publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review 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.

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: March 1, 1999.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to revise the Technical Safety Requirements (TSRs) related to the audibility requirements for the criticality accident alarm system (CAAS) at PGDP. It is related to the CAAS audibility upgrade modifications. The revision is necessary to ensure adequate TSR coverage during the modification and system changeover. This amendment also revises related sections in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR).

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 change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS at PGDP, and it does not involve any process which would change or increase the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite. Therefore, the proposed change will not result in an increase in the amounts of effluents that may be released offsite or result in any impact to the environment.

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

The CAAS system does not prevent criticality, thus the possibility of a criticality occurring is not increased. The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS which minimizes the consequences of a criticality accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not increase individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

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

The proposed change to the TSRs reflects modifications associated with the CAAS upgrade, which has been planned as a part of Compliance Plan Issues 46 and 50. The proposed change does not change the scope or expand the planned construction. Therefore, it does not result in a significant construction impact.

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 the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS which minimizes the consequences of a criticality accident. The CAAS does not change any previously analyzed accidents and does not affect the possibility of occurrence of a criticality accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

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

The CAAS is an alarm system to warn people of criticality events. It does not initiate or contribute to an accident, and it is intended to mitigate the consequences of a criticality accident. The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS. Therefore, this change will not result in the possibility of 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 change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS which minimizes the consequences of a criticality accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not represent a reduction in any margin 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.

The proposed change to the TSRs improves the performance and reliability of the CAAS which minimizes the consequences of a criticality accident. Therefore, the overall effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

Effective date: The amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 will become effective no later than 30 days after being signed by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–1: This amendment will revise the TSRs related to the audibility requirements for the criticality accident alarm system at PGDP and related sections in the SAR.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 99–20125 Filed 8–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–89 and 50–163]

General Atomics TRIGA Mark I and Mark F Research Reactors; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of a license amendment to Amended Facility License No. R–38 and Facility License No. R–67, issued to General Atomics (GA or the licensee), for decommissioning of the GA TRIGA Mark I and TRIGA Mark F Research Reactors, located at General Atomics in San Diego, San Diego county, California.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would approve the licensee's decommissioning plan. GA submitted their decommissioning plan in accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(b) for the GA TRIGA Mark I and TRIGA Mark F Research Reactors which occupy parts of the TRIGA Reactor Facility within GA's Torrey Mesa site. The TRIGA Mark I license was amended on October 29, 1997, and the TRIGA Mark F license was amended on March 22, 1995, to remove authority to operate the reactors. Fuel from both reactors have been placed in the TRIGA Mark F fuel storage canal which is in the same pool as the TRIGA Mark F reactor. The proposed decommissioning plan would authorize immediate dismantlement of the TRIGA Mark I Research Reactor. To protect the stored fuel from potential damage due to decommissioning activities, only limited dismantlement of the TRIGA Mark F Research Reactor

will occur with fuel in the TRIGA Mark F fuel storage canal. This would be followed by a period of fuel storage. After fuel is removed from the TRIGA Mark F fuel storage canal, dismantling will be completed on the TRIGA Mark F Research Reactor. The soonest that the Department of Energy can accept fuel from GA is 2003. Domestic spent nuclear fuel receipts at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory have been severely constrained because of a settlement agreement of a lawsuit concerning spent nuclear fuel and nuclear waste. The site will be decontaminated to meet unrestricted release criteria. After the Commission verifies that the release criteria have been met, the reactor license will be terminated.

The licensee will continue with their health physics program, and approved emergency and security plan during the decommissioning and their operator requalification plan until fuel is removed from the facility.

A ''Notice of Application for Decommissioning Amendment'' was published in the **Federal Register** on December 11, 1997 (62 FR 65288), in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.82(b)(5).

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated April 18, 1997, as supplemented on November 20, 1998, and January 28 and 29, February 3, April 22, May 3 and 12, and June 15, 16, and 22, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed because of GA's decision to cease reactor operations permanently at the Torrey Mesa site. As specified in 10 CFR 50.82, any licensee may apply to the NRC for authority to surrender a license voluntarily and to decommission the affected facility. Once the licensee permanently ceases operation, 10 CFR 50.82(b)(1) requires the licensee to make application for license termination within two years following permanent cessation of operations, and in no case later than one year prior to expiration of the operating license. GA is planning to use the area that would be released for unrestricted use for other purposes.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the radiological effects of decommissioning the TRIGA Mark I and Mark F Research Reactors will be minimal. The licensee will continue with their health physics program, and approved emergency and security plans. Until fuel is removed from the site, the licensee will also continue to meet the requirements of their operator requalification plan.

All proposed operations in connection with decommissioning and decontaminating of the GA reactors will be carefully planned and controlled, all contaminated components will be removed, packaged, and shipped offsite in accordance with the regulations, and radiological control procedures will be in place and implemented to ensure that releases of radioactive wastes from the facility are within the limits of 10 CFR Part 20 and are as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA).

All decontamination will be performed by trained personnel in accordance with previously reviewed procedures and will be overseen by experienced health physics staff. No new postulated accidents have been identified during decommissioning activities or storage of the reactor fuel that would have greater radiological impact than previously evaluated accidents. The GA staff has calculated that the total dose to workers for the decommissioning project will be about 20 person-rem over the period 1999 to 2004 (assuming fuel is removed from the facility in 2003). The GA staff estimates that the dose to members of the public from decommissioning activities will be negligible. These doses are consistent with those given in NUREG–0586, ''Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities,'' for the reference research reactor.

While on site, fuel will be stored in approved storage locations under the restrictions of the facility license. The license will continue to maintain systems necessary for safe storage of the fuel.

The proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. Hazardous materials such as lead and asbestos will be handled and disposed of in accordance with all applicable regulations and, therefore, will not result in any significant release of non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The alternatives to the proposed action for the GA TRIGA research reactors are SAFSTOR, ENTOMB and no action. ENTOMB is the alternative in which radioactive contaminates are encased in a structurally long-lived material, such as concrete, the entombed structure is appropriately maintained and continued surveillance is carried out until the radioactivity decays to a level permitting release of the property for unrestricted use. SAFSTOR is the alternative in which the facility is placed and maintained in a condition that allows the facility to be safely stored and subsequently decontaminated to levels that permit release for unrestricted use.

The ENTOMB alterative could not be put into place until the fuel was removed from the facility and would require the facility to remain on site for an extended period of time. Likewise, the SAFSTOR alternative would require continued surveillance for an extended period of time. However, GA wants to use the space that will become available for other purposes and wants to enter into the decommissioning activities as soon as possible. The alternative of not decommissioning reactors was rejected in NUREG–0586. The no action alternative would leave the facility in its present configuration. Denial of the application would result in no significant change in current environmental impacts.

The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative actions are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

The action does not involve the use of resources different from previously committed for construction and operation of the GA TRIGA reactors.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 20, 1999, the staff consulted with the State of California official, R. Lupo of the Radiologic Health Branch of the California Department of Health Services regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The state official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of 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 this proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated April 18, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated November 20, 1998, and January 28 and 29, February 3, April 22, May 3 and 12, and June 15, 16, and 22, 1999. These documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20003–1527.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ledyard B. Marsh,

Chief, Events Assessment, Generic Communications and Non-Power Reactors Branch, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–20124 Filed 8–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Review of a Revised Information Collection: SF 2803 and SF 3108

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for review of a revised information collection. SF 2803, Application to Make Deposit or Redeposit (CSRS), and SF 3108, Application to Make Service Credit Payment for Civilian Service (FERS), are applications to make payment used by persons who are eligible to pay for Federal service which was not subject to retirement deductions and/or for Federal service which was subject to retirement deductions which were subsequently refunded to the applicant.

Comments are particularly invited on: whether this information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the Office of Personnel Management, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

In addition to the current Federal employees who will use these forms, we expect to receive approximately 75 filings of each form from former Federal employees per year. Each form takes approximately 30 minutes to complete. The annual burden is 75 hours.

For copies of this proposal, contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey on (202) 606–8358, or E-mail to mbtoomey@opm.gov.

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before October 4, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—Ronald W. Melton, Chief, Operations Support Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW, Room 3349, Washington, DC 20415.

FOR INFORMATION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION—CONTACT: Phyllis R. Pinkney, Management Analyst, Budget & Administrative Services Division, (202) 606–0623.

Office of Personnel Management.

Janice R. Lachance,

Director.

[FR Doc. 99–19981 Filed 8–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Reclearance of Information Collection: RI 38–107

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for reclearance of the following information collection. RI 38–107, Verification of Who is Getting Payments, is used to verify that the entitled person is indeed receiving the monies payable. Failure to collect this information would cause OPM to pay monies absent the assurance of a correct payee.

Comments are particularly invited on: whether this information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the Office of Personnel Management, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

We estimate 25,400 RI 38–107 forms are completed annually. Each form takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. The annual estimated burden is 4,234 hours.

For copies of this proposal, contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey on (202) 606–8358, or E-mail to mbtoomey@opm.gov.

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before October 4, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—Ronald W. Melton, Chief, Operations Support Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW, Room 3349, Washington, DC 20415.

FOR INFORMATION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION—CONTACT: Phyllis R. Pinkney, Management Analyst, Budget & Administrative Services Division, (202) 606–0623.

Office of Personnel Management.

Janice R. Lachance,

Director.

[FR Doc. 99–19982 Filed 8–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for Review of a Revised Information Collection: RI 30–9

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for review of a revised information collection. RI 30–9, Reinstatement of Disability Annuity Previously Terminated Because of Restoration to Earning Capacity, informs former disability annuitants of their right to request restoration under title 5, U.S.C., Section 8337. It also specifies the conditions to be met and the documentation required for a person to request reinstatement.