

being withdrawn with the licensee submitting change 3-11-A above.

16. Change 10-20-LS-39 (ITS 3/4.7), question Q3.7.10-14, response letter dated October 21, 1998, the change is given in the application and would revise and add an action to CTS LCO 3.7.7.1, for ventilation system pressure envelope degradation, that allows 24 hours to restore the CR pressure envelope through repairs before requiring the unit to perform an orderly shutdown. The new action has a longer allowed outage time than LCO 3.0.4 which the CTS would require to be entered immediately. This change recognizes that the ventilation trains associated the pressure envelope would still be operable.

17. Change 4-8-LS-34 (ITS 3/4.4), question Q3.4.11-2, response letter dated September 24, 1998, the change is given in the application and would limit the CTS SR 4.4.4.2 requirement to perform the 92 day surveillance of the pressurizer PORV block valves and the 18 month surveillance of the pressurizer PORVs (i.e., perform one complete cycle of each valve) to only Modes 1 and 2.

18. Change 4-9-LS-36 (ITS 3/4.4), question Q3.4.11-4, response letter dated September 24, 1998, the Change 4-9-LS-4 is revised to add a note to Action d for CTS LCO 3.4.4 that would state that the action does not apply when the PORV block valves are inoperable as a result of power being removed from the valves in accordance Action b or c for an inoperable PORV.

19. Change 1-60-A (ITS 3/4.3), question TR 3.3-007, followup items letter dated December 18, 1998, a new administrative change is being added to the application. The change would revise the frequency for performing the trip actuating device operational test (TADOT) in CTS Table 4.3-1 for the turbine trip (functional units 16.a and 16.b) to be consistent with the modes for which the surveillance is required. This would be adding a footnote to the TADOT that states "Prior to exceeding the P-9 interlock whenever the unit has been in Mode 3."

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed conversion of the CTS to the ITS for CPSES, including the beyond-scope issues discussed above. Changes which are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TS. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operators control of CPSES in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements from the CTS to other licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may then be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 and other NRC-approved control mechanisms which will ensure continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found consistent with the guidelines of NUREG-1431 and the Commission's Final Policy Statement.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to enhance station safety.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit, or to place an unnecessary burden on the licensee, their removal from the TS was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG, and found to be acceptable for the station. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1431 have been reviewed by the NRC staff and found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revisions to the TS were found to provide control of station operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

The proposed actions will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in the occupational or public radiation 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

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). 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

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for CPSES.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 26, 1999, the staff consulted with the Texas State official, Mr. Arthur Tate of the Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding 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 May 15, 1997, as supplemented by the eleven letters in 1998 dated June 26, August 5, August 28, September 24, October 21, October 23, November 24 (two letters), December 11, December 17, December 18, and three letters in 1999 dated February 3, which 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 University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of February 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John N. Hannon,

Director, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-3496 Filed 2-10-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40-3453; License No. SUA-917]

Atlas Corporation Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given of receipt of a Petition dated January 11, 1999, filed on behalf of the Grand Canyon Trust and

other parties (collectively identified as "Trust") pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206.

In its Petition, the Trust asserts that the Atlas site, at which there are no operations, is currently leaching toxic chemicals into the Colorado River at levels that are harming and killing endangered fish, seriously degrading the quality of at least a mile of river where these fish spawn and live, and threatening the extinction of these species. The Trust requests that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission take six immediate actions to halt these impacts and to ensure the conservation of the endangered species. The specific actions requested are as follows:

(1) Set water quality standards for the Atlas site that are protective of endangered fish and incorporate those standards into the Atlas license.

(2) Require immediate corrective action to eliminate the take of and jeopardy to endangered fish from the Atlas site.

(3) Prohibit any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources for the purpose of stabilizing and capping the tailings pile in its present location in the Colorado River floodplain until after consultation on the entire action has been completed.

(4) Require the removal of the tailings out of the floodplain of the Colorado River for long-term disposal.

(5) Consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to develop a specific plan to conserve the endangered Colorado squawfish and razorback sucker, including, but not limited to, steps to protect the Colorado squawfish nursery areas in the vicinity of the Atlas pile.

(6) Take all other actions necessary to eliminate taking, prevent jeopardy to and insure the recovery of the Colorado squawfish and the razorback sucker, and to preserve the designated critical habitat on which these species depend.

Petitioner's requests for immediate action were denied by letter dated January 26, 1999. In the letter, it was noted that none of the six items addresses a health, safety, or environmental concern that requires emergency steps before a complete review as provided for in Section 2.206.

The Petition has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. As provided by Section 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on this Petition within a reasonable time. A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room

at 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Myron Fliegel, Petition Manager,
Telephone (301) 415-6629.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of February, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 99-3497 Filed 2-11-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Interest Assumption for Determining Variable-Rate Premium; Interest Assumptions for Multiemployer Plan Valuations Following Mass Withdrawal

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of interest rates and assumptions.

SUMMARY: This notice informs the public of the interest rates and assumptions to be used under certain Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation regulations. These rates and assumptions are published elsewhere (or are derivable from rates published elsewhere), but are collected and published in this notice for the convenience of the public. Interest rates are also published on the PBGC's web site (<http://www.pbgc.gov>).

DATES: The interest rate for determining the variable-rate premium under part 4006 applies to premium payment years beginning in February 1999. The interest assumptions for performing multiemployer plan valuations following mass withdrawal under part 4281 apply to valuation dates occurring in March 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Harold J. Ashner, Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005, 202-326-4024. (For TTY/TDD users, call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1-800-877-8339 and ask to be connected to 202-326-4024.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Variable-Rate Premiums

Section 4006(a)(3)(E)(iii)(II) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and § 4006.4(b)(1) of the PBGC's regulation on Premium

Rates (29 CFR part 4006) prescribe use of an assumed interest rate in determining a single-employer plan's variable-rate premium. The rate is the "applicable percentage" (currently 85 percent) of the annual yield on 30-year Treasury securities for the month preceding the beginning of the plan year for which premiums are being paid (the "premium payment year"). The yield figure is reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Releases G.13 and H.15.

The assumed interest rate to be used in determining variable-rate premiums for premium payment years beginning in February 1999 is 4.39 percent (*i.e.*, 85 percent of the 5.16 percent yield figure for January 1999).

The following table lists the assumed interest rates to be used in determining variable-rate premiums for premium payment years beginning between March 1998 and February 1999.

For premium payment years beginning in:	The assumed interest rate is:
March 1998	5.01
April 1998	5.06
May 1998	5.03
June 1998	5.04
July 1998	4.85
August 1998	4.83
September 1998	4.71
October 1998	4.42
November 1998	4.26
December 1998	4.46
January 1999	4.30
February 1999	4.39

Multiemployer Plan Valuations Following Mass Withdrawal

The PBGC's regulation on Duties of Plan Sponsor Following Mass Withdrawal (29 CFR part 4281) prescribes the use of interest assumptions under the PBGC's regulation on Allocation of Assets in Single-employer Plans (29 CFR part 4044). The interest assumptions applicable to valuation dates in March 1999 under part 4044 are contained in an amendment to part 4044 published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**. Tables showing the assumptions applicable to prior periods are codified in appendix B to 29 CFR part 4044.

Issued in Washington, DC, on this 8th day of February 1999.

John Seal,

Acting Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc. 99-3469 Filed 2-11-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7708-01-P