10. *Date:* August 7, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 415.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for College Teachers and Independent Scholars in Languages and Literature I, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for projects at the May 1, 1998 deadline.
11. *Date:* August 10, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 315.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for College Teachers and Independent Scholars in Philosophy, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for projects at the May 1, 1998 deadline.
12. *Date:* August 10, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 415.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for College Teachers and Independent Scholars in American Literature, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for projects at the May 1, 1998 deadline.
13. *Date:* August 11, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 315.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for College Teachers and Independent Scholars in American Studies, Rhetoric, Communication, and Media, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for projects at the May 1, 1998 deadline.
14. *Date:* August 11, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 415.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for University Teachers in Modern European Languages, Literature, and Criticism, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for projects at the May 1, 1998 deadline.
15. *Date:* August 12, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 315.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for College Teachers and Independent Scholars in Classical and Medieval Studies, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for projects at the May 1, 1998 deadline.
16. *Date:* August 12, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 415.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for University Teachers in Ancient, Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for the May 1, 1998 deadline.
17. *Date:* August 13, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 315.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for University Teachers in Art and Architectural History, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for the May 1, 1998 deadline.
18. *Date:* August 17, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 315.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for University Teachers in American Literature, Linguistics, and Literary Criticism, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for the May 1, 1998 deadline.
19. *Date:* August 19, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 315.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for University Teachers in British Literature, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for the May 1, 1998 deadline.
20. *Date:* August 19, 1998.
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Room: 415.
Program: This meeting will review applications for Fellowships for University Teachers and Independent Scholars in British Literature, submitted to the Division of Research and Education for the May 1, 1998 deadline.

Nancy E. Weiss,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–20263 Filed 7–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7536–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–271]

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation (the licensee) to withdraw its February 5, 1996, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–28 for the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, located in Vernon Vermont.

The proposed amendment would have revised the technical specifications to correct typographical errors, textual inconsistencies, minor errors, and add other enhancements. In addition, equipment identification numbers would be added to the tables.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on March 13, 1996, (61 FR 10398). However, by letter dated July 14, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated February 5, 1996, and the licensee's letter dated July 14, 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 Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, VT 05301.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of July 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard P. Croteau,
Project Manager, Project Directorate I–3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–20236 Filed 7–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–298]

Nebraska Public Power District; Cooper Nuclear Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering the issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–46 that was issued to Nebraska Public Power District (the licensee) for operation of the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS), located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed amendment will revise the existing, or current, Technical Specifications (CTS) for the CNS in their entirety based on the guidance provided in NUREG–1433, ''Standard Technical Specifications, General Electric Plants, BWR/4,'' Revision 1, dated April 1995, and in the Commission's ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' published on July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132). The proposed amendment is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated March 27, 1997, as supplemented by the letters dated September 29 and December 22, 1997, and February 9,

March 13, March 26, April 16, and May 6, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all nuclear power plants would benefit from an improvement and standardization of plant Technical Specifications (TS). The ''NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Plants,''(52 FR 3788) contained proposed criteria for defining the scope of TS. Later, the Commission's ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' published on July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132), incorporated lessons learned since publication of the interim policy statement and formed the basis for revisions to 10 CFR 50.36, TS. ''The Final Rule'' (60 FR 36953) codified criteria for determining the content of TS. To facilitate the development of standard TS for nuclear power reactors, each power reactor vendor owners' group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS. For the CNS, the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (ISTS) are in NUREG–1433. This document formed the basis for the CNS Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) conversion. The NRC Committee to review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the ISTS, made note of its safety merits, and indicated its support of the conversion by operating plants to the ISTS.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed changes to the CTS are based on NUREG–1433 and on guidance provided by the Commission in its Final Policy Statement. The objective of the changes is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the CTS (i.e., to convert the CTS to the ITS). Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding of the TS. The Bases section of the TS has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG–1433, portions of the CTS were also used as the basis for the development of the CNS ITS. Plant-specific issues (e.g., unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed with the licensee, and generic matters with General Electric and other OGs.

The proposed changes can be grouped into the following four categories: relocated requirements, administrative changes, less restrictive changes involving deletion of requirements, and more restrictive changes. These categories are as follows:

1. Relocated requirements (i.e., LR or R changes) are items which are in the CTS, but do not meet the criteria set forth in the Final Policy Statement. The Final Policy Statement establishes a specific set of objective criteria for determining which regulatory requirements and operating restrictions should be included in the TS. Relocation of requirements to documents with an established control program, controlled by the regulations or the TS, allows the TS to be reserved only for those conditions or limitations upon reactor operation which are necessary to obviate the possibility of an abnormal situation or event giving rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety, thereby focusing the scope of the TS. In general, the proposed relocation of items from the CTS to the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR), appropriate plant-specific programs, station procedures, or ITS Bases follows the guidance of NUREG–1433. Once these items have been relocated to other licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes by the licensee.

2. Administrative changes (i.e., A changes) involve the reformatting and rewording of requirements, consistent with the style of the ISTS in NUREG–1433, to make the TS more readily understandable to station operators and other users. These changes are purely editorial in nature, or involve the movement or reformatting of requirements without affecting the technical content. Application of a standardized format and style will also help ensure consistency is achieved among specifications in the TS. During this reformatting and rewording process, no technical changes (either actual or interpretational) to the TS will be made unless they are identified and justified.

3. Less restrictive changes and the deletion of requirements involves portions of the CTS (i.e., L changes) which (1) provide information that is descriptive in nature regarding the equipment, systems, actions, or surveillances, (2) provide little or no safety benefit, and (3) place an unnecessary burden on the licensee. This information is proposed to be deleted from the CTS and, in some instances, moved to the proposed Bases, USAR, or procedures. The removal of descriptive information to the Bases of the TS, USAR, or procedures is permissible because these documents will be controlled through a process that utilizes 10 CFR 50.59 and other NRC-approved control mechanisms. The relaxations of requirements were the result of generic NRC actions or other analyses. They will be justified on a case-by-case basis for the CNS and described in the safety evaluation to be issued with the license amendment.

4. More restrictive requirements (i.e., M changes) are proposed to be implemented in some areas to impose more stringent requirements that are in the CTS. These more restrictive requirements are being imposed to be consistent with the ISTS. Such changes have been made after ensuring the previously evaluated safety analysis for the CNS was not affected. Also, other more restrictive technical changes have been made to achieve consistency, correct discrepancies, and remove ambiguities from the TS. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) on station equipment which is not required by the CTS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

There are six other proposed changes to the CTS that may be included in the proposed amendment to convert the CTS to the ITS. These are beyond-scope changes in that they are changes to both the CTS and the ISTS. For the CNS, these are the following:

1. ITS LCO 3.1.8, Scram Discharge Volume (SDV) Vent and Drain Valves, revise the ISTS LCO 3.1.8 Action A to require that for vent and drain lines with one inoperable valve, the lines be isolated within 7 days, rather than restore the valves to operable status. (Change ITS 3.1.8–L.4)

2. CNS Setpoint Methodology, revise the setpoint and allowable values in the ITS Section 3.3 from the values in the CTS.

3. ITS 3.3.2.1, CTS Table 3.2.C, relocate the upscale trip level settings (or allowable values) for the rod block monitor upscale trips to the core operating limits report (Change ITS 3.3.2.1–RL.2)

4. ITS 3.3.3.2, CTS Tables 3.2.I–1 and 4.2.I, relocate the list of alternate shutdown instrumentation and the minimum number of channels for each instrument to the IST Bases (Change ITS 3.3.3.2–RL.1)

5. ITS 3.8.3, CTS 3.9.A, 1.5.b, increase the minimum volume of fuel oil in the diesel generator fuel oil storage tanks. (Change ITS 3.8.3–M.2)

6. ITS 5.5.9, CTS 4.9.A.2.d and e, diesel fuel oil testing program, addition of a new ASTM-approved test as an alternative to the clear and bright

appearance test in CTS 4.9.A.2.e.1.d) (Change ITS 5.5–M.4)

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed conversion of the CTS to the ITS for the CNS, including the six beyond-scope issues identified above. Changes which are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TS.

The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operators control of the CNS in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements from the CTS to other licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may then be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 and other NRC-approved control mechanisms which will ensure continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found consistent with the guidelines of NUREG–1433 and the Commission's Final Policy Statement.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to enhance station safety.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit, or to place an unnecessary burden on the licensee, their removal from the TS is justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG and found to be acceptable for the station. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG–1433 have been reviewed by the NRC staff and found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revisions to the TS have been found to provide control of station operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

The proposed amendment will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, will not change the quantity or types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and will not significantly increase occupational or public doses. Also, these changes do not affect the design of the station, do not involve any modifications to the station, and do not increase the licensed power and allowable effluents for the station. The changes will not create any new or unreviewed environmental impacts that were not considered in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) related to the operation of the CNS dated February 1973. Therefore, there are no significant radiological impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed amendment involves features located entirely within the restricted area defined in 10 CFR Part 20. They do not affect non-radiological station effluents and have no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed amendment, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the proposed amendment would be to deny the amendment. Denial of the licensee's application would not reduce the environmental impacts of the CNS operations, but it would prevent the safety benefits to the station from the conversion to the ITS. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the FES for the CNS.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 22, 1998, the staff consulted with the Nebraska State official, Cheryl Rogers of the State Department of Health, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's application dated March 27, 1997, as supplemented by the letters dated September 29 and December 22, 1997, and February 9, March 13, March 26, April 16, and May 6, 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 Auburn Memorial Library, 1810 Courthouse Avenue, Auburn, Nebraska 68305.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of July 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David L. Wigginton,

Acting Director, Project Directorate IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–20235 Filed 7–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Pub. L. 97–415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Pub. L. 97–415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from July 3, 1998, through July 17, 1998. The last biweekly notice was published on July 15, 1998 (63 FR 38198).

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

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests 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