granted the request of Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (the licensee) to withdraw its September 2, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated January 15, 1998. Application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–42 for the Wolf Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1, located in Coffey County, Kansas.

The proposed amendment would have revised the technical specifications related to the auxiliary feedwater system.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on October 22, 1997 (62 FR 54878). However, by letter dated November 6, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated September 2, 1997, and supplemental letter dated January 15, 1998, and the licensee's letter dated November 6, 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 rooms located at the Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of November 1998.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Kristine M. Thomas,

Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–2, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–31497 Filed 11–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Dockets 70–7001 and 70–7002]

Notice of Renewal for Certificates of Compliance GDP–1 and GDP–2 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Paducah and Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plants, Paducah, Kentucky, and Portsmouth, Ohio

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing a certification decision for the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) to allow continued operation of the two gaseous diffusion plants (GDPs) located near Paducah, Kentucky, and Piketon, Ohio. The Director's Decision is to issue renewed Certificates of Compliance for the GDPs that cover a five-year period. USEC submitted its renewal applications on April 15, 1998. Notice of Receipt of the applications appeared in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 24832) on May 5, 1998, allowing a 45-day public comment period on the applications. As required by the Energy Policy Act, NRC consulted with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) about certification. EPA did not identify any significant compliance issues.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate renewal applications for the gaseous diffusion plants located near Paducah, Kentucky, and Piketon, Ohio, and concluded that in combination with certificate conditions, they provide reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue a renewed Certificate of Compliance for each plant. The staff has prepared Compliance Evaluation Reports which provide details of the staff's evaluations.

The NRC staff has determined that the renewals satisfy the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22(c)(19). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for the renewal.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected and who submitted written comments in response to the **Federal Register** Notice on the renewal application under Section 76.37 may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary, 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.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for renewal and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Reports. These items (except for classified and proprietary portions which are withheld in accordance with 10 CFR 2.790, ''Availability of Public Records'') 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 established for these facilities.

Date of renewal requests: April 15, 1998.

Brief description of renewal applications: USEC did not request any changes to the existing documentation; previous applications, statements, and reports are incorporated by reference into the renewal application. These include the Technical Safety Requirements, Safety Analysis Report, Compliance Plan, Quality Assurance Program, Emergency Plan, Security and Safeguards Plans, Waste Management Program, and Decommissioning Funding Program, etc. Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the Paducah GDP and Certificate of Compliance GDP–2 for the Portsmouth GDP will be renewed for a 5-year period. This will allow continued operation of the GDPs.

Effective date: The renewal of Certificates of Compliance GDP–1 and GDP–2 becomes effective immediately after being signed by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Local Public Document Room locations: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003 and Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Merri Horn, (301) 415–8126 or Mr.

Yawar Faraz (301) 415–8113; Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Elizabeth Q. Ten Eyck,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–31498 Filed 11–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corp., Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination the staff concluded that: (1) There is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22(c)(19). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review 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.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. 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 Room.

Date of amendment request: September 11, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to delete Technical Safety Requirements (TSRs) 2.3.2.1, ''Normetex Pump Discharge Pressure,'' and 2.3.3.1, ''Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System.'' The request also includes changes to related sections of the Safety Analysis Report (SAR) to support deletion of the TSR requirements.

Basis for finding of no significance:

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed amendment deletes TSR requirements for the Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System. The accident scenario that the system was designed to prevent did not change so uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) remains the only effluent that may be released, and the amount remains bounded by the 250 lbs controlled by the Normetex UF_6 Release Detection System. Therefore, there is no change in the effluents that may be released offsite.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed amendment does not propose any new or unanalyzed activity for the facility. Therefore, the amendment would not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed amendment does not involve any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed amendment deletes TSR requirements for the Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System. The accident scenario that the system was designed to prevent did not change, and the potential source term for UF_6 remains bounded by the 250 lbs controlled by the Normetex UF_6 Release Detection System. The downgrading of the Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System from a quality (Q) safety system to a non-safety safety system is offset by the upgrading of the Normetex Pump discharge block valve interlock to a Q safety system. Both systems were designed to prevent an overpressure of the pump discharge line when the pump discharge block valve closes with the pump still running. Worker protection practices would limit any exposure to the worker from any potential smaller release. Therefore, the proposed change will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical