

accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or collective occupational radiation 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 involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, 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 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 resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Limerick Generating Station, Unit 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 10, 1998, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. David Ney of the Bureau of Radiation 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 licensee's letter dated October 6, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated February 2, 1998, which are 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 Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of May 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert A. Capra,

Director, Project Directorate 1-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-12280 Filed 5-7-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NUREG-1625]

Permanently Defueled Westinghouse Plant; Proposed Standard Technical Specifications

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the availability of NUREG-1625, "Proposed Standard Technical Specifications for Permanently Defueled Westinghouse Plants," a draft report for comment dated March 1998.

DATES: Submit comments by August 6, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Draft NUREG-1625 is available for inspection and copying for a fee at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC 20555-0001. A free single copy of draft NUREG-1625 may be requested by writing to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Printing and Graphics Branch, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Webb, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Telephone: 301-415-1347.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Given the number of nuclear power plants that have permanently shutdown, the NRC has recognized the need for generic guidance on appropriate Technical Specifications for permanently shutdown power reactors.

This NUREG report describes the NRC staff's proposed Standard Technical Specifications for Permanently Defueled Westinghouse Plants (STS PDW). The report includes a detailed discussion of the strategy followed for determining the contents of the STS PDW. The proposed STS PDW is being published

to provide the general public and the nuclear community with an opportunity for comment.

The contents of the proposed STS PDW are based primarily on the Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants (NUREG-1431, Revision 1, April 1995), which in turn were based on the criteria in the NRC Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors (SECY-93-067, 58 FR 39132; July 22, 1993). The proposed STS PDW reflect the experience gained in the development of the Permanently Defueled Technical Specifications (PDTS) for the Trojan Nuclear Plant, the first PDTS approved by the NRC that were based on the improved STS for Westinghouse Plants. As licensees begin to plan permanent shutdown of their nuclear power plants, they are encouraged to adopt the STS PDW to an extent that is practical and consistent with their licensing basis.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of May 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Marvin M. Mendonca,

Acting Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Director, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-12275 Filed 5-7-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50-456, STN 50-457; STN 50-454, STN 50-455; 50-237, 50-249; 50-373, 50-374; 50-254, 50-265; And 50-295, 50-304 License Nos. NPF-72, NPF-77; NPF-37, NPF-66; DPR-19, DPR-25; NPF-11, NPF-18; DRP-29, DPR-30; And DPR-39, DPR-48]

Commonwealth Edison Company; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated March 25, 1998, the National Whistleblower Legal Defense and Education Fund and Mr. Randy Robarge (the Petitioners) have requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take immediate corrective action and imposition of civil penalties against Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd).

As grounds for their request, the Petitioners assert that (1) ComEd's assertion in a pleading in a case before the U.S. Department of Labor, 98-ERA-2, that the filing of a "Problem Identification Form" (PIF) does not constitute protected activity fosters an atmosphere of intimidation and chills