184 to Facility Operating License No. NPF–9 and Amendment No. 166 to Facility Operating License No. NPF–17 issued to Duke Energy Corporation, which revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) for operation of the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The amendments implemented a full conversion of the McGuire TSs to a set of TSs based upon NUREG–1431, ''Standard Technical Specifications—Westinghouse Plants.''

The Notice of Issuance was published in the **Federal Register** on October 19, 1998 (63 FR 55902). Correction is being made to the date of issuance stated in the second column on page 55903. The date of issuance should read as follows ''Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of September 1998.''

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank Rinaldi,

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

[FR Doc. 98–33257 Filed 12–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–272 and 50–311]

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–70 and DPR–75 issued to Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G, the licensee) for operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise Technical Specification (TS) Section 4.2.1, ''Aquatic Monitoring,'' of Appendix B, Environmental Protection Plan (EPP), to require that PSE&G adhere to the Incidental Take Statement issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), but removes the specific language of the Incidental Take Statement. Removing the specific language from Section 4.2.1 enables PSE&G to use relief granted by NMFS and the Commission on a case-by-case basis without further action by the NRC staff.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated August 1, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated October 6, 1997, February 18 and July 7, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would provide PSE&G with the flexibility to utilize relief granted by the Commission and NMFS on a case-by-case basis without further action by the NRC staff. The current wording of Section 4.2.1 would require, in the event of changes to the Biological Opinion or the Incidental Take Statement, that PSE&G continue to maintain, for example, daily cleaning of the trash racks, from June 1 through October 15, 1998, even though granted relief by the NMFS, until an amendment request could be submitted and approved by the Commission. The revision would enable PSE&G to have the ability to use approvals from the Commission and NMFS without requiring amendments to the TS. Changes to the Incidental Take Statement must be proceeded by consultation between the Commission, as the authorizing agency, and NMFS.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed changes do not change the requirements or intent of Section 4.2.1. PSE&G would continue to adhere to the specific requirements within the Incidental Take Statement, to the Biological Opinion. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no 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. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other nonradiological environmental impact.

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

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. 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 Final Environmental Statement for the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 4, 1998, the staff consulted with the New Jersey State official, Mr. R. Pinney of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Nuclear Engineering, 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 letter dated August 1, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated October 6, 1997, February 18 and July 7, 1998, which 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 Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert A. Capra,

Director, Project Directorate I–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–33252 Filed 12–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P