

request, describes the coordination with local community responders who are required to perform an emergency exercise. The exemption is requested to relieve the burden imposed on the local community responders, as well as on PSCo support staff, by having to prepare for and perform two emergency exercises between September 1998 and December 1998.

**Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:** The Environmental Assessment (EA) for the license application for the FSV ISFSI (56 FR 5428, February 11, 1991) considered the potential environmental impacts of construction and operation of an ISFSI at the FSV site. In the EA, the NRC concluded that storage of spent fuel at the FSV ISFSI will not significantly affect the quality of the environment. The proposed actions now under consideration would not change the potential environmental effects assessed in the EA. Specifically, there are no environmental impacts associated with deferring an emergency exercise conducted by PSCo for the FSV ISFSI. As previously discussed, an emergency response exercise was run at the FSV ISFSI on September 23, 1998. This exercise, although conducted by DOE, used existing local responders whose response is not affected by the pending license transfer. In addition, the onsite facility staff will remain essentially unchanged during the transition from PSCo to DOE and their response to emergency situations is not expected to be changed appreciably by the license transfer. The proposed exemption does not involve any changes that increase the probability or consequences of accidents which would require activation of the emergency response organization. The proposed exemption does not change the types of effluents that may be released offsite or significantly increase the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed exemption will have no significant radiological or nonradiological environmental impacts.

**Alternative to the Proposed Action:** Since there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact are not evaluated. The alternative to the proposed action would be to deny approval of the exemption and, therefore, require PSCo to conduct an emergency exercise before December 31, 1998. This alternative would have no significant environmental impacts as well. However, denial of the requested exemption would result in an additional

exercise of local community emergency response resources, which, because these resources were exercised as recently as September 1998, would not provide any benefit.

**Agencies and Persons Consulted:** The Director of the Laboratory and Radiation Services Division of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment was consulted about this EA for the proposed action and had no concerns.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

The environmental impacts of the proposed action have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51. Based upon the foregoing EA, the Commission finds that the proposed action of granting an exemption from 10 CFR 72.32(b)(12)(i) so that PSCo may defer conducting an emergency exercise for the FSV ISFSI will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

This application was docketed under 10 CFR Part 72, Docket 72-9. For further details with respect to this action, see the application for an ISFSI license dated December 17, 1996, and the request for exemption dated July 31, 1998, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Susan F. Shankman,**

*Deputy Director, Licensing and Inspection Directorate, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 98-34576 Filed 12-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-311]

#### **Public Service Electric and Gas Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of the Public Service Electric and Gas Company (the licensee) to withdraw its May 1, 1997, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-75 for the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would have revised the facility technical specifications pertaining to auxiliary building exhaust air filtration system and the switchgear and penetration area ventilation system. In a letter dated August 14, 1997, the licensee retracted the portion of the amendment request regarding the auxiliary building exhaust air filtration system. The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on May 15, 1997 (62 FR 26526). However, by letter dated December 21, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated May 1, 1997, as supplemented on August 14, 1997, and the licensee's letter dated December 21, 1998, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents 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 23rd day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Patrick D. Milano,**

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

[FR Doc. 98-34574 Filed 12-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-22]

#### **CBS Corporation Acting Through Its Westinghouse Electric Company Division; Westinghouse Test Reactor Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility License No. TR-2, issued to the CBS Corporation acting through its Westinghouse Electric Company Division. The license authorizes possession only and decommissioning of the Westinghouse Test Reactor (WTR), located in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would amend Facility License No. TR-2 for the WTR

to reflect the change in the legal name of the licensee from CBS Corporation acting through its Westinghouse Electric Company Division to simply the CBS Corporation once the change is accomplished.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated September 28, 1998, as supplemented on November 17, 1998.

#### *Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed to accurately reflect the legal name of the licensee once the name is changed.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the action is administrative in nature and will not modify the WTR facility configuration, procedures or requirements, or affect licensed activities. The employees responsible for the licensed WTR facility will still be responsible, either directly through the CBS Corporation or through contractual arrangements for which CBS Corporation is ultimately responsible, notwithstanding the new name of the licensee. The proposed action will not affect the financial qualifications of the licensee to possess and decommission the facility.

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 occupational or public exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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 impacts 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*

The action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the environmental report for the decommissioning of the WTR.

#### *Agencies and Persons Contacted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 20, 1998, the NRC staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State Official, James G. Yusko, of the Bureau of Radiation Protection, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### **Findings of No Significant Impact**

On the basis of 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 application dated September 28, 1998, as supplemented by submittal dated November 17, 1998, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Seymour H. Weiss,**

*Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98-34686 Filed 12-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-390]

### **Tennessee Valley Authority; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-90 issued to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA or the licensee) for

operation of the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1 (WBN), located in Rhea County, Tennessee.

The proposed amendment would change the Technical Requirement Manual (TRM) for WBN to prevent a potential shutdown of the unit. The change is in response to sporadic grounds which have been encountered on an annunciator circuit that is used to confirm operability of the ice condenser containment lower inlet door position monitoring system. The proposed license amendment would temporarily revise the TRM Bases for Technical Surveillance Requirement (TSR) 3.6.2.1 (Channel Check—Ice Condenser Lower Inlet Door Position Monitoring System) to provide a temporary, optional method of satisfying the requirements for the channel check. This method would be allowed until the next WBN plant entry into plant operating Mode 3, currently planned in late February 1999, for the next refueling outage.

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:

A. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The lower inlet doors have been verified to be closed by confirming the lights on the door position monitoring system panel in the control room. The annunciator circuit which is currently impacted by an identified cable ground is not in the required portion of the system. This annunciator provides no safety function. Further, the Inlet Door Position Monitoring System is not required for proper operation of the inlet doors. Therefore, by verifying the green lights are indicating and the red lights are not indicating on a 12-hour frequency provides reasonable assurance the door monitoring system is performing its required function and that the ice condenser system remains operable with no negative