Form	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Total annual responses	Minutes per response	Annual burden hours
Calendar Year 1999—Total					
BLS–790 BM	400	Monthly	4,800	15	1,200
BLS 790–G, G–S	39,600	Monthly	475,200	5	39,600
BLS 790–CU	[1] 0	One-time	0	0	0
BLS 790–F1, F2, F3	[2] 40,000	Monthly	480,000	7	56,000
All other BLS–790	[3] 356,500	Monthly	4,278,000	7	499,100
Total	436,500		5,238,000		595,900

[1] A subset of current reporters may receive this ''one-time'' supplemental form. This form is not used for the probability sample.
[2] The current design assumes 3,000 multi-unit firms reporting by fax for approximately 30,000 establishments. The probability-based design assumes 1,000 multi-units firms reporting by fax for approximately 10,000 establishments.
[3] All other BLS–790 forms are used to collect the same informaiton and differ only by industry definitions.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): $0.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance): $0

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

Signed at Washington, DC, this 27th day of August 1998.

W. Stuart Rust, Jr.,

Chief, Division of Management Systems, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[FR Doc. 98–23537 Filed 8–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–24–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–341]

Detroit Edison Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of the Detroit Edison Company (the licensee) to withdraw its April 3, 1998, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–43 for the Fermi 2 facility, located in Monroe County, Michigan.

The proposed amendment would have revised Technical Specification 3.8.1.1 to change the emergency diesel generator allowed outage time from 3 to 7 days. This would have been a one-time amendment, effective from the date of issuance until September 30, 1998.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on April 13, 1998 (63 FR 18048). However, by letter dated August 7, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 3, 1998, and the licensee's letter dated August 7, 1998, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents 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 Monroe County Library System, Ellis Reference and Information Center, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of August 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Andrew J. Kugler,

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

[FR Doc. 98–23461 Filed 8–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–331]

IES Utilities Inc., Central Iowa Power Cooperative, Corn Belt Power Cooperative, and Duane Arnold Energy Center; Notice of Withdrawal of Applications for Amendments to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of IES Utilities Inc. (the licensee) to withdraw its applications dated May 9, 1997 (two letters), and January 9, 1998, for proposed amendments to Facility Operating License No. DPR–49 for the Duane Arnold Energy Center, located in Linn County, Iowa.

The proposed amendments would have modified the facility technical specifications by (1) revising the definitions of Limiting Safety System Setting and Instrument/Channel Calibration; (2) revising the definition of Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO); and (3) revising the LCO for primary containment isolation valves.

The Commission had previously issued Notices of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on June 18, 1997 (62 FR 33124, 62 FR 33125), and February 11, 1998 (63 FR 6987). However, by letter dated July 31, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed changes.

For further details with respect to this action, see the applications for amendment dated May 9, 1997 (two letters), and January 9, 1998, and the licensee's letter dated July 31, 1998, which withdrew the applications for license amendments. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555, and at the local public document room located at the Cedar Rapids Public Library, 500 First Street, SE., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of August 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard J. Laufer,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III–3, Division of Reactor Projects–III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–23459 Filed 8–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In

making that determination, the staff concluded that: (1) there is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items 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.

Date of amendment request: May 13, 1998, revised August 12, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to revise two technical Safety Requirements (TSRs). USEC proposes to revise the quarterly surveillance for the calibration of the Criticality Accident Alarm System (CAAS) equipment in the product withdrawal facility to an annual calibration. This would require a revision to TSR 2.3.4.7. USEC also proposes to correct a cross reference contained in a Feed Facility TSR, TSR 2.2.4.4. The current TSR cross references a TSR for the Toll Transfer and Sampling Facility instead of the one for the Feed Facilities. The two TSRs contain identical requirements.

Basis for finding of no significance:

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed changes to revise a calibration frequency and correct a cross reference have no effect on the generation or disposition of effluents. Therefore, the proposed TSR modifications will not result in a change to the types or amount of effluents that may be released offsite.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed changes will not significantly increase any exposure to radiation. Therefore, the changes will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative radiation exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed changes will not result in any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed change to TSR 2.3.4.7 revises the calibration frequency for the CAAS equipment. This change is consistent with the calibration requirements for the other facility CAASs. This change has no impact on the potential for or occurrence of an accident. TSR 2.2.4.4 is being revised to reflect the appropriate cross reference for the required action associated with this TSR and has no impact upon either the potential for an accident or the resulting consequences. Therefore these changes will not increase the probability of occurrence or consequence of any postulated accident currently identified in the safety analysis report.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed TSR modifications revise a surveillance frequency and correct an editorial error. The proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different type of equipment malfunction or a new or different type of accident.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The proposed changes to the TSRs revise a calibration frequency for the product withdrawal CAAS and correct a cross reference in a TSR for the feed facilities and have no impact on the margin of safety. Therefore, these changes do not decrease the margins of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

Implementation of the proposed changes do not change the safety, safeguards, or security programs. Therefore, the effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

Effective date: The amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 becomes effective 30 days after being

signed by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–1: Amendment will revise TSR 2.3.4.7 to change the calibration frequency from quarterly to annual and revise TSR 2.2.4.4 to correct a cross reference to another TSR.

Local Public Document Room location: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–23456 Filed 8–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–263]

Northern States Power Company; Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant; Environmental Assessment and Final Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–22, issued to Northern States Power Company (NSP), for operation of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant (MNGP) located in Wright County, Minnesota.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

By letter dated July 26, 1996, as revised December 4, 1997, NSP requested an amendment to License No. DPR–22 for MNGP that would increase the maximum power level from 1670 megawatts-thermal (MWt) to 1775 MWt. This change is approximately 6.3 percent above the current maximum license power level and is considered an extended power rerate.

The Need for the Proposed Action

NSP has projected the need for additional generation resources through a comparison of needs to available resources. NSP has projected a shortfall of generating capacity in the future. The proposed action would provide increased reactor power, thus adding an additional 26 MW of reliable electrical energy generating capacity without major hardware modifications to the plant. Hardware changes are not needed because of improvements in technology, performance, and design. These improvements have resulted in a significant increase in the difference between the calculated safety analysis results and licensing limits established by the original license.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The issuance of the operating license for MNGP stated that any activity authorized by the license is encompassed by the overall action evaluated in the Final Environmental Statement (FES), which was issued in November 1972. The license for MNGP allowed a maximum reactor power level of 1670 MWt. NSP submitted an environmental evaluation supporting the proposed power rerate action and provided a summary of its conclusions concerning both the radiological and nonradiological environmental impacts of the proposed action. The evaluations performed by the licensee concluded that the environmental impacts of power rerate are well bounded or encompassed by previously evaluated environmental impacts and criteria established by the staff in the FES. A summary of the nonradiological and radiological effects on the environment that may result from the proposed amendment is provided below.

Nonradiological Impacts

Land Use. Power rerate does not modify land use at the site. No new facilities, access roads, parking facilities, laydown areas, or onsite transmission and distribution equipment, including power line right of way, are needed to support the rerate or operation after rerate. No change to above or below ground storage tanks would occur as a result of power rerate and the rerate does not affect land with historical or archeological sites.

Based on the operating history at the MNGP, the effects of drift, icing, and fog have been negligible. The frequency of fog and drift were provided by the licensee at the time of original licensing and the impacts of that frequency of drift and fog are bounded by the evaluation contained in the FES. The FES assumed cooling tower operation of 7 months, with the total fogging time estimated at 45 hours per year. If the cooling tower fogging rate is assumed to increase proportional to the proposed power increase, the amount of fogging due to power rerate could increase by approximately 6.3 percent above the normal summer operating period of 4 months. Additionally, the licensee determined that power rerate may involve an extra week of cooling tower operation. Taking into account the additional fogging rate and the additional cooling tower operation, the conditions at power rerate are still bounded by the FES.

The increase in power level would cause a current and magnetic field increase on the onsite transmission line between the main generator and the plant substation. The line is located entirely within the fenced, licensee-controlled boundary of the plant, and it is not expected that members of the public or wildlife would be affected. Exposure from magnetic fields from the offsite transmission system is not expected to increase significantly.

Water Use. Power rerate does not involve a significant increase in water use at MNGP. Both ground and surface water appropriation limits are established by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Operating history shows that over the last 5 years MNGP has used less than 13 million gallons of ground water per year. The annual limit established in the permit for groundwater use is 15 million gallons. Power rerate is not expected to change the groundwater usage and, therefore, operation within the allowable limit would continue. Under the surface water appropriation limit, MNGP may withdraw a maximum of 645 cubic feet per second (cfs) from the Mississippi River. There are special restrictions when the river flow is particularly high or low; however, power rerate is not expected to change the surface water requirements of the plant and, therefore, current appropriation limits would be maintained. Power rerate would result in an increase in the evaporation rate of the cooling towers resulting in an increase in evaporative losses from the river. Assuming the evaporation rate of the cooling towers increases linearly in proportion to the power increase, the evaporation rate would increase to 4400 acre-ft/yr [acre-foot per year]. The value assumed in the FES was 5000 acre-ft/yr evaporative losses; therefore, the FES is still bounding.

Discharges to the water are governed by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, issued by the State of Minnesota. Temperature and effluent limits at certain points are established in the permits. As a result of power rerate, a slight increase in circulating water discharge temperature is projected to occur. This is due to an increase in heat rejected by the condenser due to the increased power levels and increased steam flow. A conservative estimate by the licensee predicts a maximum 1.7 °F [degrees Fahrenheit] increase in the temperature of the water entering the discharge canal. This increase would