hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date. A copy of the request for a hearing and the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to R.F. Fleishman, Esquire, General Counsel, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company P.O. Box 1475, Baltimore, MD 21203.

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 dated April 8, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555 and the Local Public Document Room for the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 located in the Calvert County Public Library, 30 Duke Street, Prince Frederick, MD 20678.

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

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Stephen T. Hoffman,

Acting Director, License Renewal Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–18066 Filed 7–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–261]

Carolina Power & Light; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–23, issued to Carolina Power & Light (CP&L or the licensee), for operation of the H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit 2, located in Darlington County, South Carolina.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.8, ''Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS),'' to permit an 8-hour delay in UHS temperature restoration period prior to entering the plant shutdown required actions. Also, for the duration of the restoration, service water system (SWS) temperature will be monitored hourly, and should the temperature exceed 99 degrees F, the plant will enter TS 3.7.8 required action A.1, and be in MODE 3 within 6 hours.

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.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6), for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine 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:

Carolina Power & Light (CP&L) Company has evaluated the proposed Technical Specification change and has concluded that it does not involve a significant hazards consideration. The conclusion is in accordance with the criteria set forth in 10 CFR 50.92. The bases for the conclusion that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration are discussed below.

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

The proposed change does not involve any physical alteration of plant systems, structures or components. The proposed change provides an allowed time for the plant condition resulting from service water temperature in excess of the design limit of 95°F. The Service Water System (SWS) temperature is not assumed to be an initiating condition of any accident analysis evaluated in the safety analysis report. Therefore, the allowance of a limited time for service water temperature to be in excess of the design limit does not involve an increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated in the safety analysis report (SAR). The SWS supports operability of safety related systems used to mitigate the consequences of an accident. An increase in service water temperature in excess of the design limit is expected to be small due to the limited time allowed by the proposed change in conjunction with the generally slow rate of temperature increase experienced from thermal changes in Lake Robinson. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the SAR.

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

The proposed change does not involve any physical alteration of plant systems, structures or components. The temperature of the service water when near or slightly above the service water design temperature does not introduce new failure mechanisms for systems, structures or components not already considered in the SAR. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated is not created.

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

The proposed change will allow a small increase in service water temperature above the design basis limit for the service water system and delay the requirement to shutdown the plant when the service water system design limit is exceeded by 8 hours. There are design margins associated with systems, structures and components that are cooled by the service water system that are affected. The service water system temperature is an input assumption for mitigating the effects of design basis accidents. However, an increase in service water temperature in excess of design limit is expected to be small due to the limited time allowed by the proposed change in conjunction with the slow rate of temperature increase experienced from thermal changes in Lake Robinson. Therefore, there is no significant reduction in margin of safety associated with this change.

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 amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 14 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 14-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 14-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. 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 August 7, 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 Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College Avenue, Hartsville, South Carolina 29550. 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 a 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 the amendment is issued before the expiration of the 30-day hearing period, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. If a hearing is requested, 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 William D. Johnson, Vice President and Senior Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, Post Office Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602, 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 June 26, 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 Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College Avenue, Hartsville, South Carolina 29550.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ram Subbaratnam,

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

[FR Doc. 98–18064 Filed 7–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 72–16]

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Old Dominion Electric Cooperative; Notice of Issuance of Materials License SNM–2507 North Anna Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) has issued a Materials License under the provisions of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 72 (10 CFR Part 72), to Virginia Electric and Power Company (Virginia Power) and Old Dominion Electric Cooperative (ODEC), authorizing receipt and storage of spent fuel in an independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) located on site at its North Anna Power Station in Louisa County, Virginia.

The function of the ISFSI is to provide interim storage for up to 839.04 metric tons of uranium contained in approximately 1824 fuel assemblies from the North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2, in storage casks. Thirty two assemblies are to be loaded into each cask within the North Anna Power Station spent fuel enclosure at the plant and subsequently transferred to the onsite ISFSI. The cask that is authorized for use is the TN–32 designed by Transnuclear, Inc. The license for an ISFSI under 10 CFR Part 72 is issued for 20 years, but the licensee may seek to renew the license, if necessary, prior to its expiration.

The Commission's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) has completed its environmental, safeguards, and safety reviews in support of issuance of this license.

Following receipt of the application filed May 9, 1995, a ''Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Materials License for the Storage of Spent Fuel and Opportunity for Hearing'' was published in the **Federal Register** on July 6, 1995 (60 FR 35237). The ''Environmental Assessment (EA) Related to the Construction and Operation of the North Anna Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (dated March 28, 1997) and Finding of No Significant Impact,'' was issued and noticed in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 16202) in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51. The scope of the EA included the construction and operation of an ISFSI on the North Anna Power Station site including impacts derived from use of the TN–32 cask.

The staff has completed its safety review of the North Anna ISFSI site application and safety analysis report. The NRC staff's ''Safety Evaluation Report for the North Anna Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation'' was issued on June 30, 1998. Materials License SNM–2507, the staff's Environmental Assessment, Safety Evaluation Report, and other documents related to this action are available for public inspection and for copying for a fee at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555, and at the local public document room at the Special Collections Department, Second Floor, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903–2498.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William F. Kane,

Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–18065 Filed 7–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–213]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; Haddam Neck Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License No. DPR–61, a license held by the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCO or the licensee). The exemption would apply to the Haddam Neck Plant, a permanently shutdown and defueled plant located at the CYAPCO site in Middlesex County, Connecticut.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption would modify security requirements to eliminate certain equipment, relocate certain equipment, modify certain procedures, and reduce the number of armed responders, due to the permanently shutdown and defueled status of the Haddam Neck facility.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated June 19, 1997. The requested action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 73.55, ''Requirements for physical protection of licensed activities in nuclear power plant reactors against radiological sabotage.''

Need for the Proposed Action

Haddam Neck was shut down on July 22, 1996. On December 5, 1996, the licensee informed the Commission that it had decided to permanently cease operations at Haddam Neck Plant and that all fuel had been permanently removed from the reactor. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(a)(2), the certifications in the letter modified the facility operating license to permanently withdraw CYAPCO's authority to operate the reactor and to load fuel into the reactor vessel. In this permanently shutdown condition, the facility poses a reduced risk to public health and safety. Because of this reduced risk, certain requirements of 10 CFR 73.55 are no longer appropriate. An exemption is required from portions of 10 CFR 73.55 to allow the licensee to implement a revised Defueled Security Plan that is appropriate for the permanently shutdown and defueled reactor facility.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. The Commission concludes that exemption from certain portions of 10 CFR 73.55 are acceptable given the reduced consequences of an act of sabotage resulting in the release of radioactive material contained in the spent fuel at a defueled reactor site.

The proposed change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact.

Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-