

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 German Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By January 15, 1999, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating licenses 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 German Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina. 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 preferring 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 preferring 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 amendments and make them immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

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 German 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. Paul R. Newton, Legal Department (PB05E), Duke Energy Corporation, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina, 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 amendments dated December 7, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the German Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Peter S. Tam,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-33256 Filed 12-15-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Duke Energy Corporation; Correction to Notice of Issuance of Amendments

[Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued Amendment No.

184 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-9 and Amendment No. 166 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-17 issued to Duke Energy Corporation, which revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) for operation of the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The amendments implemented a full conversion of the McGuire TSs to a set of TSs based upon NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications—Westinghouse Plants."

The Notice of Issuance was published in the **Federal Register** on October 19, 1998 (63 FR 55902). Correction is being made to the date of issuance stated in the second column on page 55903. The date of issuance should read as follows "Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of September 1998."

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Frank Rinaldi,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-33257 Filed 12-15-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311]

### Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Salem Nuclear 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. DPR-70 and DPR-75 issued to Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G, the licensee) for operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise Technical Specification (TS) Section 4.2.1, "Aquatic Monitoring," of Appendix B, Environmental Protection Plan (EPP), to require that PSE&G adhere to the Incidental Take Statement issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), but removes the specific language of the Incidental Take Statement. Removing the specific language from Section 4.2.1 enables

PSE&G to use relief granted by NMFS and the Commission on a case-by-case basis without further action by the NRC staff.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated August 1, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated October 6, 1997, February 18 and July 7, 1998.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would provide PSE&G with the flexibility to utilize relief granted by the Commission and NMFS on a case-by-case basis without further action by the NRC staff. The current wording of Section 4.2.1 would require, in the event of changes to the Biological Opinion or the Incidental Take Statement, that PSE&G continue to maintain, for example, daily cleaning of the trash racks, from June 1 through October 15, 1998, even though granted relief by the NMFS, until an amendment request could be submitted and approved by the Commission. The revision would enable PSE&G to have the ability to use approvals from the Commission and NMFS without requiring amendments to the TS. Changes to the Incidental Take Statement must be preceded by consultation between the Commission, as the authorizing agency, and NMFS.

##### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed changes do not change the requirements or intent of Section 4.2.1. PSE&G would continue to adhere to the specific requirements within the Incidental Take Statement, to the Biological Opinion. The change 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 occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other nonradiological environmental impact.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

##### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no significant 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. 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 the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2.

##### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 4, 1998, the staff consulted with the New Jersey State official, Mr. R. Pinney of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Nuclear Engineering, 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 August 1, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated October 6, 1997, February 18 and July 7, 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 Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Robert A. Capra,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-33252 Filed 12-15-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P