

Philadelphia Electric Company the schedule of Thermo-Lag corrective actions described in the Philadelphia Electric Company submittals to the NRC dated April 16 and December 29, 1993, February 4 and December 19, 1994, March 29 and August 2, 1995, May 2, 1996, and March 24, 1997. Based on the information submitted by Philadelphia Electric Company and provided during the meetings, the NRC staff has concluded that the schedules presented by Philadelphia Electric Company are reasonable. This conclusion is based on the (1) amount of installed Thermo-Lag, (2) the complexity of the plant-specific fire barrier configurations and issues, (3) the need to perform certain plant modifications during outages as opposed to those that can be performed while the plant is at power, and (4) integration with other significant, but unrelated issues that Philadelphia Electric Company is addressing at its plant. In order to remove compensatory measures such as fire watches, it has been determined that resolution of the Thermo-Lag corrective actions by Philadelphia Electric Company must be completed in accordance with current Philadelphia Electric Company schedules. By letter dated April 16, 1998, the NRC staff notified Philadelphia Electric Company of its plan to incorporate Philadelphia Electric Company's schedule commitment into a requirement by issuance of an order and requested consent from the Licensee. By letter dated April 27, 1998, the Licensee provided its consent to issuance of a Confirmatory Order.

### III

The Licensee's commitment as set forth in its letter of April 27, 1998, is acceptable and is necessary for the NRC to conclude that public health and safety are reasonably assured. To preclude any schedule slippage and to assure public health and safety, the NRC staff has determined that the Licensee's commitment in its April 27, 1998, letter be confirmed by this Order. The Licensee has agreed to this action. Based on the above, and the Licensee's consent, this Order is immediately effective upon issuance.

### IV

Accordingly, pursuant to sections 103, 161b, 161i, 161o, 182, and 186 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 2.202 and 10 CFR Part 50, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, effective immediately, that:

Philadelphia Electric Company shall complete final implementation of Thermo-

Lag 330-1 fire barrier corrective actions at LGS, Units 1 and 2, described in the Philadelphia Electric Company's submittals to the NRC dated April 16 and December 29, 1993, February 4 and December 19, 1994, March 29 and August 2, 1995, May 2, 1996, March 24, 1997, and January 14, 1998, by completion of the April 1999 refueling outage for LGS, Unit 2.

The Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, may relax or rescind, in writing, any provisions of this Confirmatory Order upon a showing by the Licensee of good cause.

### V

Any person adversely affected by this Confirmatory Order, other than the Licensee, may request a hearing within 20 days of its issuance. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the time to request a hearing. A request for extension of time must be made in writing to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and include a statement of good cause for the extension. Any request for a hearing shall be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Attention: Chief, Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, Washington, D.C. 20555. Copies of the hearing request shall also be sent to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, to the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Enforcement at the same address, to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region I, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406-1415, and to the Licensee. If such a person requests a hearing, that person shall set forth with particularity the manner in which his/her interest is adversely affected by this Order and shall address criteria set forth in 10 CFR 2.714(d).

If a hearing is requested by a person whose interest is adversely affected, the Commission will issue an Order designating the time and place of any such hearing. If a hearing is held, the issue to be considered at such hearing shall be whether this Confirmatory Order should be sustained.

In the absence of any request for hearing, or written approval of an extension of time in which to request a hearing, the provisions specified in Section IV above shall be final 20 days from the date of this Order without further order or proceedings. If an extension of time for requesting a hearing has been approved, the provisions specified in Section IV shall be final when the extension expires if a hearing request has not been received.

An answer or a request for hearing shall not stay the immediate effectiveness of this Order.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 19 day of May 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Samuel J. Collins,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-13971 Filed 5-26-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-325 and 50-324]

### Carolina Power & Light Company; Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units No. 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

#### Introduction

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62 issued to the Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L or the licensee) for operation of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units No. 1 and 2 (BSEP 1 & 2), respectively, located at the licensee's site in Brunswick County, North Carolina.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application dated November 1, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated October 13, 1997, February 26, 1998, March 13, 1998, April 24, 1998, and May 22, 1998. The proposed amendments will replace the current BSEP 1 & 2 Technical Specifications (CTS) in their entirety with Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) based on Revision 1 to NUREG-1433, "Standard Technical Specifications General Electric Plants BWR/4" dated April 1995, and the CTS for BSEP 1 & 2.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all plants would benefit from improvement and standardization of TS. The Commission's "NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," (52 Fed. Reg. 3788, February 6, 1987), and later the Commission's "Final Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," 58 FR 39132 (July 22, 1993), formalized this need. To facilitate

the development of individual improved TS, each reactor vendor owners group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS (STS). For General Electric plants, the STS are published as NUREG-1433, and this document was the basis for the new BSEP 1 & 2 TS. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the STS and made note of the safety merits of the STS and indicated its support of conversion to the STS by operating plants.

#### *Description of the Proposed Change*

The proposed revision to the TS is based on NUREG-1433 and on guidance provided in the Final Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the existing TS. Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding. The Bases section has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG-1433, portions of the existing TS were also used as the basis for the ITS. Plant-specific issues (unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed at length with the licensee, and generic matters with the OG.

The proposed changes from the existing TS can be grouped into four general categories, as follows:

1. Non-technical (administrative) changes, which were intended to make the ITS easier to use for plant operations personnel. They are purely editorial in nature or involve the movement or reformatting of requirements without affecting technical content. Every section of the BSEP 1 & 2 TS has undergone these types of changes. In order to ensure consistency, the NRC staff and the licensee have used NUREG-1433 as guidance to reformat and make other administrative changes.

2. Relocation of requirements, which includes items that were in the existing BSEP 1 & 2 TS. The TS that are being relocated to licensee-controlled documents are not required to be in the TS under 10 CFR 50.36 and do not meet any of the four criteria in the Commission's Final Policy Statement for inclusion in the TS. They are not needed to obviate the possibility that an abnormal situation or event will give rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety. The NRC staff has concluded that appropriate controls have been established for all of the current specifications, information, and requirements that are being moved to licensee-controlled documents. In general, the proposed relocation of items in the BSEP 1 & 2 TS to the Final

Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), appropriate plant-specific programs, procedures and ITS Bases follows the guidance of the General Electric STS (NUREG-1433). Once these items have been relocated by removing them from the TS to licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC staff-approved control mechanisms, which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes.

3. More restrictive requirements, which consist of proposed BSEP 1 & 2 ITS items that are either more conservative than corresponding requirements in the existing BSEP 1 & 2 TS, or are additional restrictions that are not in the existing BSEP 1 & 2 TS but are contained in NUREG-1433. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition of Operation (LCO) on plant equipment that is not required by the present TS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

4. Less restrictive requirements are relaxations of corresponding requirements in the existing BSEP 1 & 2 TS that provide little or no safety benefit and place unnecessary burdens on the licensee. These relaxations were the result of generic NRC actions or other analyses. They have been justified on a case-by-case basis for BSEP 1 & 2, as will be described in the staff's Safety Evaluation to be issued with the license amendment, which will be noticed in the **Federal Register**.

In addition to the changes described above, the licensee proposed certain changes to the existing TS that deviated from the STS in NUREG-1433. These additional proposed changes are described in the licensee's application and in the staff's Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing (62 FR 3719). Where these changes represent a change to the current licensing basis for BSEP 1 & 2, they have been justified on a case-by-case basis and will be described in the staff's Safety Evaluation to be issued with the license amendment.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed TS conversion would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and would not

affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents.

Changes that are administrative in nature would have no effect on the technical content of the TS, and are acceptable. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operator's control of the plant in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements to licensee-controlled documents would not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which ensures continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found to be in conformance with the guidelines of NUREG-1433 and the Final Policy Statement, and, therefore, are acceptable.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements would be likely to enhance the safety of plant operations and are acceptable.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit or to place unnecessary burdens 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 NRC action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG and are acceptable for BSEP 1 & 2. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1433 as well as proposed deviations from NUREG-1433 have also been reviewed by the NRC staff and are acceptable for BSEP 1 & 2.

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

These TS changes will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable public or occupational radiation exposure.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other 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 amendments, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to this action would be to deny the request for the amendment. Such action would not reduce the environmental impacts of plant operations.

*Alternative Use of Resources*

This action did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to the operation of the BSEP 1 & 2 Electric Generating Plants.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 22, 1998, the staff consulted with the North Carolina State official, Mr. M. Fry, of the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Radiation Protection. 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 amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated November 1, 1996, as supplemented on October 13, 1997, February 26, 1998, March 13, 1998, April 24, 1998, and May 22, 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 University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 22nd day of May 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Gordon E. Edison,**

*Acting Director, Project Directorate II-1,  
Division of Reactor Projects—II, Office of  
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-14098 Filed 5-26-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL  
MANAGEMENT****Proposed Collection; Comment  
Request for 1998 Presidential  
Management Intern Program  
Application**

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel  
Management.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that OPM intends to submit a request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for renewal of authority to publish the 1998 Presidential Management Intern Program Application. The information contained in the PMI application is used by OPM's Employment Service to obtain nominations, and to screen and establish a nationwide competitive selection process. Applications are mailed to educational institutions at the beginning of each academic year. Students are nominated by their deans and chairpersons to compete in the PMI Program. The application is completed by the student (nominee) and submitted to the school official for review and nomination. After the initial review process, nominees are invited to participate in a structured assessment center process. Selection as a PMI Finalist is based on a review of the nominee's application, and participation in a structured assessment center process.

It is anticipated that 2000 applications will be received and processed in 1998. Number of hours required for completing PMI application forms by graduate programs deans or chairpersons is 1 hour per application=2000. Number of hours required per graduate student for completing application form is 1 hour=2000.

Comments are particularly invited on:  
—Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the Office of Personnel Management, and whether it will have practical utility;  
—Whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; and  
—Ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

For copies of the clearance package, call James M. Farron, Reports and Forms Manager, on (202) 418-3208, or by e-mail to jmfarron@opm.gov.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposal should be received on or before July 27, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Send or deliver comments to: Kathleen A. Keeney, Presidential Management Intern Program, William J. Green Jr., Federal Building, Room 3400, 600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathleen A. Keeney (215) 597-1920.

**Janice R. Lachance,**

*Director, U.S. Office of Personnel  
Management.*

[FR Doc. 98-13919 Filed 5-26-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-M

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL  
MANAGEMENT****Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory  
Committee; Open Committee Meeting**

According to the provisions of section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee will be held on Thursday, June 11, 1998.

The meeting will start at 10:00 a.m. and will be held in Room 5A06A, Office of Personnel Management Building, 1900 E Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee is composed of a Chair, five representatives from labor unions holding exclusive bargaining rights for Federal blue-collar employees, and five representatives from Federal agencies. Entitlement to membership on the Committee is provided for in 5 U.S.C. 5347.

The Committee's primary responsibility is to review the Prevailing Rate System and other matters pertinent to establishing prevailing rates under subchapter IV, chapter 53, 5 U.S.C., as amended, and from time to time advise the Office of Personnel Management.

This scheduled meeting will start in open session with both labor and management representatives attending. During the meeting either the labor members or the management members may caucus separately with the Chair to devise strategy and formulate positions. Premature disclosure of the matters discussed in these caucuses would unacceptably impair the ability of the Committee to reach a consensus on the matters being considered and would disrupt substantially the disposition of its business. Therefore, these caucuses will be closed to the public because of