• Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

• Evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

• Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

• Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before May 5, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments are to be submitted to the Docket Office, Docket No. ICR–98–9, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. Telephone: (202) 219–7894. Written comments limited to 10 pages or less in length may also be transmitted by facsimile to (202) 219–5046.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Theda Kenney, Directorate of Safety Standards Programs, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–3605, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, telephone: (202) 219–8061. Copies of the referenced information collection request are available for inspection and copying in the Docket Office and will be mailed to persons who request copies by telephoning Theda Kenney at (202) 219–8061, ext. 100, or Barbara Bielaski at (202) 219–8076, ext. 142. For electronic copies of the Information Collection Request for Gear Certification, contact OSHA's WebPage on the Internet at Http://www.osha.gov/ and click on ''standards.''

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act) authorizes the promulgation of such health and safety standards as are necessary or appropriate to provide safe or healthful employment and places of employment. The statute specifically authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidents.

In 29 CFR part 1919, OSHA is requiring information to be collected by accredited agencies to determine the condition of certain cargo handling gear and other material handling devices to ensure the safety of those employees working in the maritime industry while using such equipment.

II. Current Actions

This notice requests public comment on OSHA's burden hour estimates prior to OSHA seeking Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of the information collection requirements for the OSHA 70, 71 and 72 Forms required under 29 CFR part 1919—Gear Certification.

Type of Review: Extension of a Currently Approved Collection.

Agency: U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Title: Gear Certification (29 CFR part 1919).

OMB Number: 1218–0003.

Agency Number: Docket Number ICR–98–9.

Affected Public: State or local governments; Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 120.

Frequency: Annually, Quadrennially.

Average Time per Response: 1.25 hours.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 93.

Total Annualized Capital/Startup Costs: $474,406.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 2nd day of March 1998.

Charles N. Jeffress,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–5844 Filed 3–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 98–030]

NASA Advisory Council (NAC), Advisory Committee on the International Space Station (ACISS); Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting change.

FEDERAL REGISTER CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: Notice Number 98–026.

ANNOUNCED DATES AND ADDRESS OF MEETING: Thursday, March 12, from 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.; and Friday, March 13, 1997, from 8:00 a.m. until 11:00 a.m. and from 2:00 p.m. until 3:30 p.m. Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, Building 1, Room 966, Houston, TX 77058–3696.

ADDITION TO THE AGENDA: Report of the Cost Assessment and Validation Task Force.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. W. Michael Hawes, Code ML, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546, 202/358–0242.

Dated: February 28, 1998.

Matthew M. Crouch,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–5755 Filed 3–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Sunshine Act Meeting; Notice of Change in Date of Meeting

The National Credit Union Administration Board determined that its business requires the previously announced (Federal Register, Page 10653, March 4, 1998) closed meeting scheduled for 10:00 a.m., Friday, March 6, 1998 to be rescheduled.

TIME AND DATE: 10:00 a.m., Thursday, March 12, 1998.

PLACE: Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314–3428.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Year 2000 Compliance. Closed pursuant to exemptions (2) and (8).

2. SSP Vacancies and Related Personnel Matters. Closed pursuant to exemptions (2) and (6).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Becky Baker, Secretary of the Board, Telephone (703) 518–6304.

Becky Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 98–6003 Filed 3–4–98; 2:26 pm]

BILLING CODE 7535–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–317 and 50–318]

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

On Friday, January 31, 1997, a **Federal Register** Notice (62 FR 4816)

was published stating that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–53 and DPR–69 issued to the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BGE or the licensee) for operation of the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Calvert County, Maryland.

The proposed amendments requested by the licensee in a letter dated December 4, 1996, would represent a full conversion from the current Technical Specifications (TSs) to a set of TS based on NUREG–1432, Revision 1, ''Standard Technical Specifications, Combustion Engineering Plants dated April 1995. Since that time, the Commission has received supplements to the application dated March 27, June 9, June 18, July 21, August 19, September 10, October 6, October 20, October 23, November 5, 1997, and January 12 and 28, 1998. Therefore, issues not fully discussed in (62 FR 4816) are presented below.

The proposed amendment includes the following:

1. The licensee is proposing to add a new surveillance requirement (SR) 3.4.9.2 to the Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) which will require verification that the capacity of each required bank of pressurizer heaters is equal to or greater than 150 kW every 24 months. This is a more restrictive change.

2. The licensee has proposed a change to the current TS applicability for the pressurizer safety valves which require that both safety valves be operable in Modes 1, 2, and 3 and that one safety valve be operable in Modes 4 and 5. The ITS will modify these applicability requirements for Mode 3 to specify that two safety valves shall be operable with all reactor coolant system (RCS) cold leg temperature >365 °F for Unit 1 and >301 °F for Unit 2. This is a less restrictive change.

3. The licensee proposes that the power-operated relief valve (PORVs) be demonstrated operable by performance of a channel test once per 92 days as part of the conversion to the ITS. The current TS require that the PORVs be demonstrated operable by performance of a Channel Function Test once per 31 days. This a less restrictive change.

4. Current TS 3.4.6 2.C specifies that the RCS shall be limited to ''1 gpm total primary—to secondary leakage through all steam generators and 100 gallon-per-day through any one steam generator.'' The proposed ITS LCO 3.4.1.3 eliminates the limit of 1 gpm total primary-to-secondary leakage through all steam generators and thus will only require a limit of 100 gallon per day through any one steam generator. This is an administrative change.

5. Current TS SR 4.5.2.f.2 requires verifying at least once per Refueling Interval, during shutdown, that the high-pressure safety injection pump and low-pressure safety injection pump (LPSI) start automatically upon receipt of a safety injection actuation test signal. Proposed ITS SR 3.5.2.6 retains this same requirement with a specified frequency of 24 months, which is equivalent to the refueling interval. The proposed ITS will add a new SR 3.5.2.7 which requires verification that each LPSI pump stops on an actual or simulated actuation signal. This a more restrictive change.

6. The proposed amendment regarding the control room emergency ventilation system (CREVS) changes the surveillance from 18 months to 24 months (each refueling cycle) for the following SR. Current TS SR 4.7.6.1.e.2 requires that each train of CREVS is demonstrated operable at least once every 18 months by verifying that on a control room high radiation test signal, the system automatically switches into a recirculation mode of operation with flow through the HEPA filters and charcoal adsorber banks and that both of the isolation valves in each duct and common exhaust duct, and isolation valve in the toilet exhaust area duct, close. The above change is less restrictive.

7. The proposed amendment regarding the control room emergency temperature system (CRETS) changes the surveillance interval from 62 days on a staggered basis (one train every 31 days) to 24 months (each refueling interval) for the following SR:

Current TS SR 4.7.6.1.a requires demonstrating that each CRETS train is operable at least once every 62 days, on a staggered test basis (one train every 31 days) by: (1) Deenergizing the backup Control Room air conditioner; and (2) verifying that the emergency Control Room air conditioners maintain the air temperature [less than or equal to] 104 °F for at least 12 hours when in the recirculation mode.

SR 4.7.6.1.a changes to ITS SR 3.7.9.1 to require demonstrating operability of CRETS at least every 24 months by verifying each CRETS train has the capability to maintain control room temperature within limits. The above changes are less restrictive.

8. The proposed amendment regarding the spent fuel pool exhaust ventilation system (SFPEVS) will change the surveillance interval from 18 months to 24 months (each refueling interval) for the following SR. This is a less restrictive change.

Current TS SR 4.9.12.d requires demonstrating that the SFPEVS is operable at least once per 18 months by: (1) Verifying that the pressure drop across the combined HEPA filters and charcoal adsorber banks are <4 inches Water Gauge while operating the ventilation system at a flow rate of 32,000 cfm plus or minus 10%; and (2) verifying that each exhaust fan maintains the spent fuel storage pool at a measurable negative pressure relative to the outside atmosphere during system operation.

SR 4.9.12.d will change to ITS SR 3.7.11.3 to require demonstrating that the SFPEVS is operable at least once per 24 months by verifying that each exhaust fan maintains the spent fuel pool at a measurable negative pressure relative to the outside atmosphere during system operation.

9. The proposed amendment regarding the penetration room exhaust ventilation system (PREVS) changes the surveillance interval from 18 months to 24 months (each refueling interval for the following SR:

Current TS SR 4.6.6.1.d.2 requires demonstrating that each PREVS train is operable at least once per 18 months by verifying that the filter train starts on a Containment Isolation Test Signal.

SR 4.6.6.1.d.2 changes to ITS SR 3.7.12.3 to require demonstrating operability of the PREVS at least once every 24 months by verifying each PREVS train starts on an actual or simulated actuation signal. The above change is less restrictive.

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.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards 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 for the above items.

Item 1 and Item 5—More Restrictive Changes

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

The proposed changes provide more stringent requirements than previously existed in the Technical Specifications. Each change was evaluated and it was determined that these more stringent requirements do not result in operation that will increase the probability of initiating an analyzed event. If anything, the new requirements may decrease the probability or consequences of an analyzed event by incorporating the more restrictive changes discussed above. The proposed changes do not alter assumptions relative to mitigation of an accident or transient. The more restrictive requirements continue to ensure process variables, structures, systems, and components are maintained consistent with the safety analyses and licensing basis. The proposed changes do not significantly affect initiators or mitigation of analyzed events, and therefore do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes provide more stringent requirements than previously existed in the Technical Specifications. The changes will not involve a significant change in design or operation of the plant. No hardware is being added to the plant as part of the proposed changes. The proposed changes will not introduce any new accident initiators. The changes do impose different requirements. However, these changes are consistent with the assumptions in the safety analyses and licensing basis. Therefore, the changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does this change involve a significant reduction in margin of safety?

The proposed changes provide more stringent requirements than previously existed in the Technical Specifications. An evaluation of these changes concluded that adding these more restrictive requirements either increases or has no impact on the margin of safety. The changes provide additional restrictions which may enhance plant safety. The changes maintain requirements within the safety analyses and licensing basis. As such, no question of safety is involved. Therefore, the changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Item 2—Less Restrictive Changes

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

The proposed change deletes the Mode 3 with any cold leg temperature [less than or equal to] 365°F ([less than or equal to] 301°F for Unit 2) and the Mode 4 and 5 Applicabilities from the Modes of Applicability for the pressurizer safety valves. The pressurizer safety valves are not initiators of any analyzed event. The pressurizer safety valves are not required to mitigate any accidents in Mode 3 with cold leg temperature [less than or equal to] 365°F ([less than or equal to] 301°F for Unit 2), or in Modes 4 or 5. In Mode 3 with any cold leg temperature [less than or equal to] 365°F ([less than or equal to] 301°F for Unit 2) overpressure protection is provided by the Low Temperature Overpressure Protection (LTOP) System. The change will not alter assumptions relative to the mitigation of an accident or transient. The proposed changes do not significantly affect initiators or mitigation of analyzed events, and therefore do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change deletes the Mode 3 with any cold leg temperature [less than or equal to] 365°F ([less than or equal to] 301°F for Unit 2), and the Mode 4 and 5 Applicabilities from the Modes of Applicability for the pressurizer safety valves. The change will not involve a significant change in design or operation of the plant. No hardware is being added to the plant as part of the proposed change. The proposed change will not introduce any new accident initiators. Therefore, the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does this change involve a significant reduction in margin of safety?

The proposed change deletes the Mode 3 with any cold leg temperature [less than or equal to] 365°F ([less than or equal to] 301°F for Unit 2), and Mode 4 and 5 Applicabilities from the Modes of Applicability for the pressurizer safety valves. The pressurizer safety valves are not required for overpressure protection in Mode 3 with any cold leg temperature [less than or equal to] 365°F ([less than or equal to] 301°F for Unit 2), or in Modes 4 or 5. The overpressure protection in these Modes are provided by the LTOP System. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Item 3—Less Restrictive Change

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency for the PORV Special Test Exception from 31 days to 92 days. Decreasing the PORV Special Test Exception Frequency to 92 days is not an initiator of any analyzed event. The PORV shares the same instrumentation as the Reactor Protective System Pressurizer High Function, which was approved for quarterly Channel Functional Testing in an NRC Safety Evaluation Report, dated August 24, 1994. A plant-specific setpoint drift analysis demonstrated that the observed changes in instrument uncertainties for extended Surveillance test intervals do not exceed the current 30-day setpoint assumptions. This provides confidence the 90–92 day test interval will not impact the ability of the PORV to perform its safety function. The change will not significantly alter assumptions relative to the mitigation of an accident or transient. The proposed changes do not significantly affect initiators or mitigation of analyzed events, and therefore do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency for the PORV Channel Functional Test from 31 days to 92 days. The change will not involve a significant change in design or operation of the plant. No hardware is being added to the plant as part of the proposed change. The proposed change will not introduce any new accident initiators. Therefore, the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does this change involve a significant reduction in margin of safety?

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency for the PORV Channel Functional Test from 31 days to 92 days. The PORV shares the same instrumentation as the Reactor Protective System Pressurizer Pressure High Function, which was approved for quarterly Channel Functional Testing in an NRC Safety Evaluation Report, dated August 24, 1994. This change makes the testing Frequency for the PORV consistent with the Reactor Protective System High Pressurizer Function, which shares the same instrumentation. The core melt Frequency remains unchanged. Also, the instrument drift resulting from the proposed Surveillance interval is less than the instrument drift presently assumed for the current Surveillance interval. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Item 4—Administrative Change

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

The proposed changes involve reformatting, renumbering, and rewording of the existing Technical Specifications, along with the incorporation of current plant practices and other changes, as discussed above, in order to be consistent with NUREG–1432. These changes involve no technical changes to the existing Technical Specifications. Specifically, there will be no change in the requirements imposed on Calvert Cliffs due to these changes. Thus, the changes are administrative in nature and do not impact initiators of analyzed events. The proposed changes do not significantly affect initiators or mitigation of analyzed events, and therefore do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes involve reformatting, renumbering, and rewording of the existing Technical Specifications, along with the incorporation of current plant

practices and other changes, as discussed above, in order to be consistent with NUREG–1432. The changes will not involve a significant change in design or operation of the plant. No hardware is being added to the plant as part of the proposed change. The proposed changes will not introduce any new accident initiators. Therefore, the changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does this change involve a significant reduction in margin of safety?

The proposed changes involve reformatting, renumbering, and rewording of the existing Technical Specifications, along with the incorporation of current plant practices and other changes, as discussed above, in order to be consistent with NUREG–1432. The changes are administrative in nature and will not involve any technical changes. The changes will not reduce a margin of safety because it has no impact on any safety analysis assumptions. Therefore, the changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Item 6—Less Restrictive Changes

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency from 18 to 24 months for verifying that the Control Room Emergency Ventilation System (CREVS) will actuate on an actual or simulated actuation signal. The CREVS is not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated so there is no change in the probability of an accident. The 24-month test frequency is sufficient to verify that the equipment will actuate if needed, so the equipment will continue to be able to mitigate the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. Therefore, this change will not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency from 18 to 24 months for verifying that the CREVS will actuate on an actual or simulated actuation signal. This change will not physically alter the plant (no new or different types of equipment will be installed). The change does not require any new or unusual operator actions. Therefore, the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change decreased the Surveillance Frequency from 18 to 24 months for verifying that the CREVS will actuate on an actual or simulated actuation signal. A review of previously performed Surveillances determined that no failures have been found during the performance of this SR once per 18 months. Given the performance history, there is no reason to believe that a Frequency of 24 months would result in reduced reliability of the system. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Item 7—Less Restrictive Change

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

The proposed change will decrease the Frequency from 62 days on a Staggered Test Basis (one train every 31 days) to 24 months for verifying that the CRETS can maintain temperature in the Control Room at [less than or equal to] 104°F. This change will not significantly increase the possibility of an accident previously evaluated. The CRETS is not an initiator of any analyzed event. This change will not significantly increase the consequences of an accident. The CRETS will still be tested at a Frequency that will show it can maintain Control Room temperature. Review of the past 10 years of data has shown that during this period the test has never failed. This change will not significantly affect the assumptions relative to the mitigation of accidents or transients. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant increase in the probability of consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change will decrease the Frequency from 62 days on a Staggered Test Basis (one train every 31 days) to 24 months for verifying that the CRETS can maintain temperature in the Control Room at [less than or equal to] 104°F. This change does not involve a significant change in the design or operation of the plant. No hardware is being added to the plant as part of the proposed change. The proposed change will not introduce any new accident initiators. Therefore, the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change will decrease the Frequency from 62 days on a Staggered Test Basis (one train every 31 days) to 24 months for verifying that the CRETS can maintain temperature in the Control Room at [less than or equal to] 104°F. The margin of safety is not significantly affected by this change. The Surveillance will still be performed at an interval which will prove the CRETS remains Operable based on an evaluation of past Surveillance history. Also, increasing the Surveillance interval will prevent inadvertent wear and tear on the system due to over testing, which can possibly lead to premature failures. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Item 8—Less Restrictive Change

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency from 18 months to 24 months for verifying that the SFPEVS can maintain a measurable negative pressure in the spent fuel pool area of the Auxiliary Building. This change will not affect the probability of an accident. The SFPEVS is not an initiator of any analyzed event. The change will not affect the consequences of an accident. The 24-month Frequency is sufficient to ensure that the SFPEVS can maintain a measurable negative pressure in the spent fuel pool area. The change will not alter assumptions relative to the mitigation of an accident or transient. Therefore, the change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency from 18 months to 24 months for verifying that the SFPEVS can maintain a measurable negative pressure in the spent fuel pool area of the Auxiliary Building. This change will not physically alter the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed). The change does not require any new or unusual operator actions. Therefore, the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency from 18 to 24 months for verifying that the SFPEVS can maintain a measurable negative pressure in the spent fuel pool area of the Auxiliary Building. The margin of safety is not significantly affected by this change. The failure history for this SR has shown that no failures have occurred in the previous ten years. The proposed Frequency will continue to prove that the SFPEVS will maintain a negative pressure in the spent fuel pool area. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Item 9—Less Restrictive Change

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency from 18 to 24 months for verifying that the Penetration Room Emergency Ventilation System (PREVS) will actuate on an actual or simulated actuation signal. The PREVS is not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated so there is no change in the probability of an accident. The 24-month test frequency is sufficient to verify that the equipment will actuate if needed so the equipment will continue to be able to mitigate the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. Therefore, this change will not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency from 18 to 24 months for verifying that the PREVS will actuate on an actual or simulated actuation signal. This change will not physically alter the plant (no new or different types of equipment will be installed). The change does not require any new or unusual operator actions. Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change decreases the Surveillance Frequency from 18 to 24 months for verifying that the PREVS will actuate on an actual or simulated actuation signal. A review of previously performed Surveillances determined that no failures have been found during the performance of this SR once per 18 months. Given the performance history, there is no reason to believe that a Frequency of 24 months would result in reduced reliability of the system. Therefore, this change will not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analyses 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, regarding the matters discussed above.

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 April 6, 1998, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678. 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 Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037, 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 4, 1996, as supplemented March 27, June 9, June 18, July 21, August 14, August 19, September 10, October 6, October 20, October 23, November 5, 1997, and January 12 and January 28, 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 Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Alexander W. Dromerick,

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

[FR Doc. 98–5809 Filed 3–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–220]

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is permitting the withdrawal of Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation's (the licensee) application of September 26, 1996, regarding the proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–63 for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, located in Oswego County, New York.

The proposed amendment would have revised the facility technical specifications by adding Specification 3.7.2/4.7.2, ''Special Test Exception—System Leakage and Hydrostatic Testing.''

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on November 21, 1996 (61 FR 59248). However, by letter dated February 2, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated September 26, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated May 6, 1997, and the licensee's letter dated February 2, 1998, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Darl S. Hood,

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

[FR Doc. 98–5806 Filed 3–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No.: 30–5897]

Applications, Hearings, Determinations, etc.: Phillip's Research Center's Radiation Laboratory; Bartlesville, OK

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of consideration of amendment request for decommissioning the Phillip's Research Center's Radiation Laboratory in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, and oppportunity for a hearing.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of a license amendment to Byproduct Material License No. 35–00313–03, issued to the Phillips Petroleum Company (Phillips), to authorize decommissioning of portions of its facility at Phillip's Research Center in Bartlesville, Oklahoma. Phillips is currently authorized by the NRC to perform activities with licensed radioactive material at its Phillip's Research Center and plans to continue licensed operations at this site.

On November 12, 1996, Phillips notified NRC of its intent to cease principal activities permanently at the Radiation Laboratory. The licensee has been decommissioning the Radiation Laboratory at the Bartlesville facility in accordance with the conditions discussed in License No. 35–00313–03. On April 7, 1997, the licensee submitted a site decommissioning plan (SDP) to NRC for review that summarized the decommissioning activities that will be undertaken to remediate the Radiation Laboratory, and release it from radiological controls and licensing restrictions so that the building debris can be disposed in an industrial landfill. Radioactive contamination at the licensee's Radiation Laboratory facility discussed in the SDP consists of soils and building rubble contaminated with tritium resulting from licensed operations that occurred from 1960 until 1996. Because Phillips is actively performing work under their current license, they are not requesting unrestricted release of the entire site at the Phillip's Research Center, nor termination of the license.

Phillips requested NRC approval of site specific decommissioning criteria for tritium. The NRC will review the licensee's request for elevated release criteria for tritium. During decommissioning activities, the NRC will require the licensee to maintain effluents and doses within NRC requirements and as low as reasonably achievable.

Prior to approving the decommissioning plan, NRC will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and NRC's regulations. These findings will be documented in a Safety Evaluation Report and an Environmental Assessment. Approval of the SDP will be documented in an amendment to License No. 35–00313–03.

The NRC hereby provides notice that this is a proceeding on an application for amendment of a license falling within the scope of Subpart L ''Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudication in Materials Licensing Proceedings,'' of NRC's rules and practice for domestic licensing proceedings in 10 CFR Part 2. Pursuant to § 2.1205(a), any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a request for a hearing in accordance with § 2.1205(d). A request for a hearing must be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of the publication of this **Federal Register** notice.