

Section 10 CFR 51.21 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 50, the Commission is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

### Environmental Assessment

#### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would revise Facility Operating Licenses No. NPF-76 and NPF-80, replacing "Central Power and Light Company (CPL)" with "AEP Texas Central Company" throughout the Operating License of each unit.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated March 31, 2003.

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

The application was submitted by STPNOC, acting on behalf of itself and for Texas Genco, LP, the City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company, and the City of Austin, Texas. The amendments change the operating license to reflect a change in the name of "Central Power and Light Company (CPL)," a licensed co-owner of the facility, to "AEP Texas Central Company (AEP)," effective December 23, 2002.

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

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and changes to the licenses. We agree with the licensee that the name change will not impact the existing ownership of South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2 or the existing entitlement to power and will not alter the existing antitrust license conditions applicable to STPNOC's ability to comply with these conditions or with any of its other obligations or responsibilities. As stated by the licensee, "With the exception of this name change, this transaction does not in any way affect the qualifications of AEP Texas Central Company for ownership of 25.2% [percent] of South Texas Project Electric Generating Station Units 1 and 2 (STPEGS), nor does it involve any direct or indirect transfer of control of the STPEGS Operating Licenses." Therefore, the change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types or amounts of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation 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 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 Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no 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 different resources than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

On July 15, 2003, the staff consulted with the Texas State official, Arthur Tate of the Division of Compliance and Inspection, Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control, 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 application dated March 31, 2003. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have

access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail at [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of July, 2003.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Robert A. Gramm,**

*Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate IV, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 03-18844 Filed 7-23-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Workshop on Issues Related to the Level of Programmatic Information Needed in a Combined License Application; Submitted in Accordance With 10 CFR Part 52**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of August 25, 2003, public workshop.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is holding a workshop on August 25, 2003, on issues related to the level of programmatic information that would be needed in order to issue a combined license (COL) in accordance with the requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 52, Subpart C without inspections, tests, analyses, and acceptance criteria (ITAAC) for any particular program. The NRC staff has developed a draft proposal titled, "Use of Fire Protection as an Example Program to Discuss Programmatic Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria," to address this issue. The NRC staff has scheduled the public workshop to discuss the issue and to solicit stakeholder comments on the staff's draft proposal. This workshop will be transcribed. To allow for timely registration on the day of the meeting, it is recommended that guests preregister for the workshop. To preregister for the workshop, contact Mr. Joseph Sebrosky (information provided below) and provide the following information: name, organization, phone number, and country of citizenship.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Joseph M. Sebrosky, New, Research and Test Reactors Program, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

Mr. Sebrosky may be reached by phone at 301-415-1132 or by e-mail at

*jms3@nrc.gov*. Questions on the public meeting process should be directed to Mr. Chip Cameron; e-mail: *fxc@nrc.gov*, telephone: 301-415-1642; Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

**DATES:** The workshop will be held on August 25, 2003, from 1 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Comments on the NRC staff's draft proposal should be submitted by September 15, 2003. Comments received after the due date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

**ADDRESSES:** The workshop will be held at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission offices in the Two White Flint North Auditorium, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The NRC staff's draft proposal to use fire protection as an example program to discuss programmatic ITAAC is available for public inspection in the Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Public Document Room located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Public File Area O1 F21, Rockville, Maryland. The information is also available electronically from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of ADAMS (ADAMS # ML031820084). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room). For more information, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 202-634-3273 or by e-mail to *pdr@nrc.gov*. In addition, the draft proposal and additional associated documentation can be found on NRC's Web site under the combined license discussion on the following Web page: <http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/new-licensing/licensing-process.html>.

Written comments on the draft proposal should be sent to: Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T6-D59, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Comments may be hand-delivered to the NRC at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. Comments may be submitted electronically by the Internet to the NRC at *nrcprep@nrc.gov*. All comments received by the Commission, including those made by Federal, State, and local agencies, Indian tribes, or other interested persons, will be made available electronically at the Commission's PDR

in Rockville, Maryland or from the PARS component of NRC's document system (ADAMS).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In 1989, the NRC established new alternatives for nuclear plant licensing under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 52, which describes, among other things, a process for issuing a combined construction and operating license, or combined license (COL). A COL authorizes construction and, with conditions, operation of a nuclear power plant. A COL application must describe the conditions (the ITAAC) that are necessary to ensure that the plant has been properly constructed and will operate safely. After issuing a COL, the NRC verifies that the licensee has completed the required ITAAC before the plant can operate. The NRC publishes notices of the successful completion of the ITAAC. Then, at least 180 days before the scheduled date for initial loading of nuclear fuel into the reactor, the NRC publishes a notice of intended operation. The notice will provide that any person whose interest may be affected by operation of the plant may request the Commission to hold a hearing on whether the facility complies, or on completion will comply with the acceptance criteria in the COL. A request for a hearing must demonstrate that the licensee has not met or will not meet the acceptance criteria in the COL.

The principle issue to be discussed at the workshop is the staff's draft proposal that categorizes operational programs such as emergency planning and training into those that will likely require ITAAC, those that may or may not require ITAAC (depending on the level of information available at the COL stage), and those that will be unlikely to require ITAAC. The staff would also like to discuss its proposal relative to the level of information needed for operational programs such as fire protection in order to issue a COL without ITAAC for any particular program.

In SECY-02-0067, "Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria for Operational Programs (Programmatic ITAAC)," the staff requested Commission approval for its position that COLs for a nuclear power plant submitted in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 52 Subpart C contain ITAAC for operational programs required by regulations such as training and emergency planning (ADAMS Accession Number ML020700641). The Commission disapproved the staff's position in a September 11, 2002, staff requirements

memorandum (SRM) (ADAMS Accession Number ML022540755). The Commission approved a much more limited use of programmatic ITAAC than that proposed by the staff. The Commission directed the staff to resolve the maximum number of programmatic issues prior to issuing a COL. The Commission also directed the staff to develop appropriate guidelines to support the submission of necessary and sufficient information on programs in COL applications and clarify when programs beyond emergency planning, if any, call for or are likely to call for ITAAC in the COL application.

In a public meeting on May 22, 2003, the NRC staff discussed a response to the SRM including a discussion of the following option. A draft standard review plan Section 14.3 Appendix E, "Programmatic ITAAC" would be developed for guidance. The staff stated that it was considering categorizing the 14 programs that it listed in SECY-02-0067 in the following manner as part of this guidance:

*Category A:* Programmatic ITAAC are required. A program that falls into this category is emergency planning.

*Category B:* Programmatic ITAAC are not necessary because hardware-related ITAAC address the results to which the program is directed. Examples of programs that may fall into this category are equipment qualification, quality assurance, and containment leak rate testing.

*Category C:* An ITAAC for a program or elements of the program is not necessary because the program and its implementation can be fully described<sup>1</sup> in the application and found to be acceptable at the COL stage.<sup>2</sup>

*Category D:* An ITAAC for a program or elements of the program is necessary because the program and its implementation cannot be fully described<sup>1</sup> in the application. That is, the COL applicant cannot provide the necessary and sufficient programmatic information for approval of the COL without ITAAC.<sup>2</sup>

*Category E:* An ITAAC for a program is not necessary because ITAAC will be dispositioned prior to fuel load and the program is not required to be implemented until after fuel load. Examples of programs that may fall into this category include the inservice inspection and inservice testing

<sup>1</sup> A principal issue for these categories is what constitutes a "fully described" program.

<sup>2</sup> The following programs may fall into Category C or D depending on the information provided at the time of the COL: fire protection, radiation protection, security, fitness for duty, training, access authorization, reportability, licensed operator training.

programs, and the maintenance rule program.

Subsequent to the May 22, 2003, meeting the NRC staff developed a proposal to use the fire protection program as an example program to illustrate the level of detail needed to determine if programmatic ITAAC are necessary. The fire protection program was chosen because it could fall into Category C or D above depending on the information provided at the time of a COL application.

*During the workshop the following topics will be discussed:*

- Is the categorization of the 14 programs listed in SECY-02-0067 appropriate?
- Are there programs that are missing from the list?
- Should any of the programs be placed in different categories?
- The NRC staff would like to discuss the programs that fall into Categories C and D. The NRC staff's proposal uses the fire protection program for the AP600 standard nuclear reactor design and the Callaway Plant as a starting point to develop guidelines for the level of programmatic information that would be needed in order to issue a COL without ITAAC for that program. Is the level of detail contained in the staff's proposal appropriate?

A specific agenda for the workshop will be developed and made available prior to the meeting. To assure a diversity of viewpoints, the NRC is inviting stakeholders from the nuclear power industry, representatives from citizens groups, and State agencies, to sit in a roundtable discussion. Although the focus of the meeting will be on the roundtable discussion, there will be opportunities for members of the audience to offer comments and ask questions. Questions related to the staff's draft proposal should be directed to Joseph Sebrosky. Questions related to the public meeting process should be directed to Mr. Chip Cameron. Mr. Sebrosky's and Mr. Cameron's contact information is provided above.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of July, 2003.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**James E. Lyons,**

*Program Director, New, Research and Test Reactors Program, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 03-18843 Filed 7-23-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Proposed Generic Communication Method For Estimating Effective Dose Equivalent From External Radiation Sources Using Two Dosimeters

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of opportunity for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is proposing to issue a Regulatory Issue Summary (RIS) which approves and provides guidance on a two dosimeter monitoring method that can be used by licensees for estimating effective dose equivalent (EDE) from external radiation exposures. The NRC is seeking comment from interested parties on the clarity and utility of the guidance contained in the proposed RIS. In particular, comment is requested on the following questions:

1. Is the two dosimeter method a technically acceptable alternative to the current practice of estimating EDE from deep dose equivalent (DDE)?
2. Is the NRC use of a RIS to approve the two dosimeter method acceptable under the existing regulations?
3. Are algorithms that attempt to provide better estimates of the effective dose equivalent by using more than one dosimeter of importance to your industry?
4. Do you believe that this and similar algorithms, many of which were described in NCRP Publication 122, are sufficiently technically developed to serve as a basis for dosimetry of record?
5. Is the discussion of the issues provided in the RIS sufficiently detailed to provide a background for the reasons for approving the EPRI method generically?
6. Should different or more detailed guidance be provided in an NRC Regulatory Guide or generic communication?
7. Should the definition of the total effective dose equivalent (TEDE) in part 20 be revised to replace the deep dose equivalent with the effective dose equivalent, and make that quantity more consistent with national and international definitions?
8. To what extent should accuracy replace conservatism as the goal for personnel monitoring?

The NRC will consider the comments received in its final evaluation of the proposed RIS.

This **Federal Register** notice is available through the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under accession number ML031980001.

**DATES:** Comment period expires September 22, 2003. Comments submitted after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except for comments received on or before this date.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop T6-D59, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to NRC Headquarters, 11545 Rockville Pike (Room T-6D59), Rockville, Maryland, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sami Sherbini at (301) 415-7853 or by e-mail to [sxs2@nrc.gov](mailto:sxs2@nrc.gov), or Roger Pedersen at (301) 415-3162 or by e-mail to [rlp1@nrc.gov](mailto:rlp1@nrc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Draft Regulatory Issue Summary Method For Estimating Effective Dose Equivalent From External Radiation Sources Using Two Dosimeters

#### Addressees

All U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licensees.

#### Intent

NRC is issuing this regulatory issue summary (RIS) to provide guidance on an approved two-dosimeter monitoring method for estimating effective dose equivalent (EDE) from external radiation exposures. This EDE can be used instead of the deep dose equivalent (DDE) in complying with NRC regulatory requirements.

#### Background

Total effective dose equivalent (TEDE) is used in 10 CFR part 20 (part 20) to specify dose limits for occupationally exposed workers, and for members of the public. Other requirements (in part 20 and other parts of NRC's regulations), such as the criteria for license termination, are also specified in terms of the TEDE. Since EDE cannot be directly measured, part 20 defines TEDE as "the sum of the deep-dose equivalent (for external exposures) and the committed effective dose equivalent (for internal exposures)." Part 20 goes on to specify that this DDE be measured at the part of the whole body with the highest exposure. This DDE can be directly measured with available dosimeters, and, in most exposure situations, provides a reasonable, conservative, and often the best, estimate for EDE from