

Commission, the presiding officer, or the 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).

Detailed information about the license renewal process can be found under the nuclear reactors icon of the NRC's web page, <http://www.nrc.gov>.

A copy of the application to renew the ONS Units 1, 2, and 3 licenses is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, and the Local Public Document Room for the ONS Units 1, 2, and 3 located in the Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, SC 29691.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of August 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Christopher I. Grimes,

*Director, License Renewal Project Directorate,
Division of Reactor Program Management,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 98–21463 Filed 8–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40–8681–MLA–4 ASLBP No. 98–748–03–MLA]

International Uranium (USA) Corporation Designation of Presiding Officer

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972, published in the **Federal Register**, 37 FR 28710 (1972), and Sections 2.105, 2.700, 2.702, 2.714, 2.714a, 2.717 and 2.1207 of the Commission's Regulations, a single member of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel is hereby designated to rule on petitions for leave to intervene and/or requests for hearing and, if necessary, to serve as the Presiding Officer to conduct an informal adjudicatory hearing in the following proceeding.

International Uranium (USA) Corporation (IUSA) (Request for Material License Amendment)

The hearing, if granted, will be conducted pursuant to 10 C.F.R. Subpart L of the Commission's Regulations, "Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operator Licensing Proceedings." This proceeding concerns a request for hearing by Envirocare of Utah, Inc. and the State of Utah with respect to NRC's approval of a license amendment which allows IUSA to

receive uranium bearing material from the Ashland 2 Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program site near Tonawanda, New York.

The Presiding Officer in this proceeding is Administrative Judge Peter B. Bloch. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR § 2.722, Administrative Judge Richard F. Cole has been appointed to assist the Presiding Officer in taking evidence and in preparing a suitable record for review.

All correspondence, documents and other materials shall be filed with Judge Bloch and Judge Cole in accordance with CFR § 2.701. Their addresses are:

Administrative Judge Peter B. Bloch,
Presiding Officer, Atomic Safety and
Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, Washington,
D.C. 20555

Administrative Judge Richard F. Cole
Special Assistant, Atomic Safety and
Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, Washington,
D.C. 20555

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 4th day of August 1998.

B. Paul Cotter, Jr.,

*Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety
and Licensing Board Panel.*

[FR Doc. 98–21461 Filed 8–10–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7002]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–2 For The U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant; Portsmouth, OH

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination, the staff concluded that: (1) there is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes

will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards, or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is described below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PORTS). The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation. The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review 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 Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see: (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items 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.

Date of amendment request: June 11, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) submitted a certificate amendment request for the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PORTS) to delete the requirement in The Plan for Achieving Compliance with NRC Regulations at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Compliance Plan) Issue 11, Plan of Action and Schedule, to install evacuation horns/lights in the X-744H warehouse and to tie them to the X-744G warehouse Criticality Accident Alarm System (CAAS). Prior to requesting approval from the NRC for changes to the Plan of Action and Schedule section of the Compliance Plan, USEC is required to obtain the Department of Energy's (DOE's) approval. As such, USEC in a letter dated May 7, 1998, requested DOE approval of the change. DOE's approval was granted on May 29, 1998.

Issue 11 of the Compliance Plan was originally developed by DOE to ensure that workers in X-744H would be alerted immediately if an inadvertent criticality occurred in X-744H. The criticality in X-744H would be detected by the CAAS cluster of instruments located in X-744G which is about 300 feet from X-744H. However, recent operational changes, which includes the transfer of fissile material operations (FMOs) of concern from X-744H to another facility which is already covered by a CAAS, and the intrinsic nature of the residual contaminated material stored in X-744H, do not warrant CAAS coverage for X-744H, since a criticality accident in this facility is not credible.

Basis for Finding of No Significance

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

This amendment deletes the Compliance Plan requirement to install criticality alarms (horns/lights) in X-

744H and to tie them to the existing X-744G CAAS. It does not involve systems that are used to prevent or mitigate effluents that may be released offsite. Therefore, this amendment will not result in a significant change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

This amendment deletes the Compliance Plan requirement to install criticality alarms (horns/lights) in X-744H and to tie them to the existing X-744G CAAS. This requirement was included in the Compliance Plan before certification to ensure that workers in X-744H would be alerted immediately if an inadvertent criticality occurred in X-744H. However, since that time, USEC has transferred the FMOs of concern to another facility covered by a CAAS thus reducing the likelihood of a criticality in X-744H to insignificant levels. In addition, the X-744H facility is more than 200 feet from the nearest FMO of concern which places it outside the range of significant criticality doses. Therefore, not requiring CAAS coverage for this amendment would not adversely affect criticality safety for X-744H. For these reasons, the proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed amendment does not involve any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 2, the proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 2, the proposed amendment will not result in new or different kinds of accidents.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 2, the proposed amendment will not result in a

significant reduction in any margin of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards, or security programs.

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 2, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety program.

The staff has not identified any safeguards or security related implications from the proposed amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safeguards or security programs.

Effective date: The amendment to GDP-2 will become effective five (5) days after issuance by NRC.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-2: Amendment will revise PORTS Compliance Plan Issue 11.

Local Public Document Room location: Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of July 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Malcolm R. Knapp,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98-21548 Filed 8-10-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Submission of Information Collection for OMB Review; Comment Request; Liability for Termination of Single-Employer Plans

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of request for extension of OMB approval.

SUMMARY: The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation ("PBGC") is requesting that the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") extend approval, under the Paperwork Reduction Act, of a collection of information in its regulation on Employer Liability (29 CFR Part 4062) (OMB control number 1212-0017). This notice informs the public of the PBGC's request and solicits public comment on the collection of information.

DATES: Comments should be submitted by September 10, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of