NRC staff, nor will it tolerate retaliation or the threat of retaliation against those licensees who communicate concerns to the agency. NRC staff whose actions are found to be contrary to this policy could be subject to disciplinary actions in accordance with the NRC Management Directive 10.99, ''Discipline, Adverse Actions and Separations'' (formerly Manual Chapter 4171), or in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and National Treasury Employees Union.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of October 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John C. Hoyle,

Secretary of the Commission.

Appendix A to This Document—NRC Principles of Good Regulation

NRC Principles of Good Regulation

Independent. Nothing but the highest possible standards of ethical performance and professionalism should influence regulation. However, independence does not imply isolation. All available facts and opinions must be sought openly from licensees and other interested members of the public. The many and possibly conflicting public interests involved must be considered. Final decisions must be based on objective, unbiased assessments of all information, and must be documented with reasons explicitly stated.

Open. Nuclear regulation is the public's business, and it must be transacted publicly and candidly. The public must be informed about and have the opportunity to participate in the regulatory processes as required by law. Open channels of communication must be maintained with Congress, other government agencies, licensees, and the public, as well as with the international nuclear community.

Efficient. The American taxpayer, the rate-paying consumer, and licensees are all entitled to the best possible management and administration of regulatory activities. The highest technical and managerial competence is required, and must be a constant agency goal. NRC must establish means to evaluate and continually upgrade its regulatory capabilities. Regulatory activities should be consistent with the degree of risk reduction they achieve. Where several effective alternatives are available, the option which minimizes the use of resources should be adopted. Regulatory decisions should be made without undue delay.

Clear. Regulations should be coherent, logical, and practical. There should be a clear nexus between regulations and agency goals and objectives where explicitly or implicitly stated. Agency positions should be readily understood and easily applied.

Reliable. Regulations should be based on the best available knowledge from research and operational experience. Systems interactions, technological uncertainties, and the diversity of licensees and regulatory activities must all be taken into account so that risks are maintained at an acceptably low level. Once established, regulation should be perceived to be reliable and not unjustifiably in a state of transition. Regulatory actions should always be fully consistent with written regulations and should be promptly, fairly, and decisively administered so as to lend stability to the nuclear operational and planning processes.

[FR Doc. 95–27411 Filed 11–3–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Knowledge and Abilities Catalog Revision; Notice of Availability

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: NUREG–1122, ''Knowledge and Abilities Catalog for Nuclear Power Plant Operators: Pressurized Water Reactors,'' and NUREG–1123, ''Knowledge and Abilities Catalog for Nuclear Power Plant Operators: Boiling Water Reactors,'' were developed in 1985 to assist operator licensing examiners in the development of content valid written and operating examinations to administer to reactor plant operators and senior operators.

The Knowledge and Abilities (K/A) catalogs have been revised to resolve inconsistencies between the two catalogs and inconsistencies in content within the K/A catalogs. The revision also incorporates evolutionary changes in the operator licensing program and revised definition of operator's tasks within facility licensee's organizations. NRC will fully integrate NUREG–1122, Revision 1 and NUREG–1123, Revision 1 into the operator licensing program with the next revision of the Examiner Standards (NUREG–1021, Revision 8) in the fall of 1996.

Copies of NUREG–1122, Revision 1 and NUREG–1123, Revision 1 may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013–7082. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161. A copy is also available for inspection and/or copying for a fee in the NRC Public Document Room. Copies of NUREG–1122, Revision 1 and NUREG 1123, Revision 1 are available on the Tech Specs Plus BBS, the data line number is 1–800–679–5784. The files are also available in the NRC-PDR library at FedWorld through November 30, 1995. FedWorld is accessible via internet (http://www.fedworld.gov) as well as pc/modem (1–800–303–9672). The filenames are: NREG1122.ZIP and NREG1123.ZIP. Both files are compressed using PKzip.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank Collins, Mail Stop 010–D22, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, telephone (301) 415–3173.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of October, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Stuart A. Richards,

Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, Division of Reactor Controls and Human Factors, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–27412 Filed 11–3–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–366]

Georgia Power Company, et al. (Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2); Exemption

I.

Georgia Power Company, et al. (GPC or the licensee), is the holder of Facility Operating License No. NPF–5, which authorizes operation of the Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2. The license provides, among other things, that the licensee is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) now and hereafter in effect. The facility consists of one boiling water reactor located in Appling County, Georgia.

II.

Section 50.54(o) of 10 CFR Part 50 requires that primary reactor containments for water cooled power reactors be subject to the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50. Appendix J contains the leakage test requirements, schedules, and acceptance criteria for tests of the leak tight integrity of the primary reactor containment and systems and components that penetrate the containment. Sections II.H.4 and III.C.2 of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 require leak rate testing of the Main Steam Isolation Valves (MSIVs) at the calculated peak containment pressure related to the design- basis accident, and Sections III.A.5, III.B.3, and III.C.3 require that the measured leak rates be included in the combined leak rate test results.

By letter dated June 20, 1995, the licensee requested an exemption from the Commission's regulations. The subject exemption is from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, ''Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing for Water-Cooled Power Reactors,'' Sections III.A.5(b)(1), III.A.5(b)(2), III.B.3, and III.C.3 to exclude the MSIV leakage from

the combined local leak rate test results. This request was needed after the MSIV leakage rate was increased by the issuance of Amendment No. 132 on March 17, 1994. In addition, the Commission is granting another exemption from the requirements of Section III.C.2(a) to account for a previously granted exemption, stated in the Hatch Unit 2 Technical Specifications (TS), which allows the leak rate testing at a reduced pressure.

The licensee's June 20, 1995, request stated that a plant-specific radiological analysis of a postulated design-basis loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) has been performed, and is documented in Section 15.1.39 of the Hatch Unit 2 Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). The radiological analysis calculated the effect of the maximum leakage rate from the containment volume in terms of onsite and offsite doses, which were evaluated against the dose limits of 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion (GDC) 19 and 10 CFR Part 100, respectively. The analysis accounted for the radiological effect from MSIV increased leakage and other containment leakages following a postulated LOCA in terms of the doses that could be received by personnel in the technical support center (TSC), the main control room (MCR), and at the site boundary. The analysis results demonstrated that the dose from all the leakage, including the MSIV leakage rate limit of 100 standard cubic feet per hour (scfh) per MSIV not to exceed 250 scfh for all four main steam lines, results in an acceptable value when evaluated against the regulatory limits for the off-site doses, TSC and MCR doses contained in 10 CFR Part 100, and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, GDC–19, respectively.

The staff concluded that the exemption requested is acceptable based on: the method of MSIV testing (i.e., 28.8 psig test pressure when applied between MSIVs on a single steam line); a radiological analysis that assumes a 100 scfh per MSIV leak rate not to exceed 250 scfh for all four steam lines; and the requirement that the MSIVs would be periodically tested to ensure the validity of the radiological analysis (i.e., verify that the MSIV leakage rate during testing is accounted for separately in the radiological analysis of the site).

For the reasons set forth above, the NRC staff concludes that there is reasonable assurance that: the current MSIV leak testing method (i.e., test pressure of 28.8 psig when applied between MSIVs) is an acceptable method; and the calculated doses obtained by performing radiological analysis (calculated using an MSIV leakage rate limit of 100 scfh per MSIV, not to exceed 250 scfh for all four main steam lines), are within the limits of 10 CFR Part 100 and GDC–19. The staff finds it acceptable to continue to exclude the measured MSIV leakage rate from the combined leak rate test results, since the leakage is accounted for separately and continues to meet the underlying purpose of the rule. Therefore, the staff finds that the requested exemption presented in the licensee's June 20, 1995, submittal is acceptable.

III.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, the Commission may, upon application by any interested person or upon its own initiative, grant exemptions from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50 when (1) the exemptions are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to public health and safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security; and (2) when special circumstances are present. Special circumstances are present whenever, according to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), ''Application of the regulation in the particular circumstances would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule or is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.''

The underlying purpose of the rule is to assure that leakage through systems and components penetrating the primary containment should not exceed allowable leakage rates, so that the dose due to the total leakage, including that due to the MSIVs, is within the limits of 10 CFR Part 100 and GDC–19. The licensee's analysis has demonstrated that an adequate margin can be maintained even if leakage from the MSIVs is considered separately and subject to a leakage restriction of 100 scfh per MSIV, not to exceed a total of 250 scfh for all four main steam lines.

IV.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, an exemption is authorized by law and will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and that there are special circumstances present, as specified in 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2). An exemption is hereby granted from the requirements of Sections III.A.5(b)(1), III.A.5(b)(2), III.B.3, III.C.2(a), and III.C.3 of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50. The exemption allows (1) leakage testing of the MSIVs, after deletion of the LCS, using a test pressure of 28.8 psig applied between MSIVs, and (2) exclusion of the measured MSIV leakage rate from the combined local leak rate test results.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment (60 FR 54709).

This exemption is effective upon issuance and will be implemented prior to startup of Cycle 13 for Hatch, Unit 2.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 1st day of November 1995.

Steven A. Varga,

Director, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–27414 Filed 11–3–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Number 40–0299]

UMETCO Minerals Corporation

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Receipt of Application from Umetco Minerals Corporation to change a site-reclamation milestone in Condition 59 of Source Material License SUA–648 for the Gas Hills, Wyoming Uranium Mill site Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has received, by letter dated October 11, 1995, an application from Umetco Minerals Corporation (Umetco) to amend License Condition (LC) 59 A.(3) of Source Material License No. SUA–648 for the Gas Hills Wyoming uranium mill site. The license amendment application proposes to modify LC 59 A.(3) to change the completion date for a site-reclamation milestone. The new date proposed by Umetco would extend completion of placement of final radon barrier on the Heap Leach Impoundment by two years.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mohammad W. Haque, High-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone (301) 415–6640.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The portion of LC 59 A.(3) with the proposed change would read as follows:

A. (3) Placement of final radon barrier designed and constructed to limit radon emissions to an average flux of no more than 20 pCi/m^2/s above background:

For the Heap Leach Impoundment—December 31, 1997.

Umetco's application to amend LC 59 A.(3) of Source Material License SUA–648, which describes the proposed change to the license condition and the