IV

The Commission has determined that pursuant to 10 CFR 70.14, this exemption is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants the licensee an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24 for Quad Cities.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact (63 FR 10957).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–8918 Filed 4–3–98; 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 20, 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 changing certain surveillance requirements currently performed during refueling outages such that the surveillance requirements could be performed when the reactor is operating or during outage periods not associated with refueling. The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on December 18, 1996 (61 FR 66709). However, by letter dated March 12, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated September 20, 1996, and the licensee's letter dated March 12, 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 31st 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. 98–8917 Filed 4–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–272 and 50–311]

Public Service Electric and Gas Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Public Service Electric and Gas Company (the licensee) to withdraw its May 14, 1997, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–70 and DPR–75 for the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would have revised the facility technical specifications pertaining to the surveillance requirements for the control room air conditioning system by changing the filter testing boundary and associated acceptance criteria.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on May 29, 1997 (62 FR 29158). However, by letter dated March 12, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated May 14, 1997, and the licensee's letter dated March 12, 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 Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Patrick D. Milano,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–8919 Filed 4–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–607]

Department of the Air Force at McClellan Air Force Base (McClellan Air Force Base Triga Reactor); Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of Facility Operating License No. R–130 for a term of 20 years for the Department of the Air Force at McClellan Air Force Base (AFB) (the applicant) 2.3-megawatt thermal (MW(t)) TRIGA reactor located at the McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center (MNRC), McClellan AFB, California.

Description of Proposed Action

The proposed action is the issuance of Facility Operating License No. R–130 for the MNRC TRIGA research reactor at McClellan AFB, California, in response to an application from the applicant dated October 23, 1996, as supplemented. The proposed action would authorize operation of the MNRC reactor at a power level of 2.3 MW(t) for a period of 20 years. The reactor has pulsing capability, with a maximum reactivity step addition of 1.75$ proposed by the applicant. The MNRC has been in operation since mid-1991 under the authority of the Department of the Air Force under Section 91b of the Atomic Energy Act. The applicant has sought NRC licensing of the reactor due to the planned closure of McClellan AFB.

Summary of the Environmental Assessment

The NRC staff has reviewed the applicant's application for an operating license including the applicant's environmental report. To document its review, the staff has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) which examined radiological and nonradiological impacts of continued operation, the environmental effects of postulated radiological accidents, and the long-term effects of continued facility operation. Based on its review of the applicant's application, the staff has determined that the environmental

impacts, both radiological and nonradiological, associated with the licensing the MNRC for a period of 20 years, are not significant and have been adequately evaluated by the applicant.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The staff has reviewed the applicant's application for an operating license and environmental report in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51. Based upon the EA, the staff concluded that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action and that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement.

For further details with respect to this action see the applicant's request for an operating license dated October 23, 1996, as supplemented on June 16, September 5, October 7 and 9, and December 17, 1997. These documents are available for public inspection at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20003. Single copies of the EA may be obtained from Alexander Adams Jr., Senior Project Manager, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, M.S. O–11–B–20, Washington, D.C. 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Marvin M. Mendonca,

Acting Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–8916 Filed 4–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–133]

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact; Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit No. 3)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of a license amendment to Facility License No. DPR–7, issued to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or the licensee), for the Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit No. 3, a permanently shut down plant, located near Eureka, California.

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise the Technical Specifications to incorporate the requirements of Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50, into the Radiological Effluents Technical Specification (RETS) and to relocate the controls and limitations on RETS and radiological environmental monitoring (currently in the Technical Specifications) to the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual and the Process Control Program. The proposed action would also revise the Technical Specifications to implement Generic Letter 89–01 (GL 89–01) and to incorporate the requirements of the revised 10 CFR Part 20.

The Need for the Proposed Action

On July 29, 1996, the NRC published a **Federal Register** notice containing decommissioning regulation amendments that became effective August 28, 1996. Contained within these amendments were revisions to 10 CFR 50.36a and 10 CFR 50, Appendix I, making the Appendix I requirements applicable to decommissioning activities as well as operating nuclear power reactors.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

There is no alternative to this proposed action. PG&E, the Humboldt Bay licensee must comply with the recently revised NRC decommissioning regulations which require the technical specification changes contained in the proposed license amendment.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

Although the proposed limits on radiological effluents are much more stringent that the limits in the current technical specifications, the previous radiological effluents from Humboldt Bay decommissioning were so low that they would have been in compliance with the proposed new limits. Thus, the proposed action does not involve any measurable environmental impacts, since neither the facility configuration nor SAFSTOR decommissioning mode will change. The staff has also determined that the proposed action will not have any significant radiological impacts on air, water, land, or biota in the area or any other significant environmental impact.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action based on the foregoing environmental assessment. The Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment for the reason given above.

For detailed information with respect to this proposed action, see the application for a license amendment dated December 9, 1996, as supplemented on June 12, 1997 and March 13, 1998. These documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Marvin M. Mendonca,

Acting Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–8915 Filed 4–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 100th meeting on April 21–22 (Room T–2B3) and April 23 (Room T–2B1), 1998, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The schedule for this meeting is as follows:

Tuesday, April 21, 1998—8:30 A.M. until 6 P.M.

Wednesday, April 22, 1998—8:30 A.M. until 6 P.M.

Thursday, April 23, 1998—8:30 A.M. until 4 P.M.

A. *Viability Assessment (VA) Guidance*—The NRC staff will discuss guidance being prepared for its review of the Department of Energy's (DOE's) Yucca Mountain Viability Assessment.

B. *NEI Comments on VA*—Representatives from the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) will comment on the DOE's viability assessment for the proposed high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain.

C. *Meeting with the NRC Executive Director for Operations*—Mr. Callan will discuss a number of issues of mutual interest with the Committee.