

insufficient supervision, deficient procedures, failure to follow procedures, and inattention to detail. In an effort to reduce the frequency of such events, the NRC requires licensees to implement a quality management program (§ 35.32) to provide high confidence that byproduct material or radiation from byproduct material will be administered as directed by an authorized user physician.

Collection of this information enables the NRC to ascertain whether misadministrations are investigated by the licensee and that corrective action is taken. Additionally, NRC has a responsibility to inform the medical community of generic issues identified in the NRC review of misadministrations.

On May 6, 1998, an invitation to comment on the information collection requirements for 10 CFR 35.32 and 35.33 was published in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 25098). NRC received two responses. The NRC is evaluating the reporting and recordkeeping requirements associated with this clearance as part of NRC's efforts to revise 10 CFR Part 35, "Medical Use of Byproduct Material," in its entirety. The proposed rule is expected to be published for comment in August 1998. The comments received in response to the May 1998 **Federal Register** notice will be considered during development of the final rule.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>) under the FedWorld collection link on the home page tool bar. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by September 16, 1998: Erik Godwin, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0171), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, 301-415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of August 1998.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98-22086 Filed 8-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414]

Duke Energy Corporation; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52, issued to Duke Energy Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina.

The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications (TS), deleting Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.i.2. This requires the performance, every 10 years, of a pressure test of those portions of the diesel fuel oil system designed to Section III, subsection ND of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code) at a test pressure equal to 110 percent of the system design pressure. This requirement is in conflict with a relief granted by the staff on February 13, 1995, authorizing the licensee to implement the alternative rules of ASME Section XI, Code Case N-498-1. Code Case N-498-1 permits the use of VT-2 visual examination in conjunction with a system pressure test on Class 3 systems in lieu of hydrostatic testing. The deletion of TS 4.8.1.1.2.i.2 would remove such conflict.

The licensee requested approval on an exigent basis pursuant to its request for enforcement discretion. The staff verbally granted the enforcement discretion on August 6, 1998, and affirmed it by a subsequent notice of enforcement discretion (NOED) letter dated August 7, 1998. The NOED stated that the enforcement discretion is in effect until the issuance of amendments to revise TS 4.8.1.1.2.i.2. The staff intends to issue such amendments within 4 weeks of the NOED letter. This issuance schedule would not be accommodated by the normal 30-day notice to the public.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, 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:

First Standard

Implementation of this amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Approval of this amendment will have no significant effect on accident probabilities or consequences. The diesel generator fuel oil system is not an accident initiating system; therefore, there will be no impact on any accident probabilities by the approval of this amendment. Each unit's diesel generator fuel oil system is currently fully capable of meeting its design basis accident mitigating function. Therefore, there will be no impact on any accident consequences.

Second Standard

Implementation of this amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. No new accident causal mechanisms are created as a result of NRC approval of this amendment request. No changes are being made to the plant which will introduce any new accident causal mechanisms. This amendment request does not impact any plant systems that are accident initiators, since the diesel generator fuel oil system is an accident mitigating system.

Third Standard

Implementation of this amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Margin of safety is related to the confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers to perform their design functions during and following an accident situation. These barriers include the fuel cladding, the reactor coolant system, and the containment system. The performance of these fission product barriers will not be impacted by implementation of this proposed amendment. The diesel generator fuel oil system for each unit is already capable of performing as designed. No safety margins will be impacted.

Based upon the preceding analysis, Duke Energy [Corporation] has concluded that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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 amendments 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 amendments before the expiration of the 14-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments involve 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 September 16, 1998, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments 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 York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina. 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 amendments 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 amendments are 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 amendments and make them immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

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 amendments.

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 Mr. Paul R. Newton, Legal Department (PB05E), Duke Energy Corporation, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina, 28242, 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 amendments dated August 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 York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of August 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Peter S. Tam,

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

[FR Doc. 98-22081 Filed 8-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-423]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company; 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. NPF-49 issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) for operation of Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3, located in New London County, Connecticut.

The latest Millstone Unit No. 3 steam generator tube inspection began on September 24, 1996, and was complete on October 1, 1996. The inspection results placed the steam generators in category C-2. Technical Specification Surveillance 4.4.5.3.a establishes an allowable inspection interval of 24 calendar months. Without an extension of the interval, Millstone Unit No. 3 must shut down prior to September 24, 1998. This proposed amendment would request a one-time extension to the surveillance interval until the next refueling outage.

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.

The Commission has made a proposed determination 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:

The proposed revision does not involve a [significant hazards consideration] because the revision would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

This proposed revision to Technical Specification 4.4.5.3.a for a one time extension to the surveillance interval until the next refueling outage will not increase the potential to impact steam generator tube integrity by allowing a steam generator tube to be degraded and go undetected. The only active damage mechanism, affecting the steam generator tubes is vibration wear adjacent to an antivibration bar that occurs during power operation. Since this surveillance interval extension will not increase the actual plant operating time, the vibration wear will not be increased. If there is no increase in tube degradation, there will be no increase in the probability of occurrence or consequence of a Steam Generator Tube Rupture. The failure of a Steam Generator tube is evaluated within Final Safety Analyses Report Section 15.6.3 and fully bounds this proposed surveillance interval extension.

Thus it is concluded that the proposed revision does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

This proposed revision to the surveillance interval does not change the operation of any plant system or component during normal or accident conditions. The Final Safety Analyses Report evaluation for a failure of a Steam Generator tube bounds this proposed surveillance interval extension.

Thus, this does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed revision to Technical Specification 4.4.5.3.a for a one time extension to the surveillance interval until the next refueling outage will not deviate from the guidance of Reg [Regulatory] Guide 1.121. The active damage mechanism resulting in Steam Generator tube degradation currently experienced at Millstone Unit No. 3 has been primarily anti-vibration bar wear and is dependent on

power operation. Since this extension will not increase the actual plant operating time, the vibration wear will not be increased.

Thus, it is concluded that the proposed revision does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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 30 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 30-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 30-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 and provide for opportunity for a hearing after 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 September 16, 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