

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.

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. Christopher J. Warner, Esq., Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Post Office Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120, 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).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated June 2, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated January 9, June 25, August 5, and 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 California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Departments, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of October 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Steven D. Bloom,

*Project Manager Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-27508 Filed 10-13-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353]

Philadelphia Electric Company Limerick Generating 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 an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85, issued to Philadelphia Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of the Limerick Generating Station (LGS), Units 1 and 2, located in Montgomery and Chester Counties, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85 and the Technical Specifications (TSs) and the Environmental Protection Plans (EPPs) appended to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85 for LGS, Units 1 and 2. Specifically, the proposed action would amend the licenses to reflect the change in the licensee's name from Philadelphia Electric Company to PECO Energy Company.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated February 25, 1997, as supplemented September 8 and November 18, 1997, and January 8 and July 2, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to have the licenses accurately reflect the legal name of the licensee, which changed on January 1, 1994.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed changes to the licenses, and EPPs. By letter dated December 21, 1993, the Philadelphia Electric Company informed the NRC that effective January 1, 1994, it was changing its name to PECO Energy Company. PECO Energy Company was not to be a new corporation, or a successor corporation to Philadelphia Electric Company, but it was to remain and continue to be the same company with a different name. As a result, contracts, agreements, obligations, licenses, and permits relating to Philadelphia Electric Company would continue to be legal, valid, and binding with respect to PECO Energy Company.

This proposed change should have no effect or impact on the regulatory obligations of the licensee under the laws and regulations administered by the Commission, or the licensee's qualifications to hold the license, and should not change in any way the business of the licensee with the Commission. There should be no change in the safety and security of the public from the name change and the applicable antitrust condition will continue to apply.

The proposed name change is administrative in nature, and will not affect plant operations. Thus, the proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed name change is administrative in nature and does not involve any physical features of the plant. Thus, it does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (no-action alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for LGS, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 23, 1998, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. David Ney, of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, regarding the environmental

impact of the proposed action. 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 action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letters dated February 25, 1997, as supplemented September 8 and November 18, 1997, and January 8 and July 2, 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 Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of October 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bartholomew C. Buckley,

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

[FR Doc. 98-27509 Filed 10-13-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subcommittee Meeting on Planning and Procedures; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Planning and Procedures will hold a meeting on November 4, 1998, Room T-2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of a portion that may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (2) and (6) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of ACRS, and information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, November 4, 1998—10:00 a.m.—12:00 Noon

The Subcommittee will discuss proposed ACRS activities and related matters. It may also discuss the qualifications of candidates for appointment to the ACRS. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information,

analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff person named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions open to the public, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements, and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff person, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone: 301/415-7360) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: October 7, 1998.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 98-27506 Filed 10-13-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATE: Weeks of October 12, 19, 26, and November 2, 1998.

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

STATUS: Public and Closed

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of October 12—Thursday, October 15

11:30 a.m. Affirmative Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

Week of October 19—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of October 19, 1998.