DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–34,578]

Lanier Litigation Services (d.b.a. Quorum/Lanier), Bloomington, Minnesota; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Acting Director of the Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at the Lanier Litigation Services (d.b.a. Quorum/Lanier), Bloomington, Minnesota. The review indicated that the application contained no new substantial information which would bear importantly on the Department's determination. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA–W–34,578; Lanier Litigation Services (d.b.a. Quorum/Lanier), Bloomington, Minnesota (August 31, 1998)

Signed at Washington, DC, this 1st day of September 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–24312 Filed 9–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–002544]

Oneita Mexicana, Clint, TX; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act 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. 2331), an investigation was initiated on August 6, 1998, in response to a petition filed on July 30, 1998 on behalf of a worker at Oneita Mexicana, Clint, Texas.

During the course of the investigation it was revealed that the workers' firm was located outside of the United States. Therefore, further investigation would serve no purpose and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC this 1st Day of September 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–24311 Filed 9–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[NAFTA–002535]

Proctor & Gamble Manufacturing Co., Greenville, NC; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 103–1 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. 2331), an investigation was initiated on July 30, 1998, in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at The Proctor & Gamble Manufacturing Company, Greenville, North Carolina. Workers produced catamenial products and adult incontinence products.

The petition has requested that the petition be withdrawn with the intent to resubmit the petition at a later date closer to the time when the shift in production of catamenial products to Canada occurs. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 28th day of August 1998.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98–24317 Filed 9–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Commission Meeting

AGENCY: Medicare Payment Advisory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Commission will hold its next public meeting on Thursday, September 17, 1998 and Friday, September 18, 1998 at the Embassy Suites Hotel, 1250 22nd Street NW, Washington, DC. The meeting is tentatively scheduled to begin at 11:00 a.m. on September 17 and 8:30 a.m. on September 18.

The Commission will discuss case-mix classification systems in post-acute care, risk adjustment, graduate medical education, and care at the end of life. Several sessions will be devoted to quality measures by the Commission's work plan on quality in Medicare.

Final agendas will be mailed on Wednesday, September 9, 1998 and will be available on the Commission's web sites (WWW.MedPAC.GOV).

ADDRESSES: 1730 K Street, NW,; Suite 800; Washington, D.C. 20006. The telephone number is 202/653–7220.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Ellison, Office Manager, 202/653–7220.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: If you are not on the Commission mailing list and wish to receive an agenda, please call 202/653–7220.

Murray N. Ross,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 98–24310 Filed 9–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–BW–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–219]

GPU Nuclear, Inc.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–16 issued to GPU Nuclear, Inc., the licensee) for operation of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station located in Ocean County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would remove the requirement for the Automatic Depressurization System (ADS) function of the Electromatic Relief Valves (EMRV) to be operable during Reactor Vessel Pressure Testing. Additionally, note h of Table 3.1.1 will be corrected due to a typographical error introduced in the issuance of Amendment 75.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no

significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. State the basis for the determination that the proposed activity will or will not increase the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident.

As the ADS is not required to mitigate a [Loss of Coolant Accident] LOCA during reactor vessel pressure testing and this change will not affect the integrity of the reactor pressure vessel, bypassing the ADS during vessel pressure testing will not affect the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the [safety analysis report] SAR. Correcting the allowed out of service time for the relief function of the EMRVs does not impact any of the accidents previously evaluated by the SAR.

2. State the basis for the determination that the activity does or does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously identified in the SAR.

This change does not change the ADS system or affect its function; therefore, it does not create the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than previously identified in the SAR.

3. State the basis for the determination that the margin of safety is not reduced.

The effect of the unavailability of Primary Containment has been previously analyzed for Amendment 120 to the Technical Specifications. This analysis may be applied to bypassing ADS since Primary Containment is required for ADS to initiate. Therefore, the Margin of Safety is not reduced by this change. This Technical Specification change reestablishes the out of service time to the value originally established in Amendment 44.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By October 9, 1998, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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 Reference Department, Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to

relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, 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. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 21, 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 Reference Department, Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ronald B. Eaton,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I–3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–24305 Filed 9–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–461]

Illinois Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–62 issued to Illinois Power Company (IP, or the licensee) for operation of the Clinton Power Station (CPS), located in DeWitt County, Illinois.

The proposed amendment concerns the ''ready-to-load'' requirement for the Division 3 diesel generator (DG). The Division 3 DG requires operator action to reset the mechanical governor to meet the ''ready-to-load'' requirement.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change revises the acceptance criteria for meeting the ''ready-to-load'' requirement denoted by TS Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.8.1.17 for the Division 3 Diesel Generator (DG). The proposed change also adds a discussion of this acceptance criterion to the USAR [updated safety analysis report] to clarify the intent of the requirement. The proposed change allows manual operator action to reset the governor upon receipt of an ECCS [emergency core cooling system] signal. Analyzed events are considered to be initiated by the failure of plant structures, systems, or components. The DGs are not considered as initiators of any analyzed event. The proposed change does not have a detrimental impact on the condition or performance of any plant structure, system, or component that initiates an analyzed event. The proposed change will not alter the operation of or otherwise increase the failure probability of any plant equipment that initiates an analyzed event. As such, the probability of occurrence for a previously analyzed accident is not significantly increased.

The consequences of a previously analyzed event are dependent on the initial conditions assumed for the analysis, the availability and successful functioning of the equipment assumed to operate in response to the analyzed event, and the setpoints at which these actions are initiated. The Division 3 DG continues to override the test mode and return the DG to a standby operation. The manual operator action to reset the governor following the receipt of an ECCS signal, continues to ensure that the equipment being powered by the DG will perform its intended function. The proposed change continues to ensure that the Division 3 DG will adequately support its design basis performance and mitigative function during an accident. Since the manual operator action performed during the test mode ensures that the governor is reset upon receipt of an ECCS signal, no analyses assumptions are violated and there are no adverse effects on the factors that contribute to offsite or onsite dose as the result of an accident. The proposed change does not affect setpoints that initiate protective or mitigative actions. The proposed change ensures that plant structures, systems, or components are maintained consistent with the safety analysis and licensing bases. Based on this evaluation, there is no significant increase in the consequences of a previously analyzed event.

Therefore, this change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

(2) The proposed change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change revises the acceptance criteria for meeting the ''ready-to-load'' requirement denoted by TS SR 3.8.1.17 for the Division 3 DG. The proposed change also adds a discussion of this acceptance criterion to the USAR to clarify the intent of the requirement. The proposed change does not change the operating characteristics or the safety function of the DG. The DG performs a mitigative function. No new or