

ADDRESSES: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Lewis Research Center, Building 3, Room 215, 21000 Brookpark Road, Cleveland, OH 44135.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Carol J. Russo, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Lewis Research Center, 21000 Brookpark Road, Cleveland, OH 44135, 216/433-2965.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

- Overview
- Propulsion Systems Program Base R&T Review
- Focus Program Review
- Roadmaps Review
- Strategic Management Issues

It is imperative that the meeting be held on these dates to accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants.

Dated: September 8, 1998.

Matthew M. Crouch,
Advisory Committee Management Officer,
National Aeronautics and Space
Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-24563 Filed 9-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-P

that are currently performed at 18-month or other specified outage intervals.

A notice of the proposed amendment was published in the **Federal Register** at 63 Fed. Reg. 43200, 43205 (August 12, 1998).

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges:

B. Paul Cotter, Jr., Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Charles N. Kelber, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Linda W. Little, 5000 Hermitage Drive, Raleigh, NC 27612

All correspondence, documents and other materials shall be filed with the Judges in accordance with 10 C.F.R. § 2.701.

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of September 1998.

B. Paul Cotter, Jr.,
Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety
and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 98-24564 Filed 9-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

frequency applies. The latter change is consistent with a previously approved amendment. These changes were previously noticed (63FR25119) and are being renoticed because the licensee has revised the application so as to further reduce the RCS specific activity limit.

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; (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 change was reviewed in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.92 to show no significant hazards exist. The proposed change will not:

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

The change implements a more restrictive reactor coolant system (RCS) activity limit. Specific RCS activity is an initial plant condition and, therefore, is not an accident initiator and can not cause the occurrence of or increase the probability of an accident. The change also lowers the curve of Figure TS 3.1-3 which restricts operation with high specific activity. The new value for specific activity is justified by the Westinghouse calculation which demonstrates acceptable offsite and control room doses following a main steam line break (MSLB) with a maximum allowable primary to secondary leak rate. By lowering the RCS specific activity and maintaining leakage within the projected maximum allowable, 10 CFR 100 and GDC 19 criteria are satisfied. Therefore, the change does not 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 previously evaluated.

The proposed change to the RCS specific activity limit will not significantly affect operation of the plant nor will it alter the configuration of the plant. There will be no additional challenges to the main steam system or the reactor coolant system pressure boundary and no new failure modes are introduced. Therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-443-LA-2; ASLBP No. 98-751-07-LA]

North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation; Establishment of Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972, published in the **Federal Register**, 37 F.R. 28710 (1972), and Sections 2.105, 2.700, 2.702, 2.714, 2.714a, 2.717, 2.721 of the Commission's Regulations, all as amended, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is being established to preside over the following proceeding.

North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation; Seabrook Station Unit No. 1

This Board is being established pursuant to the request for hearing submitted by Robert A. Backus on behalf of the Seacoast Anti-Pollution League and the New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution. The petition opposes the issuance of a license amendment to North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation for Seabrook Station Unit No. 1 that would revise Technical Specifications on the frequency of surveillance requirements to accommodate 24-month fuel cycles

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-305]

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation; Wisconsin Power and Light Company; Madison Gas and Electric Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-43 issued to Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Wisconsin Power and Light Company, Madison Gas and Electric Company (the licensee) for operation of the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant located in Kewaunee County, WI.

The proposed amendment would reduce the maximum allowable level of reactor coolant system (RCS) specific activity (dose equivalent Iodine-131). This change is based on Generic Letter 95-05, and, as described therein, provides a means of accepting higher projected leak rates for steam generator tubes while still meeting offsite and control room dose criteria. The proposed amendment also includes a change to the secondary coolant activity level for which an increased sampling

different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Reduction of the RCS specific activity limit allows an increase in the MSLB allowable primary to secondary leakage. The net effect is no reduction in the margin of safety provided by 10 CFR 100 and GDC 19 criteria. The maximum allowable leakage is the leakage limit for projected steam generator (SG) leakage following SG tube inspection and repair. Reducing specific activity to increase projected leak rate follows guidance given by GL 95-05 and effectively takes margin available in the specific activity limits and applies it to the projected SG leak rate. This has been determined to be an acceptable means for accepting higher projected leak rates while still meeting the applicable limits of 10 CFR 100 and GDC 19 criteria with respect to offsite and control room doses. Additionally, monitoring of the specific activity and compliance with the required actions remains unchanged. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

For consistency, the value of secondary coolant activity for which an increased sampling frequency applies, is being corrected from 1.0 microcurie/gram to 0.1 microcurie/gram. This is consistent with a previously submitted and approved amendment, therefore, no significant hazards exist for this change.

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 October 14, 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 University of Wisconsin, Cofrin Library, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, WI 54311-7001. 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 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 a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. 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 Bradley D. Jackson, Esq., Foley and Lardner, P.O. Box 1497, Madison, WI 53701-1497, 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 April 8, 1998, as modified by letter dated August 27, 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 University of Wisconsin, Cofrin Library, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, WI 54311-7001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William O. Long,

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

[FR Doc. 98-24568 Filed 9-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

Duke Energy Corporation, et al.; Catawba Nuclear 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 amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52, issued to Duke Energy Corporation, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would amend the Catawba Facility Operating Licenses (FOLs) for Units 1 and 2 and to revise the Catawba Technical Specifications (TSs) to be consistent with the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (ITS) conveyed by NUREG-1431 (April 1995).

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated May 27, 1997, which was supplemented by letters dated March 9, March 20, April 20, June 3, June 24, July 7, July 21, and August 5, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all plants would benefit from improvement and standardization of the TSs. The Commission's "NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors" (52 FR 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 TSs, each reactor vendor owners group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS (STS). For Westinghouse plants, the STS are published as NUREG-1431, and this document was the basis for the new Catawba Unit 1 and Unit 2 TSs. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements 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 TSs is based on NUREG-1431 and on guidance provided in the Final Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite,

reformat, and streamline the existing TSs. 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-1431, portions of the existing TSs 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 TSs can be grouped into four general categories, as follows:

1. Nontechnical (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 Catawba TSs has undergone these types of changes. In order to ensure consistency, the NRC staff and the licensee have used NUREG-1431 as guidance to reformat and make other administrative changes.

2. Relocation of requirements, which includes items that were in the existing Catawba TSs. The TSs that are being relocated to licensee-controlled documents are not required to be in the TSs 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 TSs. They are not needed to obviate the possibility that an abnormal situation or event will give rise to an immediate threat to 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 Catawba TSs to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, appropriate plant-specific programs, procedures, and ITS Bases follows the guidance of NUREG-1431. Once these items have been relocated by removing them from the TSs 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 Catawba ITS items that are either more conservative than corresponding requirements in the current Catawba TSs, or are additional restrictions that are not in the existing Catawba TSs but are contained in