

Subject category	Volume (cubic feet)
FG 303 Western Interstate Nuclear Board FG 304 Securities Investor Protection Corporation. FG 305 National Tourism Resources Review Commission. FG 306 Commission on American Shipbuilding. FG 307 Federal Regional Councils (1969–1970) Ohio River Basin Commission (1970–1974). FG 308 Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse. FG 309 Plymouth-Provincetown Celebration Commission. FG 310 Special Railway Dispute Commission. FG 311 Emergency Railway Dispute Panel. FG 312 National Commission on Materials Policy. FG 313 Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission. FG 314 Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Personnel Policy. FG 315 Construction Industry Stabilization Committee. FG 316 Interagency Committee on Construction. FG 317 Inter-Departmental Committee on Internal Security. FG 318 National Council on Quality in Education. FG 319 Commission on Highway Beautification. FG 320 National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws. FG 321 National Parks Centennial Commission. FG 322 Advisory Committee on Federal Pay. FG 323 Susquehanna River Basin Commission. FG 324 Low-Emission Vehicle Certification Board. FG 326 Interdepartmental Council to Coordinate all Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs. FG 328 Advisory Panel on South Asian Relief Assistance. FG 329 President's Advisory Panel on Timber and the Environment. FG 330 Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control.	

One file group from the Staff Member and Office Files will also be made available to the public. These consist of materials that were transferred to Central Files but were not incorporated into the Subject Files. Listed below is the Staff Member and Office File that will be made available to the public on March 18, 1998.

File group	Volume (cubic feet)
Oliver F. Atkins .....	8.7

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 12958, several series within the National Security Council files were systematically reviewed and will be made available to the public on March 18, 1998. In addition, a number of documents which were previously withheld from public access have been re-reviewed for release and or declassified under the provisions of Executive Order 12958, or in accordance with 36 CFR 1275.56 (Public Access Regulations). These documents will also be publicly available on March 18, 1998.

File group	Volume (cubic feet)
National Security Council Files series .....	46.0
Previously restricted materials .....	9.5

Public access to some of the items in the file segments listed in this notice

will be restricted as outlined in 36 CFR 1275.50 or 1275.52 (Public Access Regulations).

Dated: February 2, 1998.

**John W. Carlin,**

*Archivist of the United States.*

[FR Doc. 98-3152 Filed 2-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-346]

### Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1); Notice of Partial Denial of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has partially denied a request by Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees) to amend Facility Operating License NPF-3 issued to the licensees for operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, located in Ottawa County, Ohio. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of the amendment was published in the **Federal Register** on January 2, 1997 (62 FR 132).

The purpose of the licensees' amendment request was to revise Technical Specification (TS) Section 3/

4.8.1, "A.C. Sources," TS Section 3/4.8.2, "Onsite Power Distribution Systems," TS Table 4.8.1, "Battery Surveillance Requirements," and the associated bases. Surveillance requirements were modified to account for an increase in the fuel cycle. Administrative changes were also made.

The proposed changes to TS 4.8.1.1.1.b, TS 4.8.1.1.2.d, TS 4.8.2.3.2.d and TS 4.8.2.3.2.f were denied in part. The proposed change to TS 4.8.2.3.2.e was denied. The licensees requested to remove the restriction "during shutdown" from these TSs. These removals were denied because these removals would be inconsistent with current staff positions.

The NRC staff has concluded that part of the licensees' request cannot be granted. The licensees were notified of the Commission's partial denial of the proposed change by letter dated February 3, 1998.

By March 11, 1998, the licensees may demand a hearing with respect to the partial denial described above. Any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a written petition for leave to intervene. A request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, *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 any petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensees.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated October 28, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated August 19 and October 16, 1997, and (2) the Commission's letter to the licensees dated February 3, 1998.

These documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room and at the local public document room located at the University of Toledo, William Carlson Library, Government Documents Collection, 2801 West Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, OH 43606.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this third day of February 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Allen G. Hansen,**

*Project Manager, Project Directorate III-3, Division of Reactor Projects—III/TV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-3166 Filed 2-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-247]

### Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.60 and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, Facility Operating License No. DPR-26, issued to Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (the licensee), for operation of the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2 (IP2) located in Westchester County, New York.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.60 and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, to allow the use of the methodology, or its equivalent, specified in Appendix G in the 1996 Addenda to Section XI of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code (the 1996 methodology)

for developing pressure-temperature (P-T) limits.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated October 7, 1997.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.60, all light water nuclear power reactors must meet the fracture toughness requirements for the reactor coolant pressure boundary as set forth in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. Appendix G of 10 CFR Part 50 requires that the appropriate requirements on both the P-T limits and the minimum permissible temperature must be met for all conditions. The P-T limits identified as "ASME Appendix G limits" require that the limits must be as conservative as limits obtained by following the methods of analysis and the margins of safety of Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code. The Codes and Standards as specified in 10 CFR 50.55a references Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code refer to Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3 components of Section XI, Division 1, and include addenda through the 1988 Addenda and editions through the 1989 Edition. The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to use a methodology specified in the 1996 edition, or its equivalent, for developing the P-T limits for Indian Point 2.

##### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed methodology specified in Appendix G in the 1996 Addenda to Section XI of the ASME Code (the 1996 methodology) for developing P-T limits and concludes that there will be no physical or operational changes to IP2.

The Commission has evaluated the environmental impact of the proposed action and has determined that the probability or consequences of accidents would not be increased by the proposed action, and that post-accident radiological releases would not be greater than previously determined. Further, the Commission has determined that the proposed action would not affect routine radiological 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 action would not affect nonradiological plant effluents and would have no other environmental impact. Therefore, 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 that there are not significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested action. 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 identical.

##### Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, dated November 1976.

##### Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on December 2, 1997, the staff consulted with the New York State Official, Jack Spath, of the New York State Research and Development Authority 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 letter dated October 7, 1997, 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 White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10610.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of January 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Jefferey F. Harold,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-3167 Filed 2-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P