Written Comments The Department received one written comment from the representative of the applicant. The comment pertains to the applicant's original submission of two appraisals of the Property, one for \$90,000 and the other for \$120,000. Because of the significant disparity between the appraisals, the Department determined that the average of the two, \$105,000, most appropriately represented the fair market value of the Property. The commentator proposes that the applicant update both appraisals as of the transfer date and suggests that the fair market value of the Property should be the average of the two appraisals. The Department is of the view that in this instance, this method of valuation is appropriate and is hereby adopted for purposes of this exemption. Accordingly, the language of condition

(c) of the exemption is hereby changed from "The Account receives the greater of the fair market value of the Property as of the date of sale or \$105,000," to "The Account receives an amount equal to the average of the two updated appraisals of the Property as of the date of Sale."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. James Scott Frazier of the Department, telephone (202) 219–8881. (This is not a toll-free number).

#### General Information

The attention of interested persons is directed to the following:

- (1) The fact that a transaction is the subject of an exemption under section 408(a) of the Act and/or section 4975(c)(2) of the Code does not relieve a fiduciary or other party in interest or disqualified person from certain other provisions to which the exemption does not apply and the general fiduciary responsibility provisions of section 404 of the Act, which among other things require a fiduciary to discharge his duties respecting the plan solely in the interest of the participants and beneficiaries of the plan and in a prudent fashion in accordance with section 404(a)(1)(B) of the Act; nor does it affect the requirement of section 401(a) of the Code that the plan must operate for the exclusive benefit of the employees of the employer maintaining the plan and their beneficiaries;
- (2) These exemptions are supplemental to and not in derogation of, any other provisions of the Act and/ or the Code, including statutory or administrative exemptions and transactional rules. Furthermore, the fact that a transaction is subject to an administrative or statutory exemption is not dispositive of whether the

transaction is in fact a prohibited transaction; and

(3) The availability of these exemptions is subject to the express condition that the material facts and representations contained in each application accurately describes all material terms of the transaction which is the subject of the exemption.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 2nd day of April, 1998.

#### Ivan Strasfeld,

Director of Exemption Determinations, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 98–9048 Filed 4–6–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4510–29–P

## NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

summary: NARA is giving public notice that the agency proposes to request extension of a currently approved information collection using an application that is submitted to a Presidential library to request the use of space in the library for a privately sponsored activity. The public is invited to comment on the proposed information collection pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before June 8, 1998 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to: Paperwork Reduction Act Comments (NHP), Room 3200, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Rd, College Park, MD 20740–6001; or faxed to 301–713–6913; or electronically mailed to tamee.fechhelm@arch2.nara.gov.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or

copies of the proposed information or collection and supporting statement should be directed to Tamee Fechhelm at telephone number 301–713–6730, or fax number 301–713–6913.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), NARA invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. The comments and suggestions should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the proposed information

collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NARA; (b) the accuracy of NARA's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of information technology. The comments that are submitted will be summarized and included in the NARA request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. In this notice, NARA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

*Title*: Application and Permit for Use of Space in Presidential Library and Grounds.

OMB number: 3095–0024. Agency form number: NA Form 16011.

Type of review: Regular. Affected public: Private organizations. Estimated number of respondents: 1,000.

Estimated time per response: 20 minutes.

Frequency of response: On occasion. Estimated total annual burden hours: 334 hours.

Abstract: The information collection is prescribed by 36 CFR 1280.42. The application is submitted to a Presidential library to request the use of space in the library for a privately sponsored activity. NARA uses the information to determine whether use will meet the criteria in 36 CFR 1280.42 and to schedule the date.

Dated: March 30, 1998.

#### L. Reynolds Cahoon,

Assistant Archivist for Human Resources and Information Services.

[FR Doc. 98-9085 Filed 4-6-98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

#### **National Transportation Safety Board**

#### **Sunshine Act Meeting**

**TIME AND DATE:** 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, April 14, 1998.

PLACE: NTSB Board Room, 5th Floor, 490 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20594.

STATUS: Open.

#### **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

6743D Marine Accident Report— Fire on Board the Panamanian Passenger Ship Universe Explorer in the Lynn Canal near Juneau, Alaska, July 27, 1996.

6984 Pipeline Special Investigation Report—Brittle-like Cracking in Plastic Pipe for Gas Service.

6986 Railroad Regional Briefs and Safety Recommendation letter to the Federal Railroad Administration.

NEWS MEDIA CONTACT: Telephone: (202) 314–6100.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: Rhonda Underwood (202) 314–6065.

Dated: April 3, 1998.

#### Rhonda Underwood,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–9265 Filed 4–3–98; 3:13 pm]

BILLING CODE 7533-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455]

Commonwealth Edison Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–37 and NPF–66 issued to Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee) for operation of the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Ogle County, Illinois.

The proposed amendments would allow the licensee to defer the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Type A testing of the Byron, Unit 2, containment until the next refueling outage in 1999.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, 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 amendments requested involve 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 amendments 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:

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

An extension, by a maximum of 10 months, of the Type A test interval does not involve a change to any structures, systems, or components, does not affect reactor operations, is not an accident initiator, and does not change any existing safety analysis previously evaluated in the UFSAR. Therefore, there is no significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

Several tables of UFSAR Chapter 15, "Accident Analyses," provide containment leak rate values used in assessing the consequences of accidents discussed in this chapter. Although an extension can increase the probability that an increase in containment leakage could go undetected for a maximum of 10 months the risk resulting from this proposed change is inconsequential as documented in NUREG-1493,

"Performance-Based Containment Leakage Test Program". This document indicated that given the insensitivity of reactor risk to containment leakage rate and a small fraction of leakage paths are detected solely by Type A testing, increasing the time between integrated leak rate tests is possible with minimal impact on public risk. Further, industry experience presented in this document indicated that Type A testing has had insignificant impact on uncertainties involved with containment leak rates.

Based on risk information presented in NUREG-1493, the proposed change does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not alter the plant design, systems, components, or reactor operations, only the frequency of test performance. New conditions or parameters that contribute to the initiation of accidents would not be created as a result of this proposed change. The change does not involve new equipment and existing equipment does not have to be operated in a different manner, therefore there are no new failure modes to consider.

An extension, by a maximum of 10 months, of the Type A test interval as shown in NUREG-1493 has no impact on, nor contributes to the possibility of a new or different kind of accident as evaluated in the UFSAR. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

With the exception of this 10 month extension of the Type A test interval, the actual tests will not change. Quantitative risk studies documented in NUREG-1493 regarding extended testing intervals demonstrated that there was minimal impact on the public health and safety. Reducing the frequency and allowing for a greater test

interval, as stated in the NUREG resulted in an "imperceptible" increase in risk to public safety. Further, a table in this NUREG regarding risk impacts due to a reduction in testing frequency illustrates that there was also minimal difference in risk to the public safety when the test frequency was relaxed.

The proposed change will not reduce the availability of systems and components associated with containment integrity that would be required to mitigate accident conditions nor are any containment leakage rates, parameters or accident assumptions affected by the proposed change.

The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, based on the above information.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendments requested involve no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendments until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendments before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to 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 6D22, 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