not include those INA WtW grantees participating in the demonstration under Public Law 102–477. Any INA WtW burden estimate(s) for ''477 grantees'' would be included under OMB Clearance Number 1076–0135.

The individual time per response (whether plan, record, or report) varies widely depending on the degree of automation attained by individual grantees. Grantees also vary according to the numbers of individuals served in each fiscal year. If the grantee has a fully-developed and automated MIS, the response time is limited to one-time programming plus processing time for each response. It is the Department's desire to see as many INA WtW grantees as possible become computerized, so that response time for planning and reporting will eventually sift down to an irreducible minimum with an absolute minimum of human intervention.

Estimated Grantee Burden Costs: (There are no capital/start-up costs involved in any INA WtW activities)

Recordkeeping: 36,000 hours times an estimated cost per grantee hour of $20.00 (including fringes) = $720,000.

Reporting: 5,760 hours times $20.00 = $115,200 per year.

Total estimated burden costs: $835,200 (nationwide).

As noted, these costs will vary widely among grantees, from nearly no additional cost to some higher figure, depending on the state of automation attained by each grantee and the wages paid to the staff actually completing the various forms.

All costs associated with the required submissions outlined above, whether for recordkeeping or reporting purposes, are allowable grant expenses.

Comments submitted in response to this comment request will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget continuation of the information collection request; they will also become a matter of public record.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 17th day of March 1998.

Anna W. Goddard,

Director, Office of Special Targeted Programs.

[FR Doc. 98–7437 Filed 3–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–2200]

Charles Navasky & Co., Inc., Philipsburg, Pennsylvania; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance, hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA), and in accordance with Section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 USC 2273), an investigation was initiated on February 19, 1998 in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at Charles Navasky & Co., Inc., Philipsburg, Pennsylvania.

This case is being terminated because the petitioning group of workers are subject to an ongoing investigation for which a determination has not yet been issued. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose; and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, D.C. this 12th day of March, 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–7431 Filed 3–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–001914]

Forsyth Sales Company Greensboro, NC; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance, hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA), and in accordance with Section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 USC 2273), an investigation was initiated on September 5, 1997 in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at the Forsyth Sales Company, Greensboro, North Carolina.

The petitioner, who was also an official of Forsyth Sales Company, was not responsive to requests by the Department for information necessary for the completion of the investigation. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 9th day of March 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–7435 Filed 3–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–02131]

Hamilton Sportswear, Inc., Hamilton, AL; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance, hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA), and in accordance with Section 250(a), Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273), an investigation was initiated on January 15, 1998, in response to a petition signed on January 12, 1998, and filed on behalf of workers at Hamilton Sportswear, Inc., Hamilton, Alabama.

In accordance with Section 223(b) of the Act, no certification may apply to any worker whose last total or partial separation from the subject firm occurred before one year prior to the date of the petition.

Since the closure of the company in May of 1996 was more than one year prior to the date of the petition, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation may be terminated.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 12th day of March 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–7432 Filed 3–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 30–20644–civP, ASLBP No. 98–737–02–CivP]

Power Inspection Inc.; Establishment of Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972. published in the **Federal Register**, 37 FR 28710 (1972), and Sections 2.105, 2.205,

2.700, 2.702, 2.714, 2.714a, 2.717, and 2.772(j) of the Commission's Regulations, all as amended, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is being established to preside over the following proceeding.

Power Inspection, Inc.

Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty

This Board is being established pursuant to the request of Power Inspection, Inc. for an enforcement hearing. The hearing request was made in response to an Order issued by the Director, Office of Enforcement, dated February 3, 1998, entitled ''Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty'' (63 FR 6967, February 11, 1998).

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges:

Peter B. Bloch, Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Richard F. Cole, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Frederick J. Shon, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

All correspondence, documents and other materials shall be filed with the Judges in accordance with 10 CFR 2.701.

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of March 1998.

B. Paul Cotter, Jr.,

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 98–7418 Filed 3–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–317 and 50–318]

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company; Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–53 and DPR–69, issued to Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BGE or the licensee), for operation of the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 located in Calvert County, Maryland.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application dated December 4, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated March 27, June 9, June 18, July 21, August 14, August 19, September 10, October 6, October 20, October 23, November 5, 1997, and January 12 and January 28, 1998. The proposed amendment will replace the Current Technical Specifications (CTS) in their entirety with Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) based on Revision 1 to NUREG–1432, ''Standard Technical Specifications for Combustion Engineering Plants'' dated October 9, 1996, and the CTS for Calvert Cliffs.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all plants would benefit from improvement and standardization of technical specifications (TSs). The Commission's ''NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' 52 FR 3788 (February 6, 1987), and later the Commission's ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' 58 FR 39132 (July 22, 1993), recognized this benefit. This formed the basis for a recent revision to 10 CFR 50.36 (60 FR 36953), which codified the criteria for determining the content of TSs. To facilitate the development of individual improved TS, each reactor vendor owners group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS (STS). The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the STS and made note of the safety merits of the STS and indicated its support of conversion to the STS by operating plants. For plants designed by Combustion Engineering, Inc., the STS are published as NUREG–1432, and this document was the basis for the new Calvert Cliffs ITS.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed revision to the TS is based on NUREG–1432 and on guidance provided in the Final Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the existing TS. Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding. The Bases section has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG–1432, portions of the existing TS were also used as the basis for the ITS. Plant-specific issues (unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed at length with the licensee, and generic matters were discussed with the OG.

The proposed changes from the existing TS can be grouped into four general categories, as follows:

1. Non-technical (administrative) changes, which were intended to make the ITS easier to use for plant operations personnel. They are purely editorial in nature or involve the movement or reformatting of requirements without affecting technical content. Every section of the Calvert Cliffs TS has undergone these types of changes. In order to ensure consistency, the NRC staff and the licensee have used NUREG–1432 as guidance to reformat and make other administrative changes.

2. Relocation of requirements, which includes items that were in the existing Calvert Cliffs TS. The TS that are being relocated to licensee-controlled documents are not required to be in the TS under 10 CFR 50.36 and do not meet any of the four criteria in the Commission's Final Policy Statement for inclusion in the TS. They are not needed to obviate the possibility that an abnormal situation or event will give rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety. The NRC staff has concluded that appropriate controls have been established for all of the current specifications, information, and requirements that are being moved to licensee-controlled documents. In general, the proposed relocation of items in the current Calvert Cliffs TS to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), appropriate plant-specific programs, procedures and ITS Bases follows the guidance of the Combustion STS (NUREG–1432). Once the items have been relocated by removing them from the CTS to licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC staff-approved control mechanisms, which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes.

3. More restrictive requirements, which consist of proposed Calvert Cliffs ITS items that are either more conservative than corresponding requirements in the existing Calvert Cliffs TS, or are additional restrictions that are not in the existing Calvert Cliffs TS but are contained in NUREG–1432. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) on plant equipment that is not required by the present TS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.