

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 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 Jeremy J. Euto, Esquire, 500 Circle Drive, Buchanan, MI 49107, 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 October 8, 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 Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, MI 49085.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of August, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stang,

Sr. Project Manager, Section 1,

Sr. Project Directorate III,

Division of Licensing Project Management,

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-22488 Filed 8-30-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-315 AND 50-316]

Indiana Michigan Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74 issued to Indiana Michigan Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Berrien County, Michigan.

The proposed amendments would change the runout limits for a safety injection (SI) pump to 675 gallons per minute (gpm), unless the pump is specifically tested to a higher flow rate, not exceeding 700 gpm for both Units 1 and 2. This change was initiated upon reevaluation of correspondence from Westinghouse sent to the licensee in 1991, which indicated that the generic runout limits for Pacific 2" JTCH pumps was 675 gpm unless each specific pump is tested to a higher flow rate. Individual testing is necessary due to test variations between pumps which may limit the applicability of testing of one pump to another pump due to manufacturing tolerances in the sand cast impellers and material changes in the pump casing.

Furthermore, the bases section is being clarified to describe why the injection rather than the recirculation mode during flow balancing is the minimum resistance and, consequently, more conservative configuration for runout considerations.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves 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. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its

analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.92, this proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazard consideration if it does not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed reduction in the SI pump runout flow does not increase the probability of occurrence of any previously evaluated accident because the SI pumps are not considered to be accident initiators. In addition, flow balancing performed at Cook Nuclear Plant has proven the ability to deliver the minimum T/S flow of 300 gpm to each pair of cold leg injection points without exceeding the 675 gpm (or 700 gpm) pump runout limits. Therefore, the emergency core cooling system performance objectives of 10 CFR 50.46 are not impacted and this change does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

This proposed change imposes a generic limit on maximum allowable flow for untested SI pumps. No physical system changes or changes in operating modes are being made that could introduce new or different kinds of accidents from those previously evaluated. As discussed in (1) above, the SI pumps are not considered accident initiators, and this status is not affected by the change to the SI pump runout limits.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

This change reflects a reduced maximum single pump flow to be observed during flow balancing of the SI system. Flow balance testing at Cook Nuclear Plant has demonstrated the ability to meet the SI flow requirements while maintaining an adequate margin to the revised lower runout limits being proposed by this submittal. Because the minimum required SI flow delivered to the core has not been reduced by this change, the change does not involve a reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the preceding, the evaluation concluded that the proposed change to the SI pump runout limits does not involve a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10 CFR 50.92.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92 are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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. 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 6D59, 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 Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By September 30, 1999, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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 Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, MI 49085. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic

Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing 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 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 Jeremy J. Euto, Esquire, 500 Circle Drive, Buchanan, MI 49107, 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 May 21, 1999, 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 Maud Preston Palenske Memorial

Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, MI 49085.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of August 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stang, Sr.,

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

[FR Doc. 99-22489 Filed 8-30-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316]

Indiana Michigan Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74 issued to Indiana Michigan Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Berrien County, Michigan.

The proposed amendments would make administrative changes to several Technical Specifications to remove obsolete information, provide consistency between Unit 1 and Unit 2, provide consistency with the Standard Technical Specifications, provide clarification, and correct typographical errors.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves 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. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the change involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The proposed change for boron sampling requirements in mode 6 does not affect the probability of a fuel handling accident. The unlikely event of a fuel assembly being misloaded is independent of the sampling frequency for fuel pool boron concentration. It has no impact on the event initiator, which is a human error while positioning a fuel assembly. The change has no impact on the assumptions for a fuel handling accident. The boron concentration requirement is not changed; there is sufficient boron in the fuel storage pool to maintain k_{eff} below 0.95 to preclude an inadvertent criticality. Therefore, the consequences of the accident will be mitigated as previously evaluated. The 72-hour maximum interval between samples is maintained. Operating experience has shown 72 hours to be adequate. Removing the additional limitation of sampling at least three times per week would allow the sample to be collected two or three times per week, consistent with the maximum 72-hour interval. This is acceptable because boron concentration changes occur slowly due to the large volume of water in the system and relatively small volumes of dilution sources. The consequences are not increased because there are no changes to the spent fuel, shielding (water), or systems used to mitigate the consequences of an accident. Additionally, there is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents released offsite.

Deleting the redundant figure for equivalent reactivity criteria for regions in the spent fuel storage racks does not impact the storage requirements because the equations provide equivalent requirements. The unlikely event of a fuel assembly being misloaded is independent of the characteristics of the spent fuel in the pool. It has no impact on the event initiator, which is a human error while positioning a fuel assembly. The change has no impact the assumptions for a fuel handling accident because the fuel storage requirements are not changed. The consequences of an accident are not increased because the fuel storage requirements are not changed and no other changes are made to systems that mitigate the consequences of an accident.

The proposed changes to correct a reference to another requirement, delete obsolete notes, revise the name of drumming room roll-up door, and correct typographical errors are considered administrative. The reference leads to a section that no longer exists; the proposed change corrects the error. The notes permitted exceptions to requirements, and they are no longer required. The normal requirements have applied since the provisions expired. Deleting them eliminates extraneous information. The revised description of the door reflects the current use of the installed door. Correcting the typographical errors improves readability. The corrections are not intended to change the meaning. These changes do not affect accidents described in the UFSAR.

Adding new surveillance requirements to test the Unit 2 pump performance pursuant