organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of ACRS, and information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows: Tuesday, July 7, 1998—12:15 p.m.—1:30 p.m.

The Subcommittee will discuss proposed ACRS activities and related matters. It may also discuss the qualifications of candidates for appointment to the ACRS. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff person named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions open to the public, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements, and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff person, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone: 301/415–7360) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: June 11, 1998.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 98–16095 Filed 6–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

DATE: Weeks of June 15, 22, 29, and July 6, 1998.

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

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of June 15

Wednesday, June 17

10:00 a.m.—Briefing by National Mining Association on Regulation of the Uranium Recovery Industry (PUBLIC MEETING)

11:30 A.M.—Affirmation Session (PUBLIC MEETING) (If needed)

2:00 p.m.—Meeting with Advisory Committee on Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI) and Briefing on Part 35 QM Rule (PUBLIC MEETING) (Contact: Larry Camper, 301–415–7231)

Week of June 22—Tentative

Thursday, June 25

9:30 a.m.—Briefing by IG on Results of NRC Organization Safety Culture and Climate Survey (PUBLIC MEETING)

11:30 a.m.—Affirmation Session (PUBLIC MEETING) (If needed)

2:00 p.m.—Briefing on EEO Program (PUBLIC MEETING)

Week of June 29—Tentative

Tuesday, June 30

10:00 a.m.—Meeting with Commonwealth Edison (PUBLIC MEETING) (Contact: Bob Capra, 301–415–1430)

11:30 a.m.—Affirmation Session (PUBLIC MEETING) (if needed)

2:00 p.m.—Briefing on Performance Assessment Progress in HLW, LLW, and SDMP (PUBLIC MEETING)

Week of July 6—Tentative

Thursday, July 9

11:30 a.m.—Affirmation Session (PUBLIC MEETING) (if needed)

*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.

* * * * *

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: By a vote of 4–0 on June 5, the Commission determined pursuant to U.S.C. 552b(e) and 10 CFR Sec. 9.107(a) of the Commission's rules that ''Affirmation of (a) Hydro Resources, Inc. Docket No. 40–8968–ML, Memorandum and Order (Denying Motion for Stay and Request for Prior Hearing, Lifting Temporary Stay Denying Motions to Strike and for Leave for Reply), LBP–98–5, (b) Proposed Licenses to Export High Enriched Uranium (HEU) for Production of Medical Isotopes at the Canadian NRU (XSNM3012) and Maple Reactors (XSNM3013), and (c) Hydro Resources, Inc. Docket No. 40–8968–ML, Memorandum and Order (Denial Of Motion to Disqualify Presiding Officer), LBP–98–11'' be held on June 5, and on less than one week's notice to the public.

* * * * *

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm

* * * * *

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, DC 20555 (301–415–1661). 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 or dkw@nrc.gov.

* * * * *

William M. Hill, Jr.,

SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–16175 Filed 6–12–98; 4:44 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving no Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97–415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97–415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from May 22,

1998, through June 5, 1998. The last biweekly notice was published on June 3, 1998 (63 FR 30261).

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed no Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve 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. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

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 before action is taken. 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 Administration 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 6D22, 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 a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By July 17, 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 for the particular facility involved. 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 a 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 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 the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of 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 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 for the particular facility involved.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50–237 and 50–249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois
Docket Nos. 50–254 and 50–265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment request: May 18, 1998.

Description of amendment request: Change various technical specification (TS) values to conservatively reflect design values. These TS values affect: (1) 125/250 volts direct current (Vdc) electrolyte temperature; (2) control rod drive accumulator pressure; (3) standby liquid control solution temperature; (4) ultimate heat sink minimum water level; (5) shutdown suppression chamber level (Quad Cities only); and (6) degraded voltage setpoint (Quad Cities only).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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:

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

The change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes to certain Technical Specification acceptance values are conservative and serve to ensure operability of equipment important to safety. By ensuring equipment availability, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not increased. In addition, the proposed changes have no impact on any initial condition assumptions for accident scenarios. Onsite or offsite dose consequences resulting from an event previously evaluated are not affected by this proposed amendment request.

Accordingly, there is no significant change in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Does the change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed license amendment provides changes in certain Technical Specification values to restore margin and ensure equipment operability. Each proposed change is conservative with respect to current requirements. The proposed amendment does not involve any plant physical changes that would create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Does the change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. In fact, the proposed changes restore margin and ensure equipment operability. Since the changes maintain the necessary level of system reliability, they do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in a 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.

Local Public Document Room location: for Dresden, Morris Area Public Library District, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450; for Quad Cities, Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021.

Attorney for licensee: Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

NRC Project Director: Stuart A. Richards.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of application for amendment: May 2, 1998, as supplemented May 21, and 23 (three letters), 1998.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changed Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.6.2, ''Protective Instrumentation,'' and its associated Bases to reflect modifications to the initiation instrumentation for the Control Room Air Treatment System. It also changed TS 3.2.4a, ''Reactor Coolant Activity,'' and added an additional condition to the operating license.

Date of issuance: May 23, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented prior to resumption of power operation.

Amendment No.: 161.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications. Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes (63 FR 27601 dated May 19, 1998. The notice recognized the existence of exigent circumstances pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) and provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The notice published May 19, 1998, also provided for an opportunity to request a hearing by June 1, 1998 (this will be corrected to June 18, 1998, by a notice to be published in the near future), but indicated that if the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination, any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. Subsequent to publishing the notice, and due to schedule improvements which have occurred at the plant, the Commission has determined that the amendment should be issued on an emergency basis pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(5). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, consultation with the State of New York, and final no significant hazards consideration determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation date May 23, 1998.

Local Public Document Room location: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State

University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Attorney for licensee: Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005–3502.

NRC Project Director: S. Singh Bajwa.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50–336, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: May 14, 1998.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Reactor Protection System (RPS) and the Engineered Safety Features Actuation System (ESFAS) instrumentation by restricting the time most RPS and ESFAS actuation channels can be in the bypass position to 48 hours. The current TSs have no time limit. The proposed amendment would also modify the TS action requirements and the channel calibration requirements for the loss of turbine load reactor trip function, and the channel calibration requirements for the wide range logarithmic neutron flux monitors; add a note to exclude the neutron detectors from the channel calibration requirements; correct a reference to a TS surveillance requirement; and correct errors that have been identified.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to restrict the time most of the reactor protection or engineered safety feature actuation channels can be in the bypass position to 48 hours, from an indefinite period of time, has no effect on the design of the Reactor Protection System (RPS) or the Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System (ESFAS), and does not affect how these systems operate. In addition, this will minimize the susceptibility of these systems to the remote possibility of fault propagation between channels. The pressurizer high pressure reactor protection channels will not be required to be placed in the tripped condition after 48 hours. A failed pressurizer high pressure channel will be allowed to remain in the bypassed condition for up to 30 days. If the failed pressurizer high pressure channel was placed in the tripped condition, and then a high failure of another pressurizer high pressure channel occurred, the reactor would trip and both pressurizer power operated relief valves (PORVs) would open, resulting in an undesired loss of primary coolant. Limiting the time that a failed pressurizer high pressure reactor protection channel can be in bypass to 30 days will minimize the risk of the inadvertent opening of both PORVs, as well as the risk associated with fault propagation between channels. These systems will still function as designed to mitigate design basis accidents. Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to increase the time a second RPS or ESFAS channel can be removed from service (from 2 hours to 48 hours), provided one of the inoperable channels is placed in the tripped condition, has no effect on the design of the RPS or ESFAS and does not affect how these systems operate. These systems will still function as designed to mitigate design basis accidents.

However, one of the proposed changes will allow two pressurizer pressure reactor protection channels to be removed from service (one channel in the tripped condition and one channel in the bypassed condition) for 48 hours instead of the current 2 hour time limit. With a pressurizer pressure channel in the tripped condition, the high failure of a second pressurizer pressure channel would initiate a reactor trip, open both pressurizer PORVs, and cause an undesired loss of primary coolant. Thus, this change will increase the probability of occurrence of a previously evaluated accident (FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] Section 14.6.1—Inadvertent Opening of a Pressurized Water Reactor Pressurizer Pressure Relief Valve). However, since this configuration will only be allowed for an additional 46 hours, the increase in the probability of occurrence of a previously evaluated accident will be limited to an acceptable value. Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to apply a more restrictive action statement to the loss of turbine load reactor trip function has no effect on the design of this trip function and does not affect how this trip function operates. Also, this trip function is not assumed to operate to mitigate any design basis accident.

Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to require a channel calibration every 18 months for the loss of turbine load reactor trip function and for the wide range logarithmic neutron flux monitors has no effect on the design of either the loss of turbine load reactor trip function or the wide range logarithmic neutron flux monitors. Also, neither of these are assumed to operate to mitigate any design basis accident. Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to exclude the neutron detectors from the channel calibration requirement has no effect on the design of the neutron detectors and has no significant effect on how these detectors operate. The detectors are passive devices with minimal drift. In addition, slow changes in the sensitivity of the linear power range flux detectors is compensated for by performing the daily calorimetric calibration and the monthly calibration using the incore detectors. These detectors will still function as designed to mitigate design basis accidents. Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to correct the surveillance requirement referenced in an action statement has no effect on the design of the ESFAS and does not affect how this system operates. The ESFAS will still function as designed to mitigate design basis accidents. Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to add a reference to the reactor coolant pump low speed reactor trip function to a note that states this trip may be bypassed when [less than] 5 [percent] power, and that the bypass must be automatically removed when [greater than or equal to] 5 [percent] power will not effect this reactor trip function. This bypass capability currently exists in the design of the Millstone Unit No. 2 RPS, and is the same bypass feature referenced for the reactor coolant flow low reactor trip function. Both of these reactor trip functions provide protection for a reduction in RCS [Reactor Coolant System] flow. The addition of this note will not result in any technical change to the Millstone Unit No. 2 RPS. The RPS will continue to function as before. Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to correct the power level high trip setpoint on Technical Specification Page 2–4 will not result in any change to the actual plant setpoint for this RPS trip function. As a result of this proposed change, the setpoint listed on Page 2–4 will agree with the setpoint previously approved by the NRC, and currently used by the RPS. The change has no effect on the design of the RPS and does not affect how this system operates. Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The information added to the Bases of the Technical Specifications to provide a discussion of how the RPS and ESFAS are affected by the proposed changes, the effect the action statements have on the operation of the RPS and ESFAS, and to discuss the impact of surveillance testing on RPS operability will have no effect on equipment operation. The RPS and ESFAS will continue to function as designed to mitigate design basis accidents. Therefore, this change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Thus, this License Amendment Request does not impact the probability of an accident previously evaluated nor does it 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.

The proposed changes do not alter the plant configuration (no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or require any new or unusual operator actions. They do not alter the way any structure, system, or component functions and do not alter the manner in which the plant is operated. The proposed changes do not introduce any new failure modes. They will not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis and licensing basis. The RPS and the ESFAS will still function as designed to mitigate design basis accidents.

Therefore, these changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes will not reduce the margin of safety since they have no impact on any safety analysis assumption. The proposed changes do not decrease the scope of equipment currently required to be operable or subject to surveillance testing, nor do the proposed changes affect any instrument setpoints or equipment safety functions.

The effectiveness of Technical Specifications will be maintained since the changes will not alter the operation of any RPS or ESFAS function. In addition, most of the changes are consistent with the Calvert Cliffs RPS and ESFAS Technical Specifications mode provided in Enclosure 3 of the NRC correspondence dated April 16, 1981 (R. A. Clark letter to W. G. Counsil, Evaluation of the Reactor Protection System Inoperable Channel Condition at Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, dated April 16, 1981) and the new, improved Standard Technical Specifications (STS) for Combustion Engineering plants (NUREG–1432).

Therefore, there is no significant reduction in a 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.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq., Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, Connecticut.

NRC Deputy Director: Phillip F. McKee.

Power Authority of The State of New York, Docket No. 50–286, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: June 25, 1997.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Indian Point 3 Technical Specifications to allow the use of zirconium alloy or stainless steel filler rods in fuel assemblies to replace failed or damaged fuel rods.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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:

Consistent with the criteria of 10 CFR 50.92, the enclosed application is judged to involve no significant hazards based on the following information:

(1) Does the proposed license amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed?

Response: The proposed changes modify the technical specification only to the extent that the reconstitution is recognized as acceptable under limited circumstances. Reconstitution is limited to substitution of zirconium alloy or stainless steel filler rods, and must be in accordance with approved applications of fuel rod configurations. Although these changes permit reconstitution to occur without the need for a specific technical specification change, use of an approved methodology is required prior to its application. Since the changes will allow substitution of filler rods for leaking, potentially leaking rods or damaged rods, the changes may actually reduce the radiological consequences of an accident. It is noted that the specific changes requested in this letter have previously been found acceptable by the NRC in GL [Generic Letter] 90–02, Supplement 1. For these reasons, we conclude that the changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(2) Does the proposed license amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated?

Response: The proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because they will only affect the assembly configuration and can only be implemented if demonstrated to meet current plant requirements in accordance with an NRC-approved methodology. The other aspects of plant design, operation limitations, and responses to events will remain unchanged. It is noted that the changes have previously been determined acceptable by the NRC in GL 90–02, Supplement 1.

(3) Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: The proposed change will not involve a reduction in a margin of safety because the changes can only be implemented if demonstrated to meet current plant requirements in accordance with an NRC-approved methodology. It is noted that the changes have previously been determined acceptable by the NRC in GL 90–02, Supplement 1.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied.

Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. David Blabey, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

NRC Project Director: S. Singh Bajwa.

Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Docket No. 50–354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: April 28, 1998.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.4.2.1 to replace the plus or minus 1 percent setpoint tolerance limit for safety/relief valves (SRVs) with a plus or minus 3 percent setpoint tolerance limit. In addition, the proposed amendment would revise TS 4.4.2.2 to state that all SRVs must be certified to be within plus or minus 1 percent of the TS setpoint prior to returning the valves to service.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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 changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed TS revisions involve: (1) no significant hardware changes; (2) no significant changes to the operation of any systems or components in normal or accident operating conditions; and (3) no changes to existing structures, systems, or components. Therefore these changes will not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

These proposed changes were developed in accordance with the provisions contained in an NRC Safety Evaluation Report, dated 3/8/93, for the ''BWR Owners Group Inservice Pressure Relief Technical Specification [Revision] Licensing Topical Report'', NEDC–31753P as described in General Electric report NEDC–32511P, ''Safety Review for Hope Creek [Generating Station] Safety/Relief Valve Tolerance Analyses''. Since the plant systems associated with these proposed changes will still be capable of: (1) meeting all applicable design basis requirements; and (2) retain the capability to mitigate the consequences of accidents described in the HC [Hope Creek] UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report], the proposed changes were determined to be justified. Therefore, these changes will not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Establishment of the [plus or minus] 3 [percent] SRV setpoint tolerance limit will not adversely impact the operation of any safety related component or equipment. Since the proposed changes involve: (1) no significant hardware changes; (2) no significant changes to the operation of any systems or components; and (3) no changes to existing structures, systems, or components, there can be no impact on the occurrence of any accident. These proposed changes were developed in accordance with the provisions contained in an NRC Safety Evaluation Report, dated 3/8/93, for the ''BWR Owners Group Inservice Pressure Relief Technical Specification [Revision] Licensing Topical Report'', NEDC–31753P as described in General Electric report NEDC–32511P, ''[Safety Review for Hope Creek Generating Station] Safety/Relief Valve Tolerance Analyses''. Furthermore, there is no change in plant testing proposed in this change request which could initiate an event. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Establishment of the [plus or minus] 3 [percent] SRV setpoint tolerance limit will not adversely impact the operation of any safety related component or equipment. General Electric analyses performed for Hope Creek and contained in General Electric report NEDC–32511P, ''[Safety Review for Hope Creek Generating Station] Safety/Relief Valve Tolerance Analyses,'' concluded that there is no significant impact on fuel thermal limits, no significant impact on safety related systems, structures or components, and no significant impact on the accident analyses associated with the proposed changes. Therefore, the changes contained in this request do not result in a significant reduction in a 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.

Local Public Document Room location: Pennsville Public Library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, NJ 08070.

Attorney for licensee: Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50–424 and 50–425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: May 8, 1998.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would change the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.7, ''Reactor Coolant Pump Flywheel Inspection Program,'' to provide an exception to the examination requirements of Regulatory Position C.4.b of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.14, Revision 1, August 1975.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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) Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The safety function of the RCP [reactor coolant pump] flywheel is to provide sufficient rotational inertia to ensure reactor coolant flow through the core during coastdown following a loss of offsite power and subsequent reactor trip. FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] Chapter 15 analysis for a complete loss of forced reactor coolant flow demonstrates that the reactor trip together with the flow sustained by the inertia of the RCP impeller will be sufficient to prevent the most limiting fuel assembly from exceeding the DNBR [departure from nucleate boiling ratio] limits.

The maximum mechanical loading on the RCP motor flywheel results from overspeed following a LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident]. The analysis presented in WCAP–14535A demonstrates that the revised inspection program proposed by this license amendment will ensure the integrity of the RCP flywheels will be maintained.

Based upon the findings of WCAP–14535A, the ability of the RCP flywheel to perform its intended safety function will be unaffected by the license amendment and the FSAR Chapter 15 analysis will remain valid. Therefore, these proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(2) Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed license amendment will not change the physical plant configuration nor the modes of operation of any plant equipment. Based upon the results of WCAP–14535A, no new failure mechanism will be introduced by the revised RCP flywheel inspection program. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The operating limits and functional capabilities of the affected systems, structures, and components will be unchanged by the proposed amendment. The results of the RCP flywheel inspections performed throughout the industry and at VEGP have identified no indications which would affect its integrity. As presented in WCAP–14535A, detailed stress analysis and risk assessments have been completed with the results indicating that there would be no change in the probability of failure for RCP flywheels if all inspections were eliminated. Therefore, these changes do not involve a significant reduction in a 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.

Local Public Document Room location: Burke County Public Library, 412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Arthur H. Domby, Troutman Sanders, NationsBank Plaza, Suite 5200, 600 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia.

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50–390 Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: May 6, 1998.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would replace the two percent penalty addressed in surveillance requirement (SR) 3.2.1.2(a) with a burnup-dependent factor to be specified in the Watts Bar Core Operating Limits Report (COLR). Specifically, the following changes are being proposed:

1. SR 3.2.1.2(a) and its associated BASES will have the phrase ''by a factor of 1.02'' deleted and replaced with the phrase ''by the appropriate factor specified in the COLR.''

2. Technical Specification (TS) Section 5.9.5(b)(3) would be updated to reference the revised WCAP (10216–P–A, Revision 1A, 1994) that details the analytical methods utilized for the new penalty factor.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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:

A. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change involves only the manner in which the penalty factors for $F_Q(Z)$ would be specified (i.e., burnup-dependent factor specified in the Core Operating Limits Report [COLR] versus a constant factor specified in the TS). This is simply used to account for the fact that $F_Q{}^C(Z)$ may increase between surveillance intervals. These penalty factors are not assumed in any of the initiating events for the accident analyses. Therefore the proposed change will have no effect on the probability of any accidents previously evaluated. The penalty factors specified in the COLR will be calculated using NRC-approved methodology and will continue to provide an equivalent level of protection as the existing TS requirement. Therefore, the proposed change will not affect the consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration to the plant (no new or different kind of equipment will be installed) or alter the manner in which the plant would be operated. Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change will continue to ensure that potential increases in $F_Q{}^C(Z)$ over a surveillance interval will be properly accounted for. The penalty factors will be calculated using an NRC-approved methodology. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a reduction in 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.

Local Public Document Room location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, TN 37402.

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET l0H, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of amendment request: May 1, 1998.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would make several editorial changes to the Administrative Controls section of the Technical Specifications. The changes include revisions due to organizational changes, quality assurance changes, editorial changes, and typographical corrections.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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. Will the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The administrative change proposed herein will have no effect on plant hardware, plant design, safety limit setting or plant system operation and therefore do[es] not modify or add any initiating parameters that would significantly increase the probability or consequences of any previously analyzed accident. The proposed amendment changes the reference to the VYNPS QA program and makes other

administrative changes, such as title changes and correction/clarification of errors. Therefore, there is no increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Will the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

This change does not affect any equipment nor does it involve any potential initiating events that would create any new or different kind of accident. The proposed change involves [ ] wording changes in the Technical Specifications identifying the name of the QA program and makes other administrative changes, such as title changes and corrective/clarification of errors. Therefore no new or different kind of accident has been introduced.

3. Will the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

This change does not affect any equipment involved in potential initiating events or safety limits. The proposed change has no significant impact on margin of safety, as it is comprised of only administrative changes.

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.

Local Public Document Room location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, VT 05301.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. David R. Lewis, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037–1128.

NRC Project Director: Cecil O.Thomas.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–338 and 50–339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: September 1, 1995, as supplemented April 8, 1996, April 22, 1996, April 23, 1996, November 18, 1997, February 9, 1998, March 25, 1998 and May 5, 1998. This notice supersedes the **Federal Register** notice of September 27, 1995 (60 FR 49949)

Description of amendment request: The originally (September 1, 1995) proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) would permit a single outage of up to 14 days for each emergency diesel generator (EDG) once every 18 months in order to perform preventive maintenance. The amended request will permit a single outage of up to 14 days for each EDG for any reason; TS change to incorporate a Configuration Risk Management Program (CRMP) in the Administrative Section in the TS, in support of the previous submittal for the 14-day Allowed Outage Time (AOT) for the EDGs and would permit an increase in the TS maintenance interval of the EDG from 18 to 24 months, based on the recommendation from the EDG owners group (Fairbanks Morse Owners Group).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration. Specifically, operation of North Anna Power Station in accordance with the proposed Technical Specification changes will not:

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

A probabilistic safety analysis (PSA) has been performed which demonstrates that a 14-day AOT for each EDG, results in a small change in core damage frequency assuming adequate compensatory measures are in place. The compensatory measures include requirements that the other EDGs, off-site power supply, and the alternate A.C. diesel (AAC DG) be operable whenever the action statement is entered.

The effect of the proposed change has been calculated to be an increase in core damage frequency of approximately 1 E–6 per year from the baseline core damage frequency of 4.1 E–5. Considering that credit was not taken for the AAC DG previously in the IPE nor was the AAC DG specified in Technical Specifications, the proposed changes remain bounded by the core damage frequency identified in the Individual Plant Examination.

Credit for the AAC DG was previously not taken nor was the AAC DG previously included in the Technical Specifications. Furthermore, the probabilistic safety analysis (PSA) demonstrates that the increase in core damage frequency due to extending the EDG AOT of a 14-day period is not significant as long as the AAC DG is operable to act as a source of emergency power to replace the EDG. The period of time during which the EDG is unavailable is short enough to limit the impact of using the manually operated AAC DG as a replacement for the automatically operated EDG.

The plant design and operation are not changed by the incorporation of a CRMP into the Administrative Section of Technical Specifications. Further, with the proposed change to the preventive maintenance interval, the EDG reliability remains adequate to perform its function of supporting accident mitigation equipment with emergency electrical power.

Therefore, neither the probability of occurrence nor the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the safety analysis report are increased due [to] the proposed changes to permit a 14-day allowed outage time and a 24 month preventive maintenance interval for the EDGs.

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

No new initiators are defined as a result of a review of the PSA model. The proposed Technical Specifications changes only modify the AOT of an EDG. The UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report] accidents are analyzed assuming that the EDG is the worst single failure. This assumption is more severe than the proposed Technical Specifications changes, which [replace] the EDG with the AAC DG. Similarly, the PSA performed to evaluate the proposed Technical Specifications changes considered all of the initiating events defined for the PSA performed for the Individual Plant Examination. No new initiators were defined as a result of a review of the PSA model.

Adding the CRMP and changing the EDG preventive maintenance interval in the Technical Specifications does not change any method of operation or create any new modes of operation or accident precursors.

Therefore, it is concluded that no new or different kind of accident or malfunction from any previously evaluated has been or will be created by the proposed changes to permit a 14-day allowed outage time and a 24 month preventive maintenance interval for the EDGs.

c. The proposed Technical Specifications changes do not result in a reduction in margin of safety as defined in the basis for any Technical Specifications.

The PSA was performed to evaluate the concept of a one-time outage. The results of the analyses show a small change in the core damage frequency. As described above the proposed Technical Specifications changes only modify the AOT of an EDG. Thus, operation with slightly increased EDG unavailability due to maintenance is acceptable given the operability of the AAC DG and the other EDG.

Incorporating the CRMP and changing the EDG preventive maintenance interval in the Technical Specifications

does not affect any accident analysis assumptions or change any Technical Specifications criteria.

Therefore, the margin of safety is not changed.

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

Local Public Document Room location: The Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903–2498.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, Riverfront Plaza, East Tower, 951 E. Byrd Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

NRC Project Director: Gordon E. Edison, Acting.

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50–305, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: May 7, 1998.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification 5.4, ''Fuel Storage,'' would be changed to increase the allowable mass of uranium-235, per axial centimeter, for fuel storage in new fuel and spent fuel storage racks. This change will allow use of new Siemens heavy fuel assemblies.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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:

The proposed change was reviewed in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.92 to show no significant hazards exist. The proposed change will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

The mass of the fuel assembly is increased by a small amount (30 pounds, or 2.4%), from that of the fuel assemblies now in the core. Even with this increase, the load on the fuel handling equipment is still well within design limits. Therefore, the probabilities of a fuel handling accident inside containment (FHAIC) and the fuel handling accident outside containment (FHAOC) are not changed.

The total core mass, with Siemens heavy fuel, is less than that assumed in the original plant safety analysis. The proposed change does not alter the plant configuration, operating set points, or overall plant performance. The probability of other accidents is therefore not changed.

Attachment 4 (of the application) shows that the consequences of a fuel handling accident or a large break loss of coolant accident are not significantly affected.

Any changes in the nuclear properties of the reactor core that may result from a higher mass of fuel U^{235} per axial centimeter will be analyzed and shown to meet acceptance criteria in the appropriate reload analysis, which would be completed prior to use.

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

As discussed above, the only safety issue significantly affected by the proposed change is the criticality analysis of the spent fuel storage racks and new fuel storage racks. Since it has been demonstrated that k_{eff} remains below the k_{eff} acceptance criteria, no new or different accident would be created through the use of fuel with up to 56.067 grams of U^{235} per axial centimeter at the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant.

The proposed change does not alter the plant configuration, operating set points, or overall plant performance and therefore does not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The criticality analysis in Reference 3 (of the application) demonstrates that adequate margins to criticality can be maintained with up to 56.067 grams of U^{235} per axial centimeter stored in either the new fuel storage racks or the spent fuel storage racks.

The bounding cases of the analysis demonstrate that k_{eff} remains less than 0.95 in the spent fuel storage racks and the new fuel storage racks if flooded with unborated water. The bounding cases of the analysis also demonstrate that k_{eff} remains less than 0.98 in the new fuel storage racks if moderated by optimally misted moderator. Therefore, the 56.067 grams of U^{235} per axial centimeter limit is acceptable for storage in both the new fuel storage racks and the spent fuel storage racks.

Any changes in the nuclear properties of the reactor core that may result from a higher mass of fuel U^{235} per axial centimeter will be analyzed in the appropriate reload analysis to ensure compliance with applicable reload considerations and requirements.

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.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Wisconsin, Cofrin Library, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, WI 54311–7001.

Attorney for licensee: Bradley D. Jackson, Esq., Foley and Lardner, P.O. Box 1497, Madison, WI 53701–1497.

NRC Acting Project Director: Ronald R. Bellamy.

Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket No. 50–301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: May 15, 1998 (NPL–98–0303).

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment revises the schedule for implementing the boron concentration changes related to the planned conversion of Unit 2 to 18-month fuel cycles.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: 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. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are administrative only. There are no physical changes to the facility or its operation. All Limiting Conditions of Operation, Limiting Safety System Settings, and Safety Limits specified in the Technical Specification remain unchanged. Additionally, there are no changes in the Quality Assurance Program, Emergency Plan, Security Plan, and Operator Training and Requalification Program. Therefore, an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated cannot occur.

2. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are administrative only. No changes to the facility structures, systems and components or their operation will result. The design and design basis of the facility remain unchanged. The plant safety analyses remain current and accurate. No new or different failure mechanisms are introduced. Therefore,

the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated is not introduced.

3. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed [amendment is] administrative only. All safety margins established through the design and facility license including the Technical Specifications remain unchanged. Therefore, all margins of safety are maintained.

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.

Local Public Document Room location: The Lester Public Library, 1001 Adams Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241.

Attorney for licensee: John H. O'Neill, Jr., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: Cynthia A. Carpenter.

Previously Published Notices of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed no Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances. They are repeated here because the biweekly notice lists all amendments issued or proposed to be issued involving no significant hazards consideration.

For details, see the individual notice in the **Federal Register** on the day and page cited. This notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice.

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50–341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: May 20, 1998 (NRC–98–0099).

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the scram discharge volume (SDV) vent and drain valve action requirements to be consistent with those contained in NUREG–1433, Revision 1, ''Standard Technical Specifications General Electric Plants, BWR/4.''

Detroit Edison is requesting that this license amendment request be processed in an exigent manner in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) because delay in granting this amendment could lead to a plant shutdown.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: May 28, 1998 (63 FR 29254).

Expiration date of individual notice: Comments: June 11, 1998; hearing: June 29, 1998.

Local Public Document Room location: Monroe County Library System, Ellis Reference and Information Center, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

Duke Energy Corporation, Docket Nos. 50–413 and 50–414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: May 22, 1998.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise Surveillance Requirement Section 4.4.3.3 of the Technical Specifications. Section 4.4.3.3 currently requires that the emergency power supply for the pressurizer heaters be demonstrated OPERABLE at least once per 18 months by manually transferring power from the normal to the emergency power supply. The licensee proposed to delete the ''manual'' requirement because the power supply transfer at the unit was designed to be automatic. The proposed requirement is to verify that required pressurizer heaters are capable of being powered from an emergency power supply once per 18 months.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: June 1, 1998 (63 FR 29759).

Expiration date of individual notice: July 1, 1998.

Local Public Document Room location: York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of application for amendment: May 2, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications 3/4.6.2, ''Protective Instrumentation,'' to reflect modifications to the initiation instrumentation for the Control Room Air Treatment system.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: May 19, 1998 (63 FR 27601).

Expiration date of individual notice: June 18, 1998.

Local Public Document Room location: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of application for amendment: May 15, 1998 (two letters).

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes administrative sections of the Technical Specifications to reflect a restructuring of upper management organization.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: June 2, 1998 (63 FR 30026).

Expiration date of individual notice: July 2, 1998.

Local Public Document Room location: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50–387 and 50–388 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: May 12, 1998.

Brief description of amendment request: These amendments relocate certain requirements related to fire protection from the TSs to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. The TS sections to be relocated are: 3/4.3.7.9, Fire Detection Instrumentation; 3/4.7.6, Fire Suppression Systems; 3/4.7.7, Fire Rated Assemblies; and 6.2.2e, Fire Brigade Staffing. The amendments also replace License Condition 2.C.(6) for Unit 1 and License Condition 2.C.(3) for Unit 2. These amendments are consistent with the guidance of NRC Generic Letter (GL) 86–10, ''Implementation of Fire Protection Requirements,'' and GL 88–12, ''Removal of Fire Protection Requirements from Technical Specifications.''

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: May 21, 1998 (63 FR 28010).

Expiration date of individual notice: June 22, 1998.

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701.

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, Docket No. 50–244, R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Wayne County, New York

Date of amendment request: March 31, 1997, as supplemented June 18, 1997, October 10, 1997, October 20, 1997, November 11, 1997, December 22, 1997, January 15, 1998, January 27, 1998, March 30, 1998, April 23, 1998, and April 27, 1998.

Brief description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Ginna Station Improved Technical Specifications to reflect a planned modification to the spent fuel pool storage racks.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: May 12, 1998 (63 FR 26213). This notice supersedes the March 31, 1997, application published on April 30, 1997 (62 FR 23502).

Expiration date of individual notice: June 11, 1998.

Local Public Document Room Location: Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items 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 rooms for the particular facilities involved.

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50–317 and 50–318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of application for amendments: January 31, 1997, as supplemented February 13, February 28, March 25, April 16, August 19, and September 29, 1997, January 22, March 17, April 8, April 21, 1998, and May 22, 1998.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the TS for a reduction of the total reactor coolant system flow limit from 370,000 gallons per minute (gpm) to 340,000 gpm in support of increased steam generator tube plugging.

Date of issuance: May 23, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance Unit 1 to be implemented within 60 days and Unit 2 prior to startup from the spring 1999 refueling outage.

Amendment Nos.: 228 and 202.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–53 and DPR–69: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: February 26, 1997 (62 FR 8780).

The February 13, February 28, March 25, April 16, August 16, and September 29, 1997, January 22, March 17, April 8, and April 21, 1998, and May 22, 1998, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission's related evaluation of these amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–325 and 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: July 18, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the listed design suppression chamber temperature of 200°F to 220°F and the listed total water and steam volume of the reactor coolant system from 18,670 cubic feet to 18,320 cubic feet, respectively.

Date of issuance: May 27, 1998.

Effective date: May 27, 1998.

Amendment Nos.: 195 and 225.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62: Amendments revise the facility's Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: August 27, 1997 (62 FR 45454).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 27, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–325 and 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: June 12, 1997, as supplemented February 2, 1998. The February 2, 1998, submittal contained clarifying information only and did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration or expand the scope of the original **Federal Register** Notice.

Brief Description of amendments: The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) to revise the Limiting Condition for Operation of the TS to limit the drywell average air temperature rather than primary containment air temperature. Additionally, the amendments require that the drywell average air temperature be maintained less than or equal to 150 °F during plant operation. The current primary containment average temperature limit is 135 °F.

Date of issuance: May 28, 1998.

Effective date: May 28, 1998.

Amendment Nos.: 196 and 226.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62: Amendments change the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: August 27, 1997 (62 FR 45454) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 28, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–325 and 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: October 28, 1997

Brief Description of amendments: The amendments revise certain instrumentation allowable values in the current technical specifications to the Improved Technical Specifications format.

Date of issuance: May 28, 1998.

Effective date: May 28, 1998.

Amendment Nos.: 197 and 227.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62: Amendments change the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: December 31, 1997 (62 FR 68304)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 28, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–325 & 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 & 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: November 15, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments modify the channel functional test interval in the Technical Specifications Surveillance Requirements for the Electrical Protective Assemblies in the Reactor Protection System.

Date of issuance: May 29, 1998.

Effective date: May 29, 1998.

Amendment No.: 198 and 228.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62: Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: July 3, 1996 (61 FR 34887).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 29, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–325 & 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 & 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: November 16, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated February 14, 1995, and April 9, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments change the Technical Specifications (TS) for Units 1 and 2 to revise the basis for removing the suppression chamber water temperature monitoring instrumentation requirements from the TS. This change is being processed in parallel with the Improved Technical Specification conversion.

Date of issuance: May 29, 1998.

Effective date: May 29, 1998.

Amendment Nos.: 199 and 229.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62: Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: January 4, 1995 (60 FR 497)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 29, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–325 and 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: April 4, 1996, as supplemented January 24, 1997, March 31, 1997, April 2, 1997, April 14, 1997, March 24, 1998, and May 20, 1998.

Brief Description of amendments: The amendments modify Technical Specifications (TS) 3.0.4, 4.0.3, and 4.0.4, and their associated Bases in accordance with the guidance provided in Generic Letter 87–09, ''Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) on the Applicability of Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements.''

Date of issuance: June 2, 1998.

Effective date: June 2, 1998.

Amendment Nos.: 200 and 230.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62: Amendments change the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: July 17, 1996 (61 FR 37297).

The supplemental submittals contained clarifying information only, and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 2, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–325 & 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 & 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: April 30, 1997, as supplemented October 28, 1997, and May 15, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revise surveillance requirements 4.7.2.b.2 and 4.7.2.c to require testing of the control room emergency ventiliation system charcoal adsorber in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Material D3803–1989, ''Standard Test Method for Nuclear-Grade Activated Carbon.''

Date of issuance: June 2, 1998.

Effective date: June 2, 1998.

Amendment Nos.: 201 and 231.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62: Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: July 30, 1997 (62 FR 40846).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 2, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–325 and 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: April 3, 1998

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the specified total volume of the condensate storage tank capacity requirements from 150,000 gallons to 228,200 gallons to ensure the Core Spray System requirement of 50,000 gallons.

Date of issuance: June 5, 1998.

Effective date: June 5, 1998.

Amendment Nos.: 202 and 232.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62: Amendments revise the facility's Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: May 6, 1998 (63 FR 25103).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 5, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50–400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Date of application for amendment: October 29, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changes Technical Specifications (TS) 3.8.1.1.a.3, 3.8.1.1.b.4, and 3.8.1.1.d.2 by eliminating the plant shutdown requirements in these TS, and allowing the applicable redundant feature TS to direct the plant shutdown when required.

Date of issuance: May 22, 1998.

Effective date: May 22, 1998.

Amendment No.: 78.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: December 31, 1997 (62 FR 68305).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 22, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50–400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Date of application for amendment: April 24, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated May 15, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises TS 3.3.2, ''Engineered Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation,'' such that surveillance of the undervoltage relays may be performed without entry into TS 3.0.3. Specifically, the change modifies Table 3.3–3 to allow operation with more than one channel of the emergency bus undervoltage relays inoperable.

Date of issuance: June 3, 1998.

Effective date: June 3, 1998.

Amendment No.: 79.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: May 4, 1998 (63 FR 24574).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 3, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. STN 50–454 and STN 50–455, Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois Docket Nos. STN 50–456 and STN 50–457, Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: September 24, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the surveillance frequency for the turbine throttle valves and the turbine governor valves from monthly to quarterly.

Date of issuance: May 26, 1998.

Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment Nos.: 103 and 93.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–37, NPF–66, NPF–72 and NPF–77: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: March 11, 1998 (63 FR 11917).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 26, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: For Byron, the Byron Public Library District, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron, Illinois 61010; for Braidwood, the Wilmington Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481.

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50–341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: January 28, 1998 (NRC–98–0006), as supplemented on March 10, 1998 (NRC–98–0036).

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises technical specification surveillance requirement 4.4.3.2.2.a for the leak rate test of the pressure isolation valves, extending it from the current 18-month interval to a 24-month interval.

Date of issuance: May 28, 1998.

Effective date: May 28, 1998, with full implementation within 90 days.

Amendment No.: 118.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–43: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: February 25, 1998 (63 FR 9598).

The March 10, 1998, supplement requested a change in the implementation period. This information was within the scope of the original **Federal Register** notice and did not change the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards considerations determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 28, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Monroe County Library System, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50–341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: November 22, 1995 (NRC–95–0124), as supplemented February 19, April 19, May 3, June 12, and December 4, 1996, January 30 and August 7, 1997, and April 27 and May 22, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises technical specification (TS) 3.8.1.1 to change the emergency diesel generator (EDG) allowed outage time from 3 to 7 days and add a requirement to verify that combustion turbine-generator 11–1 is available prior to removing an EDG from service. In addition, in accordance with draft staff guidance for risk-informed amendments, a section is added to the Administrative Controls Section of the TS describing the licensee's configuration risk management program. The associated Bases are also revised. The November 22, 1995, submittal also requested changes to the testing and reporting requirements for the EDGs. These aspects were addressed in Amendment No. 107 to the TS issued on June 20, 1996. The staff's action on the licensee's request is now complete.

Date of issuance: June 2, 1998.

Effective date: June 2, 1998, with full implementation within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 119.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–43. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: February 28, 1996 (61 FR 7550) with a supplemental notice on May 1, 1998 (63 FR 24195).

The February 19, April 19, May 3, June 12, and December 4, 1996, August 7, 1997, and May 22, 1998, submittals provided clarifying information within the scope of the **Federal Register** notices and did not change the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards considerations determinations.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 2, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Monroe County Library System, Ellis Reference and Information Center, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

Duquesne Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–334 and 50–412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: March 17, 1998, as supplemented May 14, 1998.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise Action 34 of technical specification (TS) Table 3.3–3, ''Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation.'' Action 34 is applicable to Functional Units 6.b., ''Grid Degraded Voltage (4.16 kV Bus),'' and 6.c., ''Grid Degraded Voltage (480 v Bus).'' Revised Action 34 requires that with one degraded grid voltage monitoring channel inoperable, the inoperable channel be placed in the tripped condition within one hour; otherwise, immediately enter the applicable action statement(s) for the associated emergency diesel generator made inoperable by the degraded voltage start instrumentation. The revision to Action 34 also requires that with two degraded grid voltage monitoring channels inoperable, within one hour restore at least one of the channels to operable status and place the other channel in the tripped condition; otherwise, the associated emergency diesel generator would be declared inoperable and its applicable action statement(s) entered. Corresponding changes have also been made in the bases for TS 3/4.3.2 and the BVPS–2 TS Index pages.

Date of issuance: May 27, 1998.

Effective date: Effective immediately, to be implemented within 60 days (both units).

Amendment Nos.: 214 and 91.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–66 and NPF–73: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 22, 1998 (63 FR 19969).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 27, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 15001.

Duquesne Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50–334 and 50–412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, (BVPS–1 and BVPS–2) Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: March 16, 1998, as supplemented May 14, 1998.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise technical specification (TS) Table 4.3–1 to add footnote 6 to the channel calibration requirement for all instrument channels that are provided with an input from neutron flux detectors. Footnote 6 provides that neutron detectors may be excluded from channel calibrations. In addition, BVPS–1 TS Table 4.3–1 is being revised to add channel calibration requirements to items 2.b. (Power Range, Neutron Flux, Low Setpoint), 5. (Intermediate Range, Neutron Flux), 6. (Source Range, Neutron Flux (Below P–10)), and 23. (Reactor Trip System Interlocks P–6, P–8, P–9, and P–10). Furthermore, changes are being made to correct page numbers in the BVPS–2 TS Index and to add corresponding changes to the TS Bases for both units.

Date of issuance: May 28, 1998.

Effective date: Both units, effective immediately, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment Nos.: 215 and 92.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–66 and NPF–73: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 22, 1998 (63 FR 19969).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 28, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 15001.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50–250 and 50–251, Turkey Point Plant Units 3 and 4, Dade County, Florida

Date of application for amendments: January 9, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated April 20, 1998.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments permit the use of fuel with ZIRLO cladding.

Date of issuance: May 12, 1998.

Effective date: May 12, 1998.

Amendment Nos. 196 and 190.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–31 and DPR–41: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: February 25, 1998 (63 FR 9605).

The April 20, 1998 letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 12, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Florida International University, University Park, Miami, Florida 33199.

GPU Nuclear, Inc. et al., Docket No. 50–219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: December 10, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment clarifies sections of the Technical Specifications that have been demonstrated to be unclear or conflicting.

Date of Issuance: June 4, 1998.

Effective date: June 4, 1998, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 195.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–16: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: January 28, 1998 (63 FR 4313).

The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 4, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Ocean County Library, Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 2, Oswego County, New York

Date of application for amendment: December 15, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated April 24, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changes Technical Specifications 2.1.2 and 3.4.1.1 to revise the minimum critical power ratio safety limits for fuel operating cycle 7 for two-loop and single-loop recirculation operation.

Date of issuance: June 4, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented before

startup of the Unit 2 reactor to begin fuel operating cycle 7.

Amendment No.: 82.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: January 28, 1998 (63 FR 4314).

The April 24, 1998, submittal provided clarifying information that did not alter the initial no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 4, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50–336, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: September 2, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment corrects several compliance issues as identified in Licensee Event Report 97–022–00 ''Technical Specification Violations'' dated July 9, 1997, by rewording the text; changing terminology and numbering; combining two Technical Specifications (TSs) into one; changing the allowed outage times; specifying guidance for entering into TS 3.0.3; changing a definition; changing surveillance requirments, and updating the TS Bases section to reflect changes.

Date of issuance: May 26, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 215.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–65: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: September 24, 1997 (62 FR 50008).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 26, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50–423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: October 15, 1997, as supplemented January 23 and April 8, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the action statements and the instrumentation trip setpoint tables in the Technical Specifications for the reactor trip system and engineered safety feature actuation system instrumentation. In addition, the amendment (1) decreases the reactor trip setpoint for the reactor coolant pump low shaft speed (underspeed trip setpoint) from 95.8 percent to 92.4 percent of rated speed, (2) makes editorial changes, and (3) changes the Bases to reflect the new methodology.

Date of issuance: May 26, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 159.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–49: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: November 19, 1997 (62 FR 61842).

The January 23 and April 8, 1998, submittals provided clarifying and additional information that did not change the scope of the October 15, 1997, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 26, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50–423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: April 7, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment replaces the pressurizer maximum water inventory requirement with a pressurizer maximum indicated level requirement. The amendment also makes editorial changes and modifies the associated Bases section.

Date of issuance: May 27, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 160.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–49: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 23, 1998 (63 FR 20219).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 27, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50–423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: April 14, 1998, as supplemented May 7, 1998, and two letters dated June 4, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes Technical Specification 3/4.4.4, Relief Valves, to ensure that the automatic capability of the power-operated relief valves (PORVs) to relieve pressure is maintained when these valves are isolated by closure of the block valves. The amendment also makes editorial changes, adds PORV surveillance requirements, and modifies the associated Bases section.

Date of issuance: June 5, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 161.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–49: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 20, 1998 (63 FR 19532).

The May 7, 1998, letter and the two letters dated June 4, 1998, provide clarifying information that did not change the scope of the April 14, 1998, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 5, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the

Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50–275 and 50–323, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County, California

Date of application for amendments: December 23, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments changed the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to revise TS 3/4.7.1.1, Table 3.7–1, ''Maximum Allowable Power Range Neutron Flux High Setpoint With Inoperable Steam Line Safety Valves.'' The power range (PR) neutron flux high setpoints were changed based on revised calculational methodologies for 1, 2, or 3 inoperable MSSVs per steam generator (SG). The proposed TS change lowered the PR neutron flux high setpoints when 2 or 3 MSSV are inoperable per loop such that the maximum power level allowed would be within the heat removing capability of the remaining operable MSSVs. Although the method for calculating the maximum power level allowed when one MSSV per loop is inoperable was revised, the results were not and the limit remained the same. The associated Bases were also revised.

Date of issuance: May 28, 1998.

Effective date: May 28, 1998, to be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1–125; Unit 2–123.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–80 and DPR–82: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 22, 1998 (63 FR 19975).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 28, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Docket No. 50–272, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: March 26, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification 3.1.3.3, ''Rod Drop Time,'' to change the applicability from Mode 3 (hot shutdown) to Modes 1 and 2 (startup and power operation).

Date of issuance: June 4, 1998.

Effective date: As of date of issuance to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 211.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–70: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 22, 1998 (63 FR 19978). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 4, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50–321 and 50–366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of application for amendments: May 30, 1997, as supplemented April 1, 1998.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specification requirements to reflect a design modification that changes the power sources to valves associated with the low pressure coolant injection mode of the residual heat removal system.

Date of issuance: June 2, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented prior to startup from the next refueling outage for both units.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1–211; Unit 2–152.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–57 and NPF–5: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: July 16, 1997 (62 FR 38139).

The April 1, 1998, submittal provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the May 30, 1997, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 2, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Southern Nuclear Power Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50–424 and 50–425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of application for amendments: November 20, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated April 16, 1998.

Brief description of amendments: The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS): (1) Remove the inequalities applied to the ''Trip Setpoint'' column of TS Table 3.3.1–1, ''Reactor Trip System Instrumentation'' and TS Table 3.3.2–1, ''Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation'' and revise the ''Trip Setpoint'' column to read ''Nominal Trip Setpoint;'' (2) Add footnotes (n) and (i) to TS Tables 3.3.1–1 and 3.3.2–1, respectively, to include criteria for channel operability, reset, and calibration tolerance about the trip setpoint. These footnotes also allow for the trip setpoint to be set more conservatively than the Nominal Trip Setpoint value as necessary in response to plant conditions; (3) The Allowable Value for TS Table 3.3.1–1, Function 14.b, Turbine Trip—Turbine Stop Valve Closure, would be revised from ''[greater than or equal to] 96.7% open'' to ''[greater than or equal to] 90% open;'' (4) Revise footnotes (l) and (m) of TS Table 3.3.1–1 to refer to Nominal Trip Setpoint and delete the inequalities applied to the trip setpoints; (5) Delete the superscript ''(a)'' from the ''Trip Setpoint'' column on page 6 of 8 of Table 3.3.1–1; (6) Revise the inequality for the Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Allowable Value for Steam Line Pressure—Low (Table 3.3.2–1, Function 1.e) from ''[less than or equal to]'' to ''[greater than or equal to];'' and (7) Revise associated TS Bases to reflect the TS revisions.

Date of issuance: June 1, 1998.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1–101; Unit 2–79.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–68 and NPF–81: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: December 31, 1997 (62 FR 68318).

The supplement dated April 16, 1998, provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the November 20, 1997, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 1, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Burke County Library, 412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia.

TU Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50–445 and 50–446, Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Somervell County, Texas

Date of amendment request: May 1, 1995 (TXX–95090).

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise section 3/4.8.1 of the Technical Specifications (TSs) to reduce the minimum fuel oil volume requirement during MODES 5 and 6 for an operable emergency diesel generator (EDG) and allow continued OPERABLE status of diesel generators during all MODES for 48 hours with greater than a 6 day supply of diesel fuel for a given EDG.

Date of issuance: May 22, 1998.

Effective date: May 22, 1998, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1—Amendment No. 60; Unit 2—Amendment No. 46.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–87 and NPF–89: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: June 21, 1995 (60 FR 32373).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 22, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019.

Washington Public Power Supply System, Docket No. 50–397, Nuclear Project No. 2, Benton County, Washington

Date of application for amendment: December 4, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated January 28, 1998, March 3, 1998, March 9, 1998, and April 24, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment permits the continued used of the existing Siemens Power Corporation minimum critical power ratio (MCPR) safety limits for WNP–2 Fuel Cycle 14 and changes the ASEA Brown Boveri (ABB) MCPR safety limit for single loop operation from 1.08 for Cycle 13 to 1.09 for Cycle 14.

Date of issuance: May 29, 1998.

Effective date: May 29, 1998, to be implemented within 30 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 154.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–21: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: January 14, 1998 (63 FR 2284).

The January 28, 1998, March 3, 1998, March 9, 1998, and April 24, 1998, supplemental letters provided additional clarifying information and did not change the original no significant hazards consideration. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 29, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352.

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50–305, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendment: February 25, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to implement performance-based containment leakage testing under Option B of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J.

Date of issuance: May 28, 1998.

Effective date: May 28, 1998.

Amendment No.: 136.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–43: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 8, 1998 (63 FR 17237).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 28, 1998.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Wisconsin, Cofrin Library, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, WI 54311–7001.

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50–482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas

Date of amendment request: May 8, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated May 11, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment adds a new Action Statement to Technical Specification 3/4.3.2, Table 3.3–3, Functional Unit 7.b., Refueling Water Storage Tank Level—Low-Low Coincident With Safety Injection.

Date of issuance: May 28, 1998.

Effective date: May 28, 1998.

Amendment No.: 117.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–42: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes (63 FR 26829 dated May 14, 1998). The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. No comments have been received. The notice also provided for an opportunity to request a hearing by June 15, 1998, but indicated that if the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, consultation with the State of Kansas and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 28, 1998.

Local Public Document Room locations: Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621.

Attorney for Licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of June 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Elinor G. Adensam,

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–16012 Filed 6–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Meeting Between the American Society for Quality and NRC to Discuss Quality Assurance Principles

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of a meeting between the American Society for Quality, Energy and Environmental Division, Power Production Committee (ASQ EED) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) on quality assurance principles of mutual interest.

SUMMARY: The ASQ EED and the NRC have met periodically to discuss technical matters of mutual interest. Topics at this meeting will cover, codes and standards, graded QA, and more