NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR Part 34—Licenses for Radiography and Radiation Safety Requirements for Radiographic Operations.

2. Current OMB approval number: 3150–0007.

3. How often the collection is required: Applications for new licenses and amendments may be submitted at any time. Applications for renewal are submitted every 10 years. Reports are submitted as events occur.

4. Who is required or asked to report: Applicants for and holders of specific licenses authorizing the use of licensed radioactive material for radiography.

5. The number of annual responses: 73 from NRC licensees and 146 from Agreement State licensees.

6. The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: Licensee reporting of 106.5 hours and 213 hours for Agreement States (approximately 1.46 hours per response), for a total reporting burden of 319.5 hours. Licensee recordkeeping of 60,178.8 hours and 120,570 hours for Agreement States (approximately 380 hours per licensee), for a total recordkeeping burden of 180,748.8 hours. The industry total burden is 60,285.3 hours annually for NRC licensees and 120,783 hours annually for Agreement State licensees.

7. Abstract: NRC regulations in 10 CFR Part 34 establish radiation safety requirements for the use of radioactive material in industrial radiography. The information in the applications, reports and records is used by the NRC staff to ensure that the health and safety of the public is protected and that licensee possession and use of source and byproduct material is in compliance with license and regulatory requirements.

Submit, by June 22, 1998, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site (http://www.nrc.gov) under the FedWorld collection link on the home page tool bar. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T–6 F33, Washington, DC, 20555–0001, or by telephone at 301–415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of April 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–10666 Filed 4–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Dockets 70–7001 and 70–7002]

Notice of Receipt of Amendment Application to Certificates of Compliance GDP–1 and GDP–2 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Paducah and Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plants, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH; Notice of Comment Period

Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has received two amendment applications from the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) that may be significant pursuant to 10 CFR 76.45. Any interested party may submit written comments on the applications for amendment for consideration by the staff. To be certain of consideration, comments must be received by the NRC within thirty (30) days of appearance of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Comments received after that will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to assure consideration only for comments received on or before the due date.

Written comments on the amendment applications 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 am and 4:15 pm on Federal workdays. Comments should be legible and reproducible, and include the name, affiliation (if any), and address of the commenter. 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 Rooms. 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 requests. For further details with respect to the action see the applications for amendment. The applications 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 Rooms.

Date of amendment requests: October 31, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: On October 31, 1997, USEC submitted amendment requests transmitting the Safety Analysis Report updates (SARUPs) required by Issue 2 of DOE/ORO–2026, ''Plan for Achieving Compliance with NRC Regulations at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant'' and Issue 2 of DOE/ORO–2027, ''Plan for Achieving Compliance with NRC Regulations at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant'' (the Compliance Plans). The SARUPs provide updates for the two plants on commitments to various industry codes and standards, updated site specific information on geography, demography, meteorology, hydrology, geology and seismology, natural phenomena events, and external man-made events, and a new accident analysis based upon a hazard analysis methodology including new source term, in-building transport, and atmospheric transport methodology with resulting changes in the Technical Safety Requirements and the identification of important to safety structures, systems, and components.

Certificates of Compliance Nos. GDP–1 and GDP–2: Amendments will revise the Safety Analysis Reports based upon the SARUP revisions.

Local Public Document Room location: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003 and Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of April 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–10667 Filed 4–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–413 and 50–414]

Duke Energy Corporation, et al.; Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–35 and NPF–52, issued to Duke Energy Corporation, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would amend the Facility Operating Licenses (FOLs) for Units 1 and 2 and to delete license conditions that have been fulfilled, delete exemptions that are no longer needed, correct errors, and make other administrative and editorial changes.

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated December 18, 1997, and revised by letter dated January 26, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

When the FOLs, NPF–35 and NPF–52, were issued to the licensee, the NRC staff deemed certain issues essential to safety and/or essential to meeting certain regulatory interests. These issues were imposed as license conditions in the FOLs, with deadlines for their implementation. Since the units were licensed to operate in the 1980s, most of these license conditions have been fulfilled. For the license conditions that have been fulfilled, the licensee proposed to have them deleted from the FOLs.

The FOLs also included a number of exemptions from NRC regulations. The licensee stated that these exemptions have either expired, or are no longer needed since the units are in full compliance with the respective regulations. The licensee proposed to delete these exemptions from the FOLs.

The licensee also proposed to make changes to correct administrative errors such as words inadvertently omitted, documents erroneously cited, etc.

The proposed amendments involve administrative changes to the FOLs only. No actual plant equipment, regulatory requirements, operating practices, or analyses are affected by these proposed amendments.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there is no significant environmental impact if the amendments are granted. No changes will be made to the design and licensing bases, and applicable procedures at the two units at Catawba Nuclear Station will remain the same. Other than the administrative changes, no other changes will be made to the FOLs, including the Technical Specifications.

The changes will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded 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 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 related to the Catawba Nuclear Station.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 1, 1998, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Virgil Autrey of the Bureau of Radiological Health, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed amendments. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed amendments 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 amendments.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's request for the amendments dated December 18, 1997, and revised by letter dated January 26, 1998, 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 York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of April 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Peter S. Tam,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate II–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–10668 Filed 4–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Thermal-Hydraulic and Severe-Accident Phenomena; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Thermal-Hydraulic and Severe-Accident Phenomena will hold a meeting on May 11 and 12, 1998, Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

Portions of the meeting will be closed to public attendance to discuss