Yawar Faraz (301) 415–8113; Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of November 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Elizabeth Q. Ten Eyck,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–31498 Filed 11–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corp., Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination the staff concluded that: (1) There is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22(c)(19). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review 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.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items 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.

Date of amendment request: September 11, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to delete Technical Safety Requirements (TSRs) 2.3.2.1, ''Normetex Pump Discharge Pressure,'' and 2.3.3.1, ''Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System.'' The request also includes changes to related sections of the Safety Analysis Report (SAR) to support deletion of the TSR requirements.

Basis for finding of no significance:

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed amendment deletes TSR requirements for the Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System. The accident scenario that the system was designed to prevent did not change so uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) remains the only effluent that may be released, and the amount remains bounded by the 250 lbs controlled by the Normetex UF_6 Release Detection System. Therefore, there is no change in the effluents that may be released offsite.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed amendment does not propose any new or unanalyzed activity for the facility. Therefore, the amendment would not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed amendment does not involve any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed amendment deletes TSR requirements for the Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System. The accident scenario that the system was designed to prevent did not change, and the potential source term for UF_6 remains bounded by the 250 lbs controlled by the Normetex UF_6 Release Detection System. The downgrading of the Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System from a quality (Q) safety system to a non-safety safety system is offset by the upgrading of the Normetex Pump discharge block valve interlock to a Q safety system. Both systems were designed to prevent an overpressure of the pump discharge line when the pump discharge block valve closes with the pump still running. Worker protection practices would limit any exposure to the worker from any potential smaller release. Therefore, the proposed change will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical

consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed amendment does not propose any new or unanalyzed activity for the facility. The downgrading of the Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System from a quality (Q) safety system to a non-safety safety system is offset by the upgrading of the Normetex Pump discharge block valve interlock to a Q safety system. Both systems were designed to prevent an overpressure of the pump discharge line when the pump discharge block valve closes with the pump still running. Therefore, the amendment does not raise the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The safety limit proposed for deletion did not change the bounding accident release of 250 lbs. The downgrading of the Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System from a quality (Q) safety system to a non-safety safety system is offset by the upgrading of the Normetex Pump discharge block valve interlock to a Q safety system. Both systems were designed to prevent an overpressure of the pump discharge line when the pump discharge block valve closes with the pump still running. With no increase in the potential amount of hazardous material released and the switching of one Q safety system for another equivalent system, the accident remains unlikely. Therefore, there is no significant reduction in the margin of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

The proposed amendment would delete a safety limit that was determined not to be safety significant. The safety margin remains the same. While one safety system has been downgraded, an equivalent safety system has been upgraded. Therefore, the deletion of the TSRs and supporting SAR changes do not decrease the effectiveness of the plant's safety program. It also does not propose any change to or affect the safeguards and security programs. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safeguards or security programs.

Effective date: The amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 becomes effective 5 days after being signed by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–1: The amendment will delete the safety limit for the Normetex Pump discharge pressure (TSR 2.3.2.1) and TSR 2.3.3.1, ''Normetex Pump High Discharge Pressure System.''

Local Public Document Room location: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 18th day of November 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Elizabeth Q. Ten Eyck,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–31501 Filed 11–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–305]

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Wisconsin Power and Light Company, Madison Gas and Electric Company, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.60 to Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Wisconsin Power and Light Company, and Madison Gas and Electric Company (the licensee), for the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant located in Kewaunee County, Wisconsin.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

By application dated August 6, 1998, the licensee requested an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.60, ''Acceptance criteria for fracture prevention measures for lightwater nuclear power reactors for normal operation,'' and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, ''Fracture Toughness Requirements.'' The proposed action would permit the licensee to use American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code Case N–588 for analyses used to develop reactor pressure vessel (RPV) pressure-temperature (PT) limits, and the low temperature overpressure protection (LTOP) system pressure setpoint .

Note: The application also encompassed the proposed use of Code Case N–514; however, this assessment applies only to N–588.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.60(a), all lightwater nuclear power reactors must meet the fracture toughness requirements for the reactor coolant pressure boundary as set forth in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. Appendix G of 10 CFR Part 50 defines PT limits during any condition of normal operation, including anticipated operational occurrences and system hydrostatic tests to which the pressure boundary may be subjected over its service lifetime, and Appendix G.IV.2. specifies that these PT limits must be at least as conservative as the limits obtained by the following methods of analysis and the margins of safety of the ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G.

By application dated August 6, 1998, the licensee submitted an exemption request to enable use of ASME Code Case N–588. Code Case N–588 provides benefits in terms of calculating PT limits by revising the Section XI, Appendix G, to assume that a circumferential flaw, rather than an axial flaw, exists in each circumferential weld in a reactor vessel. This reference flaw is a postulated flaw that accounts for the possibility of a prior existing defect that may have gone undetected during the fabrication process. Any significant, undetected flaw in a circumferential weld in the beltline region of an RPV would be circumferentially oriented thereby having a lesser effect than an assumed axial flaw.

The effect of the change in reference flaw orientation for circumferential welds, in the calculation of PT limits, is to expand the resulting PT ''operating window.'' For Kewaunee, this larger operating window will eliminate the current requirement to disable one reactor coolant pump during conditions of low reactor coolant system temperature.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The staff has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it is acceptable because, with the application of Code Case N–588, the RPV will continue to be adequately protected against the possibility of brittle fracture. The proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no significant changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable occupational or public radiation exposure. The staff has concluded that there is no significant radiological