

letter, it was stated that the exemption issued on October 7, 1994, was no longer needed.

### III

The NRC has reviewed the information submitted by the licensee and concludes that the exemption granted for the four oil collection sites in the RCP motor lube oil system is no longer necessary. Specifically, the licensee has stated that modifications have been completed on the RCP Oil Collection System such that the system now conforms to the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III. O.

### IV

Accordingly, the Commission hereby revokes the specific exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III. O, granted on October 7, 1994, as appended September 17, 1996, relating to oil collection in the RCPs.

This Revocation of Exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Robert A. Capra,**

*Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-24128 Filed 9-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-220 and 50-410]

### Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2

Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an Order approving, under 10 CFR 50.80, an application regarding an indirect transfer of the operating licenses for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (NMP1 and NMP2, or collectively, the facility), to the extent held by Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (NMPC). The transfer would be to a New York corporation, Niagara Mohawk Holdings, Inc., to be created as a holding company over NMPC in accordance with a Settlement Agreement reached with the New York Public Service Commission (PSC Case Nos. 94-E-0098 and 94-E-0099), dated October 10, 1997, and revised March 19, 1998. NMPC is licensed by the Commission to possess, maintain, and operate both NMP1 and NMP2. NMPC fully owns NMP1 and is

a 41-percent co-owner of NMP2. The facility is located in Scriba, New York.

By application transmitted under cover of a letter dated July 21, 1998, NMPC informed the Commission of a proposed corporate restructuring under which NMPC would become a subsidiary of the newly formed holding company. Each share of NMPC's common stock would be exchanged for one share of common stock of the holding company. NMPC's outstanding preferred stock would not be exchanged. Under this restructuring, NMPC would divest all of its hydro and fossil generation assets by auction, but would retain its nuclear assets, and would continue to be an "electric utility" as defined in 10 CFR 50.2 engaged in the transmission, distribution and, through NMP1 and NMP2, the generation of electricity. NMPC would continue to be the owner of NMP1 and a co-owner of NMP2 and would continue to operate both NMP1 and NMP2. No direct transfer of the operating licenses or ownership interests in the facility would result from the proposed restructuring. The transaction would not involve any change in the responsibility for nuclear operations within NMPC. Officer responsibilities at the holding company level would be primarily administrative and financial in nature and would not involve operational matters related to NMP1 or NMP2. No NMPC nuclear management positions would be changed as a result of the corporate restructuring.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.80, the Commission may approve the transfer of control of a license after notice to interested persons. Such approval is contingent upon the Commission's determination that the holder of the license following the transfer is qualified to hold the license and that the transfer is otherwise consistent with applicable provisions of law, regulations, and orders of the Commission.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see NMPC's application transmitted under a cover letter dated July 21, 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 local public document room located at the Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 31st day of August, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Darl S. Hood,**

*Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-24129 Filed 9-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499]

### STP Nuclear Operating 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 Nos. NPF-76 and NPF-80, issued to STP Nuclear Operating Company, (STPNOC, the licensee), for operation of the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2 (STP), located in Matagorda County, Texas.

The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specification (TS) 4.0.5 to state that the inservice testing requirement for exercise testing in the closed direction for specified Unit 1 containment isolation valves shall not be required until the next plant shutdown to Mode 5 of sufficient duration to allow the testing or until the next refueling outage scheduled in March 1999.

The licensee orally requested a Notice of Enforcement Discretion (NOED) on August 27, 1998 (this was followed up by letter dated August 28, 1998). The NRC orally issued the NOED at 5:00 p.m. EDT on August 27, 1998. Pursuant to NRC's policy regarding exercise of discretion for an operating facility, set out in Section VII.c, of the "General Statement of Policy and Procedures for NRC Enforcement Actions" (Enforcement Policy), NUREG-1600, the letter documenting the issuance of the NOED was dated August 31, 1998. The NOED was to be effective until the next refueling outage or cold shutdown period of sufficient duration or until such time as a proposed TS amendment is reviewed and approved by the NRC.

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.

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; (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:

1. Does the change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No.

The proposed change would relieve the requirement to apply Surveillance 4.0.5 to the subject check valves. Specifically, STPNOC would not have to perform the ASME Section XI exercise of the valves. Neither the valves nor the systems of which they are a part are accident initiators. The proposed change is essentially a deferral of surveillance test intervals, which has no potential effect on accident initiation. Therefore, there is no significant increase in the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated in the Safety Analysis Report.

Previous testing of the valves has demonstrated that they are capable of performing their design function. Therefore, the systems of which they are a part would be expected to perform accident mitigation and safe shutdown functions as designed. There is no effect on safety analysis assumptions from the proposed discretion. Consequently, there is no significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the Safety Analysis Report.

There is no significant increase in the probability of malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the Safety Analysis Report because past leak testing of the subject check valves has shown the valves to be able to close and seal as required. The extended surveillance test interval involves no challenge to the function of the valves.

2. Does the change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No.

The effect of the proposed change is to extend the surveillance test interval. This extension has no effect on the way the subject systems are operated, nor does it affect the configuration of the station. It does not introduce the potential for any new failure modes. Therefore, the change does not involve a possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the Safety Analysis Report.

3. Does this change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No.

The proposed extension of the testing will not affect a margin of safety for any Technical Specification because there is no change in the design functions or performance of any of the subject systems. All design margins remain unchanged from the existing design basis. Therefore, the proposed extension of the testing 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 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 amendment 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 amendment before the expiration of the 14-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. 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 October 8, 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 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 Wharton County Junior College, J.M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, TX 77488. 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 amendment 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 amendment is 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 amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

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 amendment.

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 Jack R. Newman, Esq., Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1800 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036-5869, 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 amendment dated August 28, 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 Wharton County Junior College, J.M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, TX 77488.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Thomas W. Alexion,**

*Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-24127 Filed 9-8-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Weeks of September 7, 14, 21, and 28, 1998.\*

**PLACE:** Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

#### Week of September 7

*Thursday, September 10*

3:30 p.m. Affirmative Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

#### Week of September 14—Tentative

*Tuesday, September 15*

2:00 p.m. Briefing by Reactor Vendors Owners Groups (Public Meeting) (Contact: Bryan Sheron, 301-415-1274)

3:30 p.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

*Wednesday, September 16*

10:00 a.m. Briefing on Investigative Matters (Closed—Ex. 5 and 7)

#### Week of September 21—Tentative

There are no meetings the week of September 21.

#### Week of September 28—Tentative

There are no meetings the week of September 28.

\*The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings call (recording)—(301) 415-1292.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Bill Hill (301) 415-1661.

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at:

<http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm>

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, DC 20555 (301-415-1661). In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the Internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to [wmh@nrc.gov](mailto:wmh@nrc.gov) or [dkw@nrc.gov](mailto:dkw@nrc.gov).

Dated: September 4, 1998.

**William M. Hill, Jr.,**

*SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-24354 Filed 9-4-98; 3:48 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Biweekly Notice Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

#### I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the