

SPECIAL AREAS FOR REVIEW: NSF request special review and comments in the following areas:

(a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Foundation, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(b) The accuracy of the Foundation's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;

(c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond.

Dated: September 17, 1998.

Mary Lou Higgs,

Acting NSF Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 98-25282 Filed 9-21-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-382]

Facility Operating License No. NPF-38, Entergy Operations, Inc.; Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3; 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. NFP-38 issued to Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee) for operation of the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, located in St. Charles Parish, Louisiana.

The proposed amendment would modify the Notes in Table 2.2-1 (Reactor Protective Instrumentation Trip Setpoints Limits) and Table 3.3-1 (Reactor Protective Instrumentation). A Bases change is being proposed to support this change.

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:

1. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No

The proposed changes modify the table notations for the 10-4% Bistable in TS 2.2.1 and 3.3.1. The proposed changes to these trip bypass removal functions do not adversely impact any system, structure, or component design or operation in a manner that would result in a change in the frequency or occurrence of accident initiation. The reactor trip bypass removal functions are not accident initiators. System connections and the trip setpoints themselves are not affected by trip bypass removal setpoint variations.

Since the hysteresis for the 10-4% Bistable is small, there is a negligible impact on the CEA withdrawal analyses. Revised analyses, accounting for slightly different bypass removal power levels caused by the bistable hysteresis, would result in negligible changes to the calculated peak power and heat flux for the pertinent CEA withdrawal events. Therefore, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated will not significantly change.

Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

2. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No

The trip bypass removal functions in question protect against possible reactivity events. The power, criticality levels, and possible bank withdrawals associated with these trip functions have already been evaluated. Therefore, all pertinent reactivity events have previously been considered. Slight differences in the power level at which the automatic trip bypass removal occurs can not cause a different kind of accident.

There has been no changes to any plant system, structure, or component, nor will these changes reduce the ability of any of the safety-related equipment required to mitigate AOOs.

Therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No

The safety function associated with the CPC and HLP trip functions are maintained. Since the hysteresis for the 10-4% Bistable

is small, there is a negligible impact on the CEA withdrawal analyses. Calculated peak power and heat flux are not significantly changed as a result of the bistable hysteresis. All acceptance criteria are still met for these events. There is no change to any margin of safety as a result of this change.

Therefore, the proposed change will 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 October 22, 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 New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70122. 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, 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, Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to N.S. Reynolds, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-3502, 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 September 11, 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 New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70122.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Timothy J. Polich,

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

[FR Doc. 98-25279 Filed 9-21-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-289]

GPU Nuclear, Inc.; Notice of Denial of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for Hearing

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has denied a request by GPU Nuclear, Inc., (licensee) for an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-50 issued to the licensee for operation of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, located in Dauphin County, PA. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of this amendment was published in the **Federal Register** on May 14, 1997, (62 FR 26572).

The purpose of the licensee's amendment request was to seek approval from the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59(c) to allow a modification for permanent removal of the TMI-1 reactor vessel missile shields.

The NRC staff has concluded that the licensee's request cannot be granted. The licensee was notified of the Commission's denial of the proposed change by a letter dated September 16, 1998.