NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No. 50–305

Nuclear Management Company LLC; Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of exemptions from 10 CFR 50.61 and apendices G and H to part 50 to Facility Operating License No. DPR–43 issued to the Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC or the licensee), for operation of the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP or Kewaunee), located in Kewaunee County, Wisconsin.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action allows the incorporation of the use of fracture toughness (KJC) test data for evaluating the integrity of the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) reactor pressure vessel (RPV) circumferential beltline weld. The licensee submittal requested NRC staff approval of a new methodology for assessing the integrity of the RPV circumferential beltline weld based on the use of the 1997 Edition of American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Test Method E–1921 and American Society for Mechanical Engineering (ASME) Code Case N–629. The licensee submittal included: (1) An exemption from 10 CFR 50.61 to use a proposed alternative methodology based on ASME Code Case N–629 and WCAP–15075; (2) an exemption from Appendix H to Part 50, which specifies use of ASTM E185–82 for testing of surveillance materials, to use a proposed alternative, ASTM E185–98, which allows use of ASTM E1921–97 for testing of surveillance capsule material; (3) an exemption from appendices G and H to part 50, which specifies Charpy V–Notch impact and drop weight testing, to use a proposed alternative ASTM E1921–97; and, (4) a reassessment of the KNPP RPV's compliance with 10 CFR 50.61 (concerning pressurized thermal shock, PTS) for end of license (EOL) condition.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemptions dated June 7, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated February 4, September 26, and December 18, 2000.

The Need for the Proposed Action

KNPP is a pressurized water reactor (PWR) which commenced commercial operation in 1974, and its current operating license will expire in December 2013. The proposed action, exemptions from 10 CFR 50.61, Appendix G of Part 50, and appendix H of part 50, is needed to allow the use of the proposed alternative methodology. The exemption is necessary since the alternative methodology differs from the current methodology specified in the regulations. The proposed exemptions would permit the use of a proposed methodology to use fracture toughness data as an alternative to the Charpy V-notch and to use a drop weight-based methodology to adequately evaluate the integrity of the KNPP RPV, establish pressure-temperature limit curves, and ensure that the RPV is protected from failure by PTS.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the exemptions and assessment methodology described above would provide an adequate evaluation of the reactor vessel fracture toughness for KNPP for end of license (EOL) condition. The proposed action would use an alternate methodology from the methodology currently utilized. The proposed action does not result in any physical or operational changes to the plant.

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 off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public 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 environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with this action.

Alternatives to the Proposed

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 significant 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 Kewaunee.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 14, 2000, the NRC staff consulted with the Wisconsin State official, S. Jenkins of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, 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 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 June 7, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated February 4, September 26, and December 18, 2000, which are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records are 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 12th day of February, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Tae J. Kim,

Acting Section Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–10824 Filed 4–30–01; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATES: Weeks of April 30, May 7, 14, 21, 28, June 4, 2001.

PLACE: Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of April 30, 2001

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of April 30, 2001.

Week of May 7, 2001—Tentative

Thursday, May 10, 2001

10:25 a.m.—Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed).

10:30 a.m.—Briefing on Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES) Programs and Performance (Public Meeting) (Contact: James Johnson, 301–415–6802).

Friday, May 11, 2001

10:30 a.m.—Meeting with Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) (Public Meeting) (Contact: John Larkins, 301–415–7360).

Week of May 14, 2001—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of May 14, 2001.

Week of May 21, 2001—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of May 21, 2001.

Week of May 28, 2001—Tentative

Wednesday, May 30, 2001

10:25 a.m.—Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed).

Week of June 4, 2001—Tentative

Tuesday, June 5, 2001

9:25 a.m.—Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (If needed).

2 p.m.—Discussion of Management issues (Closed-Ex. 2).

Wednesday, June 6, 2001

10:30 a.m.—All Employees Meeting (Public Meeting).

1:30 p.m.—All Employees Meeting (Public Meeting).

The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings call (recording)—(301) 415–1292. Contact person for more information: David Louis Gamberoni (301) 415–1651.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: By a vote of 5–0 on April 23, the Commission determined pursuant to U.S.C. 552b(e) and § 9.107(a) of the Commission's rules that ''Affirmation of Final Rule to Amend 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart J, in Regard to the Licensing Support Network'' be held on April 24, and on less than one week's notice to the public.

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to the distribution, please contact the office of the Secretary, Washington, DC 20555 (301–415–1969). In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the Internet system is available. if you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to dkw@nrc.gov.

Dated: April 26, 2001.

David Louis Gamberoni,

Technical Coordinator, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–10955 Filed 4–27–01; 12:20 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences Fiscal Year 2000; Dissemination of Information

Section 208 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93–438) identifies an abnormal occurrence (AO) as an unscheduled incident or event that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) determines is significant from the standpoint of public health or safety. The Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–66) requires that AOs be reported to Congress annually. During fiscal year 2000, nine events that occurred at facilities licensed or otherwise regulated by the NRC and/or the Agreement States were determined to be AOs. These events are discussed below. As required by Section 208, the discussion for each event includes the date and place, the nature and probable consequences, the cause or causes, and the action taken to prevent recurrence. Each event is also being described in NUREG–0090, Vol. 23, ''Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences, Fiscal Year 2000.'' This report will be available electronically at the NRC Web site <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/NUREGS/indexnum.html> at the NRC Homepage.

Nuclear Power Plants

The following event that occurred at U.S. nuclear power plants during fiscal year 2000 was determined to be significant enough to be reported as an AO to Congress.

00–1 Steam Generator Tube Failure at Indian Point Unit 2 in Buchanan, New York

Date and Place—February 15, 2000; Indian Point Unit 2, a commercial nuclear power plant operated by Consolidated Edison Company, located about 24 miles north of New York City.

Nature and Probable Consequences—On February 15, 2000, at 7:17 p.m., the Indian Point Unit 2 nuclear plant experienced a steam generator tube failure which required the declaration of an ''Alert'' (the second lowest of four emergency classifications in the NRC-required emergency response plan) at 7:29 p.m., and a manual reactor trip at 7:30 p.m. The steam generator is a heat exchanger which allows heat to pass from the reactor (primary system) to the turbine generator (secondary system). It also provides the boundary between the radioactive primary system and the non-radioactive secondary system. At Indian Point Unit 2 there are four steam generators and each steam generator has approximately 3300 tubes. On February 15, the failure of one of these tubes allowed reactor water to leak into the secondary system. By 8:31 p.m. the operators had taken steps to isolate the steam generator which contained the leaking tube. After the steam generator was isolated, the operators began to cool down the plant. At 9:02 p.m. they were forced to suspend the cooldown process when they realized they had inadvertently established an excessive cooldown rate. This excessive cooldown rate caused a rapid reduction in reactor coolant system (pressurizer) level. To restore the level the licensee pumped borated water into the reactor coolant system using the safety injection system. After the level was restored the operators resumed the cooldown and reached cold shutdown at 4:57 p.m on February 16, 2000. The licensee exited the ''Alert'' emergency classification at 6:50 p.m. that day.

The steam generator tube failure resulted in an initial primary-to-secondary leak of reactor coolant of approximately 146 gallons per minute, and required an ''Alert'' declaration. This event involved some procedural and equipment issues that challenged operators, complicated the event response, and delayed achieving the cold shutdown condition. It caused significant public and media interest, and required increased NRC attention. The event resulted in a minor radiological release to the environment that was well within regulatory limits. No radioactivity was measured offsite above normal background levels, and the event did not impact public health and safety.

Following the event, the NRC performed an inspection and determined that Consolidated Edison Company had not performed an adequate examination of the steam generator tubes during its 1997 outage.