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 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

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 for the VEGP, ''Final Environmental Statement related to the Operation of Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2,'' NUREG–1087, dated March 1985.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 10, 1998, the staff consulted with the Georgia State official, Mr. J. Setzer, of the Georgia 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 23, 1998, which 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 located at the Burke County Library, 412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of February 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herbert N. Berkow,

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

[FR Doc. 98–5240 Filed 2–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATE: Week of March 2, 1998.

PLACE: Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of March 2

Wednesday, March 4

2:00 p.m. Discussion of Management Issues (Closed—Ex. 2)

Friday, March 6

10:30 a.m. Briefing by the Executive Branch (Closed—Ex. 1)

11:55 a.m. Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

Note: The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings call (recording)—(301) 415–1292. Contact person for more information: Bill Hill (301) 415–1661.

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm.

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, DC 20555 (301–415–1661).

In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the Internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to wmhanrc.gov or dkwanrc.gov.

Dated: February 25, 1998.

William M. Hill, Jr.,

SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–5397 Filed 2–26–98; 12:01 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Request for Public Comment

Upon written request, copies available from: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549

Extension:
Rule 15a–6, SEC File No. 270–0329, OMB Control No. 3235–0371

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

Rule 15a–6 [17 CFR 240.15a–6] under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a *et seq.*), which provides, among other things, an exemption from broker-dealer registration for foreign broker-dealers that effect trades with or for U.S. institutional investors through a U.S. registered broker-dealer, provided that the U.S. broker-dealer obtains certain information about, and consents to service of process from, the personnel of the foreign broker-dealer involved in such transactions, and maintains certain records in connection therewith.

These requirements are intended to ensure (a) that the U.S. broker-dealer will receive notice of the identity of, and has reviewed the background of, foreign personnel who will contact U.S. institutional investors, (b) that the foreign broker-dealer and its personnel effectively may be served with process in the event enforcement action is necessary, and (c) that the Securities and Exchange Commission has ready access to information concerning these persons and their U.S. securities activities.

It is estimated that approximately 2,000 respondents will incur an average burden of three hours per year to comply with this rule, for a total burden of 6,000 hours. The average cost per hour is approximately $100. Therefore, the total cost of compliance for the respondents is $600,000.