

consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

Written comments on the amendment application should be mailed to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, or may be hand delivered to 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. Comments should be legible and reproducible, and include the name, affiliation (if any), and address of the submitter. All comments received by the Commission will be made available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room and the Local Public Document Room. In accordance with 10 CFR 76.62 and 76.64, a member of the public must submit written comments to petition the Commission requesting review of the Director's Decision on the amendment request.

For further details with respect to the action, see the application for amendment. The application is 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: January 12, 1999.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment is related to the modifications to upgrade the seismic capability of Buildings C-331 and C-335 at Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The proposed amendment will change the modification completion date from June 30, 1999, to June 30, 2000.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-1: This amendment will revise Compliance Plan Issue 36 to extend the completion date from June 30, 1999, to June 30, 2000.

Local Public Document Room location: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of June 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 99-15412 Filed 6-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-220]

License No. DPR-63, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated May 24, 1999, Mr. Tim Judson (the Petitioner) on behalf of Citizens Awareness Network, Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Waste, Environmental Advocates, Greens of Greater Syracuse, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Oswego Valley Peace and Justice, Sierra Club (Iroquois Group), Student Environmental Action Coalition, Syracuse Anti-Nuclear Effort, Syracuse Peace Council, and Dr. Steven Penn, has requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take action with regard to Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1 (NMP1). The Petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (NMPC) by suspending its NMP1 operating license until (1) NMPC releases the most recent inspection data on the plant's core shroud; (2) a public meeting can be held in Oswego County, New York, to review this inspection data and the repair design to core shroud vertical welds V9 and V10; and (3) an adequate public review of the safety of the plant's continued operation is accomplished. The Petitioner bases this request upon the following issues and concerns:

1. Petitioner believes that the public cannot rely upon NMPC to accurately perform the data analysis necessary to calculate the extent and rate of cracking in the core shroud because of problems with NMPC's previous testing and analyses that were identified in letters to the NRC from Dr. Penn. Petitioner states that the NRC has not responded to Dr. Penn's letters, and, therefore, Petitioner believes Dr. Penn's expressed concerns constitute unreviewed safety issues.

2. NMPC and NRC reported during the May 1999 inspection that cap screws in the bow spring mechanisms of the shroud tie rod assemblies were found to have suffered intergranular stress-corrosion cracking, resulting in the fracture of one of the cap screws. Petitioner states that this problem, and the tie rod problem corrected during the 1997 outage, indicates that NMPC's designs warrant in-depth review by the public and closer implementation scrutiny. Petitioner believes that NMPC's prior selection of poor cap screw material and the NRC staff's

acceptance of it raises questions about the credibility of the NRC's approval of the vertical weld repair design and, thus, necessitates a public review of the level of safety before plant restart.

3. Data from the May 1999 inspection of the NMP1 core shroud are new and the NRC staff's review of the data will not be completed before plant restart. Petitioner states that previous NRC staff safety evaluations required future evaluations. Petitioner believes that subsequent NRC approval of an "unprecedented and unproven" repair design for vertical welds, issued before the inspection, does not preempt the previously determined need to assess the actual extent of cracking in the vertical welds and the structural integrity of the core shroud.

4. NMPC has informed the NRC that supporting a meeting for public review of the core shroud inspection data during this refueling outage would place an undue regulatory burden on NMPC's manpower resources, and this burden could possibly compromise safety at NMP1. Petitioner considers inadequate licensee resources to be new information and an unreviewed safety issue. Petitioner contends that violations and a civil penalty issued against NMPC on November 5, 1997, involving inadequate management oversight and failure to monitor the effectiveness of maintenance activities are "directly pertinent to failure of the tie rod installation (1995), faulty design of the bow spring modification (1997), flawed studies on core shroud boat samples (1998), postponement of mid-cycle inspection (1998), and miscalibration of instruments for vertical weld inspection (May 1999)." Petitioner believes that, because the degree of cracking in the NMP1 shroud is precedent-setting, the question of regulatory burden is not relevant, as the NMP1 shroud requires the strictest regulatory oversight and a full public review. Petitioner states that postponing restart would eliminate this regulatory burden and ensure that outage work is properly reviewed.

The NRC staff has determined that the issues and concerns addressed in the Petition do not warrant deferring restart of NMP1. The NRC staff has also determined that a meeting to provide for public review of the shroud reinspection results need not be held before restart. In reaching this determination, the NRC staff has considered the following:

1. By letter dated May 28, 1999, the NRC staff responded to Dr. Penn's letters dated December 3, 1998; March 25, 1999; and April 15, 1999. In a letter dated April 30, 1999, NMPC has also

responded to relevant concerns in Dr. Penn's letter of March 25, 1999. The responses indicate that testing and evaluations of the core shroud by NMPC and its contractors can be relied upon by the NRC with reasonable assurance as to their accuracy. Therefore, the issues in Dr. Penn's letters do not provide a sufficient basis to warrant suspension of the NMP1 operating license.

2. The bow spring modification to each of the four tie rod assemblies replaces the design function of the failed cap screw and other cap screws that have the potential for future failure. By letter dated May 28, 1999, NMPC confirmed that no additional modifications are needed other than the bow spring modification addressed in the letter of May 21, 1999. The function of the tie rod bow spring does not affect the tie rod's function of maintaining a predetermined compressive force ("preload") on the shroud during power operation. In response to NMPC's letter dated May 21, 1999, the NRC staff reviewed and approved the modifications as an alternative repair pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i) by letter dated June 7, 1999, and NMPC has implemented these modifications. With the NRC staff's review and approval of this modification, the NRC staff finds no basis to consider enforcement action to suspend the operating license.

3. During the current refueling outage, NMPC has implemented preemptive repairs of shroud vertical welds V9 and V10, as approved by the NRC staff in a letter dated April 30, 1999. These repairs mechanically restore the vertical welds. NMPC has also verbally informed the NRC that the 1997 modifications to the tie rod assemblies have performed satisfactorily and that the tie rod assemblies have applied the appropriate preload on the shroud throughout the last operating cycle. Since vertical welds V9 and V10 have been restored and the tie rods are satisfactorily performing their preload

function, the need for NRC staff review of reinspection data before restart is obviated.

4. NMPC will provide reinspection results and analyses to disposition these reinspection findings to the NRC within 30 days of completing the reinspection. This schedule is consistent with the guidelines established by the Boiling Water Reactor Vessel and Internals Project in its report BWRVIP-01, "BWR Core Shroud Inspection and Flaw Evaluation Guidelines," which the NRC staff reviewed and accepted by letter dated September 25, 1994. The NRC staff, noting the results of inspections to date and that NMPC has followed the BWRVIP generic criteria for inspection, evaluation, and repair, does not believe a public meeting is warranted prior to restart. Also, during telephone discussions with the NRC, NMPC has indicated that a meeting on reinspection results before restart would require significant participation and preparation by NMPC, involving some of the same key employees and contractors involved in outage activities. The NRC staff recognizes the value of public meetings, and to this end, a routinely scheduled meeting to discuss recent plant performance at the NMP site is planned for August 1999. This meeting will discuss a variety of topics related to licensee performance. A brief discussion on the NMP1 core shroud activities will be one of the agenda topics.

The remaining issues in the Petition are being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations and have been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. As provided by Section 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on this Petition within a reasonable time.

By letter dated June 11, 1999, the Director acknowledged receipt of the Petition. A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room

at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20555-0001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of June 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Roy P. Zimmerman,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-15414 Filed 6-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

NAME OF AGENCY: Postal Rate Commission.

TIME AND DATE: 9:30 a.m., July 19, 1999.

PLACE: Commission Conference Room, 1333 H Street, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20268-0001.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: To discuss and vote on the Postal Rate Commission Budget for FY 2000 and election of a Vice Chairman.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Margaret P. Crenshaw, Secretary, Postal Rate Commission, Suite 300, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20268-0001, (202) 789-6840.

Dated: June 15, 1999.

Margaret P. Crenshaw,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-15528 Filed 6-15-99; 12:57 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection, Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.
Extension:

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Rule 15b6-1; Form BDW | SEC File No. 270-17 | OMB Control No. 3235-0018. |
| Rule 15Ba2-5 | SEC File No. 270-91 | OMB Control No. 3235-0088. |
| Rule 15c1-5 | SEC File No. 270-422 | OMB Control No. 3235-0471. |
| Rule 15c1-6 | SEC File No. 270-423 | OMB Control No. 3235-0472. |
| Rule 15c3-1 | SEC File No. 270-197 | OMB Control No. 3235-0200. |
| Rule 17Ad-3(b) | SEC File No. 270-424 | OMB Control No. 3235-0473. |
| Rule 17Ad-17 | SEC File No. 270-412 | OMB Control No. 3235-0469. |
| Rule 17a-10 | SEC File No. 270-154 | OMB Control No. 3235-0122. |
| Rule 17f-2(c) | SEC File No. 270-35 | OMB Control No. 3235-029. |

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") is soliciting comments on the collection of information

summarized below. The Commission plans to submit these existing collections of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

Form BDW is used by broker-dealers to withdraw from registration with the Commission, the self-regulatory organizations, and the states. It is estimated that approximately 900 broker-dealers annually will incur an