individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: December 21, 1998.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–34273 Filed 12–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Indiana Michigan Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity For a Hearing

[Docket Nos. 50–315 and 50–316]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–58 and Facility Operating License No. DPR–74 issued to Indiana Michigan Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 located in Berrien County, Michigan. The proposed license amendment would revise Technical Specification Section 4.6.5.1, ''Ice Condenser, Ice Bed,'' and its associated bases to reflect the maximum ice condenser flow channel blockage assumed in the accident analyses.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below.

Criterion 1

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

The ice condenser system is used to mitigate the consequences of an accident and has no impact on the initiation of any evaluated accidents. Therefore, changing the flow channel surveillance does not increase the probability of an evaluated accident.

The proposed changes to the flow channel surveillance provide additional assurance beyond current requirements to provide reasonable assurance that the maximum analyzed blockage of 15% is not exceeded. Therefore, the change does not represent an increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2

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

The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The ice condenser has no function during normal operation. It is a passive system that functions after an accident has already occurred. The proposed change to the ice condenser flow channel surveillance does not alter physical characteristics of the ice condenser, nor does it change the function of the ice condenser. No new failure mechanisms are introduced by this change.

Therefore, it was concluded that the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Criterion 3

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

The proposed change to the ice condenser flow channel surveillance provides additional assurance that the ice condenser should contain the minimum analyzed flow area. By ensuring the minimum analyzed area is always available, inherent margins due to conservative assumptions in the calculation are maintained. These conservative assumptions include, for example, taking no credit for ice or frost blockage being blown clear during the accident and assuming only one dimensional flow through the ice bed with no credit taken for cross flow.

Therefore, these changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Conclusion

In summary, based upon the above evaluation, the Licensee has concluded that these changes involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 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. 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 Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below. By January 27, 1999, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in

accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, MI 49085. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made 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 Jeremy J. Euto, Esquire, 500 Circle Drive, Buchanan, MI 49107, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(I)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated December 3, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, MI 49085.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stang, Jr.,

Sr. Project Manager, Project Directorate III–1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–34245 Filed 12–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Inspection and Enforcement for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Medical Use Licensees—Public Meeting

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is developing new initiatives to streamline both inspection and enforcement, for certain medical use licensees. NRC will hold a public meeting on January 8, 1999, to obtain early public input in the development of this guidance.

DATES: The meeting will be held on January 8, 1999, from 9:00 a.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Two White Flint North, Room 2–B–3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852–2738.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald E. Zelac, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, telephone, 301–415–6316, e-mail *rez@nrc.gov*.

NRC plans to streamline both inspection and enforcement, for all materials licensees. NRC will begin this new approach with a 1-year pilot program for certain medical use licenses, specifically for nuclear medicine programs (use under 10 CFR 35.100, 35.200, and 35.300), beginning in calendar year 1999. These licenses represent approximately 30 percent of current NRC material licenses.