

**Environmental Assessment**

*Identification of Proposed Action*

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application dated May 1, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated August 3 and 9, September 22, November 20, and December 21, 1995, and January 26 and 30, 1996. The proposed action will replace the existing Vogtle Technical Specifications (TS) in their entirety with a new set of TS based on Revision 1 to NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications Westinghouse Plants," and the existing VEGP TS.

*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, February 6, 1987), and later the Final Policy Statement (58 FR 39132, July 22, 1993), formalized this need. To facilitate the development of individual improved TS, each reactor vendor owners group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS (STS). For Westinghouse plants, the STS are published as NUREG-1431, and this document was the basis for the new Vogtle TS. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the STS and made note of the safety merits of the STS and indicated its support of conversion to the STS by operating plants.

*Description of the Proposed Change*

The proposed revision to the TS is based on NUREG-1431 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-1431, portions of the existing TS were also used as the basis for the improved TS (ITS). Plant-specific issues (unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed at length with the licensee, and generic matters with the OG.

The proposed changes from the existing TS can be grouped into four general categories, as follows:

1. Non-technical (administrative) changes, which were intended to make the ITS easier to use for plant operations personnel. They are purely editorial in nature or involve the movement or reformatting of requirements without affecting technical content. Every section of the Vogtle TS has undergone these types of changes. In order to ensure consistency, the NRC staff and the licensee have used NUREG-1431 as guidance to reformat and make other administrative changes.

2. Relocation of requirements, which includes items that were in the existing Vogtle TS but did not meet the criteria set forth in the Final Policy Statement for inclusion in the TS. In general, the proposed relocation of items in the Vogtle TS to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), appropriate plant-specific programs, procedures and ITS Bases follows the guidance of the Westinghouse STS (NUREG-1431). Once these items have been relocated by removing them from the TS to licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC staff-approved control mechanisms, which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes.

3. More restrictive requirements, which consist of proposed Vogtle ITS items that are either more conservative than corresponding requirements in the existing Vogtle TS, or are additional restrictions that are not in the existing Vogtle TS but are contained in NUREG-1431. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition of Operation (LCO) on plant equipment that is not required by the present TS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

4. Less restrictive requirements, which are relaxations of corresponding requirements in the existing Vogtle TS that provide little or no safety benefit and place unnecessary burdens on the licensee. These relaxations were the result of generic NRC actions or other analyses. They have been justified on a

case-by-case basis for Vogtle as will be described in the staff's Safety Evaluation to be issued with the license amendments, which will be noticed in the Federal Register.

In addition to the changes described above, the licensee proposed certain changes to the existing TS that deviated from the STS in NUREG-1431. Each of these additional proposed changes is described in the licensee's application and in the staff's Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Opportunity for a Hearing (60 FR 46633). These changes have been justified on a case-by-case basis for Vogtle as will be described in the staff's Safety Evaluation to be issued with the license amendments.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed TS conversion would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents.

Changes that are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TS, and are acceptable. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operator's control of the plant in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements to licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which ensures continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found to be in conformance with the guidelines of NUREG-1431 and the Final Policy Statement, and, therefore, are acceptable.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to be acceptable and are likely to enhance the safety of plant operations.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit or to place unnecessary burdens on the licensee, their removal from the TS was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic NRC action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG and found to be acceptable for Vogtle. Generic

relaxations contained in NUREG-1431 as well as proposed deviations from NUREG-1431 have also been reviewed by the NRC staff and have been found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revision to the TS was found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided so that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

These TS changes will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Therefore, 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 involves 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 amendments, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to this action would be to deny the request for amendments. Such action would not reduce the environmental impacts of plant operations.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to the operation of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 8, 1996, the staff consulted with the Georgia State official, Mr. James Hardeman of the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, 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 amendments.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated May 1, 1995, and supplemental letters dated August 3 and 9, September 22, November 20, and December 21, 1995, and January 26 and 30, 1996, 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 Burke County Library, 412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
Leonard A. Wiens,  
*Acting Director, Project Directorate II-2,  
Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of  
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
[FR Doc. 96-4942 Filed 3-1-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

### Notice of Organization of Agreement States Technical Workshop

**AGENCY:** U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and Agreement State staffs plan to hold a public meeting with various vendors for the purpose of discussing and clarifying an NRC draft Information Notice on how radiography licensees can verify that their associated equipment meets the requirements of 10 CFR 34.20. Vendors are being invited to provide procedures for identifying associated equipment they manufacture. Agreement States are States which have assumed regulatory authority over certain radioactive materials. NRC expects to use the findings from this meeting to finalize an Information Notice on identification of associated equipment. This meeting will be held a day in advance of the previously announced March 5-6, 1996 Organization of Agreement States technical meeting, in which Agreement State Program issues, including this issue, will be discussed with Agreement State technical representatives (61 FR 5414).

**DATES:** The meeting will be held from 2:00 p.m. til 5:00 p.m on March 4, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Red Lion Inn at the Quay, 100

Columbia Street, Vancouver, Washington, 360/694-8341. Vancouver is located directly across the Columbia River from Portland, Oregon, and is served by the Portland airport.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James H. Myers, Office of State Programs, Mail Stop OWFN-3-D-23, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Telephone 301/415-2328.

**CONDUCT OF THE MEETING:** The meeting will be conducted in a manner that will expedite the orderly conduct of business. The following procedures apply to public attendance at the meeting:

1. Questions or statements will be entertained as time permits on a first-come, first-served basis, following discussion and summary.

2. Seating will be on a first-come, first-served basis.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of February, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
Richard L. Bangart,  
*Director, Office of State Programs.*  
[FR Doc. 96-4941 Filed 3-1-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

### Notice of Spent Fuel Storage and Transportation Public Workshop

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission will conduct a public workshop on May 17, 1996, to discuss the NRC's Spent Fuel Storage and Transportation Program. This program focuses the agency's efforts on the important issues associated with interim storage and transportation of spent fuel from the nation's nuclear power generators. The purpose of the workshop is to provide applicants, licensees, and other interested parties with an understanding of staff initiatives and to provide an opportunity for interested parties to obtain both NRC and licensee perspectives on issues associated with spent fuel management.

The workshop will focus on participant experience gained through the licensing and inspection programs for dry cask storage. The NRC staff will discuss current and planned staff initiatives, including the development of staff guidance for both the licensing and inspection programs. The staff will also be interested in obtaining feedback on its "Draft Standard Review Plan For Independent Spent Fuel Storage Casks." A tentative agenda is provided below in the Supplementary Information section.

**TIME AND LOCATION:** The workshop will be held on May 17, 1996, from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm, at the NRC Auditorium. The

NRC Auditorium is located in the Two White Flint North Building at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. The White Flint Metro Station is located at the intersection of Marinelli Drive and Rockville Pike. The NRC complex is directly across Marinelli Drive from the Metro Station.

**REGISTRATION:** To ensure availability of adequate copies of workshop materials, pre-registration is requested by April 15, 1996, to Mr. James Schneider via mail to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop O-6-F-18, Washington, DC 20555-0001; telephone (301) 415-8523; or facsimile (301) 415-8555. When registering, please provide the full name of attendee(s), name of organization, mailing address, daytime telephone number, and facsimile number.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Tentative Agenda

8:30 Introduction  
The Licensing Process  
—10 CFR Parts 71 and 72  
—10 CFR Part 50 Interface  
NRC Experience with Dry Cask Storage  
—Licensing and Inspection  
Observations and Lessons Learned  
Break  
NRC Experience with Dry Cask Storage (cont'd)  
—NRC Action Plan  
—Change Processes (10 CFR 50.59 and 10 CFR 72.48)  
—Quality Assurance and Inspections  
12:00 Lunch  
1:00 Industry Experience With Dry Cask Storage  
Break  
Staff Initiatives and Feedback  
—Development and Implementation—Standard Review Plan and Inspection Procedures  
—Communications—NRC, Industry, and the Public Workshop Summary  
4:30 Adjournment

Note: Time for questions and discussion has been allotted at the end of each presentation.

For further information contact Mark S. Delligatti, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Mail Stop O-6-G-22, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone (301) 415-8518.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
William D. Travers,  
*Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of  
Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*  
[FR Doc. 96-4939 Filed 3-1-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P