

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 close of business on 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 February 27, 1998, as supplemented July 14, 1998, 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 Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of August 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Tae Kim,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-22082 Filed 8-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-213]

### Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Haddam Neck Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of no Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License No. DPR-61, a license held by the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCO or the licensee). The exemption would apply to the Haddam Neck Plant (HNP), a permanently shutdown and defueled plant located at the CYAPCO site in Middlesex County, Connecticut.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed exemption would modify emergency response plan requirements, in response to the permanently shutdown and defueled status of the Haddam Neck facility.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated May 30, 1997, as supplemented or modified by letters of September 19, September 26, October 21, and December 18, 1997, and January 22, March 25, June 19, and July 31, 1998. The requested action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to discontinue offsite emergency planning activities and reduce the scope of onsite emergency planning.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

By letter dated December 5, 1996, the licensee submitted certifications that it had permanently ceased operations at HNP and that all fuel had been permanently removed from the reactor. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(a)(2), upon docketing of the certifications, CYAPCO was no longer authorized to operate the reactor or to retain fuel in the reactor vessel. In this permanently shutdown and defueled condition, the facility poses a reduced risk to public health and safety. Because of this reduced risk, certain provisions of 10

CFR 50.54(q) are no longer required. An exemption is required from portions of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to allow the licensee to implement a revised Defueled Emergency Plan (DEP) that is appropriate for the permanently shutdown and defueled reactor facility.

#### *Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. The Commission concludes that exemptions from certain portions of 10 CFR 50.54(q) are acceptable given the reduced risk and reduced consequences of an accident occurring at a permanently defueled reactor site with a substantially reduced decay heat load produced by the spent fuel held in storage.

The proposed change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off-site, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request (no-action alternative). Denial of the exemption request would not change any 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 resources not previously considered in the final environmental statement related to operation of HNP issued in October 1973.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 5, 1998, the NRC staff consulted with Mr. D. Galloway of the State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the

environmental impact of the proposed action. The NRC staff and the State official discussed the proposed issuance of the exemption. The State official did not object to issuance of the exemption.

#### **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 this action, see the licensee's letters, dated May 30, September 19, September 26, October 21, and December 18, 1997, and January 22, March 25, June 19, and July 31, 1998, which are available for public review at the NRC's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, and at the Local Public Document Room at the Russell Public Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of August 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Seymour H. Weiss,**

*Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-22084 Filed 8-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-309]

### **Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of no Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License No. DPR-36, a license held by the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company (MYAPCo or the licensee). The exemption would apply to the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, a permanently shutdown plant located at the MYAPCo site in Lincoln County, Maine.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed exemption would modify emergency response plan requirements due to the permanently

shutdown and defueled status of the Maine Yankee facility.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated November 6, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated June 29, 1998. The requested action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to discontinue offsite planning activities and reduce the scope of onsite emergency planning.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

Maine Yankee was shut down in December 1996. By letter dated August 7, 1997, the licensee informed the Commission that it had decided to permanently cease operations at Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station and that all fuel had been permanently removed from the reactor. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(a)(2), upon docketing of the certifications in the letter of August 7, 1997, the facility operating license no longer authorizes MYAPCo to operate the reactor and to load fuel in the reactor vessel. In this permanently shutdown condition, the facility poses a reduced risk to public health and safety. Because of this reduced risk, certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) are no longer required. An exemption is required from portions of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to allow the licensee to implement a revised Defueled Emergency Plan that is appropriate for the permanently shutdown and defueled reactor facility.

##### *Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has concluded that the granting of the exemption will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

##### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The