Lynn Canal near Juneau, Alaska, July 27, 1996.

6984 Pipeline Special Investigation Report—Brittle-like Cracking in Plastic Pipe for Gas Service.

6986 Railroad Regional Briefs and Safety Recommendation letter to the Federal Railroad Administration.

NEWS MEDIA CONTACT: Telephone: (202) 314–6100.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: Rhonda Underwood (202) 314–6065.

Dated: April 3, 1998.

Rhonda Underwood,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–9265 Filed 4–3–98; 3:13 pm]

BILLING CODE 7533–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50–454 and STN 50–455]

Commonwealth Edison Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 issued to Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee) for operation of the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Ogle County, Illinois.

The proposed amendments would allow the licensee to defer the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Type A testing of the Byron, Unit 2, containment until the next refueling outage in 1999.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, 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 amendments requested 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 amendments 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:

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

An extension, by a maximum of 10 months, of the Type A test interval does not involve a change to any structures, systems, or components, does not affect reactor operations, is not an accident initiator, and does not change any existing safety analysis previously evaluated in the UFSAR. Therefore, there is no significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

Several tables of UFSAR Chapter 15, ''Accident Analyses,'' provide containment leak rate values used in assessing the consequences of accidents discussed in this chapter. Although an extension can increase the probability that an increase in containment leakage could go undetected for a maximum of 10 months the risk resulting from this proposed change is inconsequential as documented in NUREG–1493, ''Performance-Based Containment Leakage Test Program''. This document indicated that given the insensitivity of reactor risk to containment leakage rate and a small fraction of leakage paths are detected solely by Type A testing, increasing the time between integrated leak rate tests is possible with minimal impact on public risk. Further, industry experience presented in this document indicated that Type A testing has had insignificant impact on uncertainties involved with containment leak rates.

Based on risk information presented in NUREG–1493, the proposed change does not increase the probability or 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.

The proposed change does not alter the plant design, systems, components, or reactor operations, only the frequency of test performance. New conditions or parameters that contribute to the initiation of accidents would not be created as a result of this proposed change. The change does not involve new equipment and existing equipment does not have to be operated in a different manner, therefore there are no new failure modes to consider.

An extension, by a maximum of 10 months, of the Type A test interval as shown in NUREG–1493 has no impact on, nor contributes to the possibility of a new or different kind of accident as evaluated in the UFSAR. Therefore, the proposed change does 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.

With the exception of this 10 month extension of the Type A test interval, the actual tests will not change. Quantitative risk studies documented in NUREG-1493 regarding extended testing intervals demonstrated that there was minimal impact on the public health and safety. Reducing the frequency and allowing for a greater test interval, as stated in the NUREG resulted in an ''imperceptible'' increase in risk to public safety. Further, a table in this NUREG regarding risk impacts due to a reduction in testing frequency illustrates that there was also minimal difference in risk to the public safety when the test frequency was relaxed.

The proposed change will not reduce the availability of systems and components associated with containment integrity that would be required to mitigate accident conditions nor are any containment leakage rates, parameters or accident assumptions affected by the proposed change.

The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, based on the above information.

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 amendments requested involve 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 amendments 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 amendments before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments involve 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 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 hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By May 7, 1998, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating licenses 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 Byron Public Library District, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron Illinois 61010. 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 amendments 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 amendments requested involve no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendments and make them immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

If the final determination is that the amendments requested involve a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendments.

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 Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603, 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 amendments dated November 7, 1997, as supplemented March 24, 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 Byron Public Library District, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron Illinois 61010.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of April, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John B. Hickman,

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

[FR Doc. 98–9039 Filed 4–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request for Review of a Revised & Expiring Information Collection: Form SF 2802 and SF 2802B

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for review of the following revised and expiring information collections: The SF 2802, Application for Refund of Retirement Deductions (Civil Service Retirement System) and