ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

1. Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: Revision.
2. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR part 4, ''Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Commission Programs.''
3. The form number if applicable: 3150–0053.
4. How often the collection is required: Occasionally.
5. Who will be required or asked to report: Recipients of Federal financial assistance provided by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
6. An estimate of the number of responses: 30.
7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 30.
8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 8 hours annually (16 minutes per recordkeeper).
9. An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies: Not applicable.
10. Abstract: Recipients of NRC financial assistance provide data to demonstrate assurance to NRC that they are in compliance with nondiscrimination regulations and policies.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site (http://www.nrc.gov) under the FedWorld collection link on the home page tool bar. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by June 3, 1998: Erik Godwin, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0053), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo Shelton, 301–415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Md., this 24th day of April 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–11730 Filed 5–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–400]

Carolina Power and Light; 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 an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–63, issued to Carolina Power & Light (CP&L or the licensee), for operation of the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant located in Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.3.2, ''Engineered Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation'' to allow a 2-hour surveillance interval to facilitate testing of the 6.9 kV Emergency Bus Undervoltage relays. Specifically, CP&L proposes modifying TS Table 3.3.3 Items 9.a. and 9.b. to change the Action from 15 to 15a. Action 15a would maintain all of the requirements of Action 15 and allow removal of 6.9 kV Emergency Bus Undervoltage relays for 2 hours for surveillance testing provided the redundant train Emergency 6.9 kV Bus and associated undervoltage primary and secondary relays are operable. With the proposed modification, CP&L would be able to perform surveillance testing of the relays without entering TS 3.0.3.

To adequately perform a TS-required surveillance test, the Harris Nuclear Plant must enter TS 3.0.3 which could lead to an unnecessary plant shutdown. The surveillance interval for this test is at least once per 31 days. There is insufficient time between test performance to process a license amendment through normal means.

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.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine 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. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Loss-of-Offsite Power Emergency Bus undervoltage relays are not accident initiating components as described in the Final Safety Analysis Report. The proposed change allows a surveillance test interval to facilitate required testing per the Harris Nuclear Plant Technical Specifications (TS). Redundancy of emergency buses, availability of alternate automatic loss-of-offsite power protection, and the capability of manual initiation of affected components combined with the short duration allowed for testing, compensate for the new allowed surveillance interval.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Loss-of-Offsite Power Emergency Bus undervoltage relays are not accident initiating components as described in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). The proposed change only affects testing of the Loss-of-Offsite Power Emergency Bus undervoltage relays while not affecting other structures, systems, or components.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed change to testing of Loss-of-Offsite Power Emergency Bus undervoltage relays does not affect any of the parameters that relate to the margin of safety as described in the Bases of the TS or the FSAR. Accordingly, NRC Acceptance Limits are not affected by this change.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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(c) 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 14 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 14-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 14-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. 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 June 3, 1998, 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 Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605. 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 a 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 the amendment is issued before the expiration of the 30-day hearing period, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. If a hearing is requested, 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 William D. Johnson, Vice President and Senior Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, Post Office Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602, 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 April 24, 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 Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27 day of April 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Scott C. Flanders,

Project Manager, Project Directorate II–1, Division of Reactor Projects -I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–11731 Filed 5–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–423]

Central Maine Power Co; Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) § 50.80, by issuance of an Order, of the transfer of control of Facility Operating License No. NPF–49, to the extent held by Central Maine Power Company (CMP), which holds a partial ownership interest in the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3, located in New London County, Connecticut.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would consent to the transfer of control of the license, to the extent effected by a proposed restructuring of CMP. Under the restructuring, CMP would become a wholly owned subsidiary of a newly created holding company but would continue to hold a partial ownership interest in Millstone Unit 3. No direct transfer of the license would occur. Northeast Nuclear Energy Company would continue to be the licensed operator for Millstone Unit 3, and is not involved in the proposed transaction. The proposed action is in accordance with the submittal, dated March 4, 1998, from Central Maine Power Company, by and through its counsel, Morgan, Lewis, and Bockius.

The proposed action is needed, to the extent the proposed restructuring of CMP will effect a transfer of control of the license as held by CMP, to permit the restructuring to occur. CMP has stated that the proposed restructuring will provide long-term advantages through increased management and financial flexibility that will better position CMP and its existing nonutility subsidiaries to compete effectively in a changing commercial and regulatory environment. CMP has also stated that this structure will also serve to insulate CMP's utility business from business risks associated with the activities of the nonutility subsidiaries and be consistent with the corporate structure used by many other utilities in the United States.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed corporate restructuring and concludes that there will be no physical or operational changes to Millstone Unit 3. The corporate restructuring will not affect the qualifications or organizational affiliation of the personnel who operate or maintain the facility, as Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, which is not involved in the proposed restructuring of CMP, will continue to be exclusively responsible for the operation and maintenance of Millstone Unit 3.

The Commission has evaluated the environmental impact of the proposed action and has determined that the probability or consequences of accidents will not be increased by the proposed action, and that post-accident radiological releases will not be greater than previously determined. Further, the Commission has determined that the proposed action will not affect routine radiological exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that 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, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental 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.

As an alternative to the proposed requested 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 resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for Millstone Unit 3, dated December 1984.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 20, 1998, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State Official, Kevin T. A. McCarthy, of the Monitoring and Radiation Division, Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State Official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon 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 the proposed action, see the application dated March 4, 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and at the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of April 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Phillip F. McKee,

Deputy Director for Licensing, Special Projects Office, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–11728 Filed 5–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P