licensee calculated the thyroid and whole body doses at the EAB as 13 rem and 0.55 rem, respectively.

The LPZ doses, which were reported for the first time by the licensee, were calculated as 5 rem thyroid and 0.15 whole body. The second case, which was evaluated, assumed primary coolant was at the maximum instantaneous technical specification value of dose equivalent ^{131}I of 60μCi/g. The results of this case were presented for the first time. The licensee calculated the doses at the EAB as 22 rem thyroid and 0.66 rem whole body. The LPZ doses were calculated as 6 rem thyroid and 0.18 rem whole body.

Even though there is some increase in dose for the Seized Rotor Event, the actual total dose is a fraction of the limits of 10 CFR part 100, as noted above, and there is a low probability of these accidents. This change does not significantly affect the risk of any dominant accident scenario, and the effect on overall risk of an accident at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant is insignificant. The change 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.

The staff has performed confirmatory calculations of the consequences of an MSLB, SGTR and Seized Rotor Events. The staff has confirmed that the consequences of these accidents will result in offsite doses which are a small fraction of the 10 CFR part 100 dose guidelines. In addition, the staff has determined that the proposed action will not result in an increase in normal radiological effluents from the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant such that 10 CFR part 20 and Appendix I to 10 CFR part 50 will continue to be met.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR part 20. It 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

The principal alternative to approving the license amendment request needed to allow plugging up to 2500 tubes per steam generator would be to deny the request and retain the current coolant flow limitations. However, this alternative could reduce operational flexibility as it may prevent a Unit 1 start-up following the upcoming refueling outage, if the steam generator tube inspections necessitate plugging greater than 800 tubes in either of the unit's two steam generators. Furthermore, denial of the amendment would not significantly enhance the protection of the environment as the impacts of this alternative and the proposed 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 the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 dated April 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 5, 1998, the staff consulted with the Maryland State official, Richard I. McLean of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon 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 letter dated January 31, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated February 13, February 28, March 25, April 16, August 16, and September 29, 1997, and January 22, March 17, April 8, and April 21, 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 Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of May 1998.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

S. Singh Bajwa,

Director, Project Directorate I–1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–13188 Filed 5–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Year 2000 Readiness of Computer Systems at Nuclear Power Plants; Issue

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Issuance.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued Generic Letter (GL) 98–01 to all holders of operating licenses for nuclear power plants, except those who have permanently ceased operations and have certified that fuel has been permanently removed from the reactor vessel, to require the submittal of written responses that will give the NRC the necessary assurance that addressees are effectively addressing the year 2000 (Y2K) problem in computer systems at their respective facilities. Simply stated, the Y2K problem pertains to the potential for a system or an application to experience date-related problems, such as misreading ''00'' as the year 1900 rather than 2000. This generic letter requires the following information from addressees, under the provisions of Section 182a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and 10 CFR 50.54(f): (1) Written confirmation that each addressee is implementing an effective plan to address the Y2K problem and provide for safe operation of their respective facilities prior to January 1, 2000, and (2) written certification that the facilities are Y2K ready with regard to compliance with the terms and conditions of the facility licenses and NRC regulations.

The generic letter is a ''rule'' for purposes of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (5 U.S.C., Chapter 8). The staff has received confirmation from the Office of Management and Budget that the generic letter is a non-major rule.

The generic letter is available in the NRC Public Document Room under accession number 9805050192.

DATES: The generic letter was issued on May 11, 1998.

ADDRESSEES: Not applicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew Chiramal, at (301) 415–2845.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This generic letter only requires information from addressees under the provisions of Section 182a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and 10 CFR 50.54(f). The generic letter does not constitute a backfit as defined in 10 CFR 50.109(a)(1) since it does not impose modifications of or additions to

structures, systems or components or to design or operation of an addressee's facility. It also does not impose an interpretation of the Commission's rules that is either new or different from a previous staff position. The staff, therefore, has not performed a backfit analysis.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of May 1998.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David B. Matthews,

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–13190 Filed 5–18–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–39985; File No. SR–NASD–98–28]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. Relating to Approval of Research Reports

May 12, 1998.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] notice is hereby given that on April 27, 1998, the NASD Regulation, Inc. (''NASD Regulation'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by NASD Regulation. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

NASD Regulation is proposing to amend Rule 2210, ''Communications with the Public,'' of the Conduct Rules of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (''NASD'' or ''Association''), to permit the approval of research reports by a supervisory analyst acceptable to the New York Stock Exchange (''NYSE;'') under NYSE Rule 344, ''Supervisory Analysts,''[2] to satisfy NASD requirements that research reports be approved by a registered principal. Below is the text of the proposed rule change. Proposed new language is in italics.

2200. Communications with Customers and the Public

2210. Communications with the Public

* * * * *

(b) Approval and Recordkeeping.

(1) Each item of advertising and sales literature shall be approved by signature or initial, prior to use or filing with the Association, by a registered principal of the member. *This requirement may be met, only with respect to corporate debt and equity securities that are the subject of research reports as that term is defined in Rule 472 of the New York Stock Exchange, by the signature or initial of a supervisory analyst approved pursuant to Rule 344 of the New York Stock Exchange.*

* * * * *

II. Self-Regulatory Organizations' Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, NASD Regulation included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. NASD Regulation has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

a. *Background.* Subparagraph (b)(1) to NASD Rule 2210 regarding Communications with the Public requires each item of advertising and sales literature to be approved by signature or initial of a registered principal of an NASD member prior to use or filing with NASD Regulation. The definition of ''sales literature'' in subparagraph (a)(2) to NASD Rule 2210 includes research reports.

Paragraph (b) to NYSE Rule 472, ''Communications with the Public,'' requires that research reports be prepared or approved by a supervisory analyst acceptable to the NYSE under NYSE Rule 334. NYSE Rule 472, Supplementary Material .10 defines ''research reports'' as ''* * * an analysis of individual companies, industries, market conditions, securities or other investment vehicles which provide information reasonably sufficient upon which to base an investment decision.'' In order to become a supervisory analyst under NYSE Rule 344, an applicant may present evidence of appropriate experience and either (i) pass an NYSE Supervisory Analysts Examination, or (ii) successfully complete a specified level of the Chartered Financial Analysts Examination prescribed by the NYSE and pass only that portion of the NYSE Supervisory Analysts Examination dealing with Exchange rules on research standards and related matters.[3]

A joint NASD/NYSE member raised the issue of whether the approval of research reports by a supervisory analyst approved by the NYSE under NYSE Rule 344 could satisfy the NASD requirement that each item of advertising and sales literature be approved by signature or initial of a registered principal prior to use or filing with NASD Regulation.

b. *Discussion.* The NYSE designation of ''supervisory analyst'' does not constitute a registration category for NASD principals. The NASD Regulation staff reviewed the content outline for the supervisory analyst examination. The particular categories of securities addressed in the ''securities analysis'' section of the outline are fixed income securities and equity securities. The NASD Regulation staff concluded that the coverage in the supervisory analysts examination of the NYSE communication rules is comparable to the communication materials covered in the NASD principal examination. Thus, NASD Regulation believes that with respect to the level of training and experience necessary for the review of research reports on debt and equity, the level of supervisory analyst registration is comparable to the level of NASD principal registration.

Given that the scope of approval authority is limited to research reports and that the material in the NYSE supervisory analyst examination and the NASD principal examination is comparable in this area, the NASD Regulation staff concluded that the investor protection goals intended by the NASD's current principal review requirement rule could be satisfied by NYSE requirements in this area.

The proposed rule change amends subparagraph (b)(1) to NASD Rule 2210 to state that the requirement that advertising and sales literature be approved by a registered principal of an NASD member firm may be met, with respect to corporate debt and equity securities that are the subject of research

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] NYSE Rule 344 states that ''Supervisory Analysts * * * shall be acceptable to, and approved by, the Exchange.'' NYSE Rule 344, Supplementary Material .10 sets forth qualifications to be considered by the Exchange.

[3] *See* NYSE Rule 344, Supplementary Material .10.