West South Central: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.

[FR Doc. 98–26931 Filed 10–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3110–01–U

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50–528, STN 50–529, and STN 50–530]

Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3; Notice of Partial Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating Licenses

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted a request by Arizona Public Service Company (the licensee) to withdraw part of its June 13, 1995, application for amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–41, NPF–51, and NPF–74, issued to the licensee for operation of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, located in Maricopa County, Arizona. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of these amendments was published in the **Federal Register** on October 25, 1995 (60 FR 54715).

The portion of the licensee's amendment request which is being withdrawn is the revision of the Technical Specifications (TS) that would change the allowed outage times (AOT) for the low pressure safety injection systems and the emergency diesel generators.

Also, the licensee informed the staff that this portion of the amendment would be resubmitted at a later time. Thus, this portion of the amendment application is considered to be withdrawn by the licensee.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated June 13, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated August 16, 1995, June 9, 1998, and September 6, 1998, and (2) the staff's letter dated October 2, 1998.

These 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 Phoenix Public Library, 1221 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of October 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mel B. Fields,

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

[FR Doc. 98–27039 Filed 10–7–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–302]

Florida Power Corporation, Crystal River Unit 3; 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 for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–72 issued to Florida Power Corporation, et al. (FPC or the licensee), for operation of the Crystal River plant, Unit 3, located in Citrus County, Florida.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix K, Section I.D.1, ''Single Failure Criteria,'' which requires accident evaluation using the combination of Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) subsystems assumed to be operative ''* * * after the most damaging single failure of ECCS equipment has taken place.'' The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the single failure requirement for very low probability scenarios under certain circumstances. The exemption is limited to the systems required for the prevention of boron precipitation during the long term cooling phase of a loss of coolant accident. 10 CFR 50.46(b)(5) requires that the ECCS be capable of providing long-term core cooling. Post-accident boron precipitation is a potential, but unlikely, challenge to maintaining long-term core cooling.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated June 4, 1998. The staff, on its own initiative, proposed to extend the exemption to a potential single failure vulnerability not requested by the licensee in its application.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix K, Section I.D.1, is to ensure that reasonable assurance exists that long-term core cooling will be maintained following a loss of coolant accident. The exemption is needed because, with the postulation of certain single failures, approved active methods for boron precipitation control (decay heat Dump-to-Sump and Auxiliary Pressurizer Spray) may not be available until decay heat levels had decreased during one postulated scenario and manual repair actions were completed for the other postulated scenario. In the event of the low probability sequence of events which could lead to these conditions, the conservatisms present in the calculations that validate the active methods, and the timely actions FPC would take to restore an active mitigation method, assure adequate long-term core cooling is maintained. Therefore, the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix K, Section I.D.1 are not necessary to provide reasonable assurance of long-term core cooling after a loss of coolant accident for the specific sequence of events covered by the licensee's exemption request.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that in the event of a loss of coolant accident that requires long-term cooling, prevention of boron precipitation would be assured by the conservatisms in the calculations and assumptions and ability to affect repairs if necessary to restore boron precipitation mitigation systems. These conservatisms are included in the assumptions for the value of boron solubility, calculations of decay heat generation rate, and the amount of boron precipitation necessary to prevent adequate core cooling. In addition, in the unlikely event that repairs are necessary, procedural guidance for these actions has been prepared and will be required to be maintained as a condition of the exemption.

The proposed exemption will not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of accidents or result in a change in occupational or public dose since long-term core cooling would continue to be available if required. The amount of radioactive waste would not be changed by the proposed exemption. The proposed exemption would not affect the type or amount of radiological plant effluents nor cause any significant occupational exposures. Therefore, there are no significant radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

The proposed exemption involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological