

physical systems or processes, preferably by use of geometrically safe configurations. This is met at Surry Units 1 and 2, as identified in the TS.

Surry TS Section 5.4, Fuel Storage, states that the new fuel assemblies are stored vertically in an array with a distance of 21 inches between assemblies to assure that the effective neutron multiplication factor,  $K_{\text{eff}}$ , will remain  $\leq 0.95$  if fully flooded with unborated water, and to assure  $K_{\text{eff}} \leq 0.98$  under conditions of low-density optimum moderation. The spent fuel assemblies are stored vertically in an array with a distance of 14 inches between assemblies to assure  $K_{\text{eff}} \leq 0.95$  if fully flooded with unborated water.

The proposed exemption would not result in any significant radiological impacts. The proposed exemption would not affect radiological plant effluents nor cause any significant occupational exposures since the TS, design controls, including geometric spacing of fuel assembly storage spaces, and administrative controls preclude inadvertent criticality. The amount of radioactive waste would not be changed by the proposed exemption.

The proposed exemption does not result in any significant nonradiological environmental impacts. The proposed exemption 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 that 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 exemption, the staff considered denial of the requested exemption. Denial of the request 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 Surry Power Station."

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy the NRC staff consulted with Mr. Foldesi of the Virginia Department of

Health on April 22, 1998, 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 January 14, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, which is located at The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of May 1998.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Pao-Tsin Kuo,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-12393 Filed 5-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Sunshine Act Meeting**

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Wednesday, May 13, 1998.

**PLACE:** Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

**STATUS:** Public.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

*Wednesday, May 13*

10:30 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)

- a. Final Rule: Amendments to 10 CFR Parts 30, 40, 50, 70, and 72-Self-Guarantee of Decommissioning Funding by Non-Profit and Non-Bond Issuing Licensee.
- b. Final Rule: Revision of 10 CFR 32.14 (D) to Place Timepieces Containing Gaseous Tritium Light Sources on the Same Regulatory Basis as Timepieces Containing Tritium Paint (Contact: Ken Hart, 301-415-1659).

\* The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings

call (recording)—(301) 415-1292.

Contact person for more information: Bill Hill (301) 415-1661.

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, D.C. 20555 (301-415-1963).

In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to [wmh@nrc.gov](mailto:wmh@nrc.gov) or [dkw@nrc.gov](mailto:dkw@nrc.gov).

Dated: May 6, 1998.

**William M. Hill, Jr.,**

*Secretary, Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-12528 Filed 5-7-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket Nos. 50-335, 50-389, 50-250, 50-251 License Nos. DPR-67, NPF-16, DPR-31, DPR-41]

### **Florida Power and Light; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206**

Notice is hereby given that by Petitions dated February 26 and 27, March 6, 15, 17, 29, and 30, and April 4, 1998, Thomas J. Saporito, Jr. and National Litigation Consultants (Petitioners) have requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take action with regard to Florida Power and Light's (FPL's) St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2, and Turkey Point Plant, Units 3 and 4.

Petitioners request that the NRC take numerous actions, including certain immediate actions, with regard to the FPL St. Lucie and Turkey Point facilities. These actions include that the NRC: (1) Take escalated enforcement action, including modifying, suspending, or revoking FPL's operating licenses until it demonstrates that there is a work environment which encourages employees to raise safety concerns directly to the NRC, and the issuance of civil penalties for violations of the NRC's requirements; (2) permit Petitioners to intervene in a public hearing regarding whether FPL has violated the NRC's employee protection regulations and require FPL to allow the National Litigation Consultants to assist its employees in understanding and exercising their rights under these regulations; (3) conduct investigations