

impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

The proposed exemption would not result in a change in nonradiological effluents and will have 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 that 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 exemption, the staff considered denial of the requested exemption. Denial of the request 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 related to the operation of Quad Cities dated September 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 16, 1990, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Frank Niziolek, of the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, 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 licensees' letter dated October 27, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room located at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of February 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert A. Capra,

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

[FR Doc. 98-5710 Filed 3-4-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-327 and 50-328]

Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, 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 exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79 for the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN), Units 1 and 2, respectively, issued to the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee).

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated December 1, 1997, for exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) regarding submission of revisions to the updated Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), which could also affect the schedule for submitting design change reports for facility changes made under 10 CFR 50.59 for SQN. Under the proposed exemption the licensee would schedule updates to the single, unified FSAR for the two units based on the refueling cycle of Unit 2.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The Code of Federal Regulations, 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4), requires licensees to submit updates to their FSAR annually or within 6 months after each refueling outage providing that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months. Since Units 1 and 2 share a common FSAR, the licensee must update the same document annually or within 6 months after a refueling outage for either unit. The underlying purpose of the rule was to relieve licensees of the burden of filing annual FSAR revisions while assuring that such revisions are made at least every 24 months. The Commission reduced the burden, in part, by permitting a licensee to submit its FSAR revisions 6 months after refueling outages for its facility, but did not provide for multiple unit facilities sharing a common FSAR in the rule.

Rather, the Commission stated that "With respect to the concern about multiple facilities sharing a common FSAR, licensees will have maximum flexibility for scheduling updates on a case-by-case basis." 57 FR 39355 (1992). Allowing the exemption would maintain the UFSAR current within 24 months of the last revision and would not exceed a 24-month interval for submission of the 10 CFR 50.59 design-change report for either unit, if this is submitted with the FSAR revision.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it involves administrative activities unrelated to plant operation.

The proposed action will not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of accidents or result in a change in occupational exposure or offsite dose. Therefore, there are no radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

The proposed action will not result in a change in nonradiological plant effluents and will have no other nonradiological environmental impact.

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

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that 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. Denial of the exemption would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed exemption and this alternative are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources:

This action did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to SQN dated February 13, 1974.

Agencies and Persons Contacted:

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 29, 1998, the staff consulted with the Tennessee State official regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the foregoing 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's request for the exemption dated December 1, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington DC, and at the local public document room located at the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 24th day of February, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frederick J. Hebdon,

Director, Project Directorate II-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98-5713 Filed 3-4-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Number: 030-14526; License Number: 37-00062-07]

Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center (Philadelphia, PA); Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated January 28, 1998, Ann Lovell (Petitioner) has requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission take immediate action to suspend or revoke the NRC license issued to the Philadelphia Veterans Administration Medical Center (PVAMC). As grounds for her request, the Petitioner asserts that the PVAMC executive management is operating in a manner that has the potential to present a significant danger to Medical Center patients, staff, and the general public. Specifically, the Petitioner asserts that there has been a consistent pattern of NRC violations occurring within the Medical Center for which PVAMC has failed to take corrective action; that PVAMC has supplied false information to NRC; that the Petitioner and two other members of the staff became contaminated with radioactive material in the nuclear medicine department as a result of what the Petitioner believes was an intentional incident; and that PVAMC

employees are fearful of bringing safety concerns to the licensee and to the NRC because of their concern for their safety and because of NRC's "history of inaction" regarding the medical center.

The request is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. It has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. The Petitioner's request for immediate action was denied by letter dated February 27, 1998.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, N.W. (lower level), Washington, DC.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98-5709 Filed 3-4-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT**Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee; Open Committee Meetings**

According to the provisions of section 10 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), notice is hereby given that meetings of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee will be held on—

Thursday, April 16, 1998
Thursday, April 30, 1998
Thursday, May 14, 1998
Thursday, June 4, 1998
Thursday, June 18, 1998
Thursday, July 9, 1998
Thursday, July 23, 1998

The meetings will start at 10:00 a.m. and will be held in Room 5A06A, Office of Personnel Management Building, 1900 E Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee is composed of a Chair, five representatives from labor unions holding exclusive bargaining rights for Federal blue-collar employees, and five representatives from Federal agencies. Entitlement to membership on the Committee is provided for in 5 U.S.C. 5347.

The Committee's primary responsibility is to review the Prevailing Rate System and other matters pertinent to establishing prevailing rates under subchapter IV, chapter 53, 5 U.S.C., as amended, and from time to time advise the Office of Personnel Management.

These scheduled meetings will start in open session with both labor and

management representatives attending. During the meetings either the labor members or the management members may caucus separately with the Chair to devise strategy and formulate positions. Premature disclosure of the matters discussed in these caucuses would unacceptably impair the ability of the Committee to reach a consensus on the matters being considered and would disrupt substantially the disposition of its business. Therefore, these caucuses will be closed to the public because of a determination made by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under the provisions of section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463) and 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B). These caucuses may, depending on the issues involved, constitute a substantial portion of a meeting.

Annually, the Chair compiles a report of pay issues discussed and concluded recommendations. These reports are available to the public, upon written request to the Committee's Secretary.

The public is invited to submit material in writing to the Chair on Federal Wage System pay matters felt to be deserving of the Committee's attention. Additional information on this meeting may be obtained by contacting the Committee's Secretary, Office of Personnel Management, Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee, Room 5559, 1900 E Street, NW., Washington, DC 20415 (202) 606-1500.

Dated: February 26, 1998.

Phyllis G. Heuerman,

Acting Chair, Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 98-5681 Filed 3-4-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**Existing Collection; Comment Request**

Upon written request, copies available from:
Securities and Exchange Commission,
Office of Filings and Information
Services, 450 5th Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20549.

Extension: Rule 23c-3 and Form N-23c-3,
SEC File No. 270-373, OMB Control No.
3235-0422.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520), the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") is soliciting comments on the collections of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit these existing collections of information to the Office