the TS and concludes that storage and use of fuel enriched with U–235 up to 4.3 weight is acceptable. The safety considerations associated with higher enrichments were evaluated by the NRC staff and the staff concluded that such changes would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed changes will not increase the probability of any accident. The higher enrichment and increased fuel burnup may slightly change the mix of fission products that might be released in the event of a serious accident, but such small changes would not significantly affect the consequences of accidents.

No changes are being made in the types or quantity of any effluents that may be released offsite, no changes are being made to the authorized power level, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment and extended irradiation are discussed in the staff assessment entitled ''NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation,'' dated July 7, 1988. This assessment was published in the **Federal Register** on August 11, 1988 (53 FR 30355) as corrected on August 24, 1988 (53 FR 32322) in connection with an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact related to the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1. As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of an increase in fuel enrichment of up to 5 weight percent U–235 and irradiation limits of up to 60 gigawatt days per metric ton (GWD/MT) are either unchanged, or may in fact be reduced from those summarized in Table S–4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c). These findings are applicable to these proposed amendments for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, given that the proposal involves less than 5% enrichment and burnup of less than 60 GWD/MT. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action involves 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 significant 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 of plant operation and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Surry Power Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 4, 1998, the staff consulted with the Virginia State official, Mr. L. Foldese of the Virginia Department of Health, 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 November 5, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated January 28, 1998, which 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 Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this day of 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gordon E. Edison, Sr.,

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

[FR Doc. 98–6781 Filed 3–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Advanced Reactor Designs; Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Advanced Reactor Designs will hold a meeting on March 31 and April 1, 1998, Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

Portions of the meeting may be closed to public attendance to discuss Westinghouse Electric Company safeguards information related to the AP600 pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3).

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Tuesday, March 31, 1998—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

Wednesday, April 1, 1998—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will hear discussion with representatives of the NRC staff and Westinghouse regarding the AP600 Standard Safety Analysis Report and the draft Final Safety Evaluation Report Chapters 2, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, Westinghouse Electric, their consultants and other interested persons regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, the scheduling of sessions which are open to the public, the Chairman's ruling on

requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff engineer, Mr. Noel F. Dudley (telephone 301/415–6888) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EST). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: March 10, 1998.

Medhat El-Zeftawy,

Acting Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 98–6783 Filed 3–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATE: Thursday, March 19, 1998.

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

STATUS: Public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Thursday, March 19—Tentative

2:30 p.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)

a. Petition for Commission Review of Director's Decision on Paducah Seismic Upgrades Certificate Amendment Request

* 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 wmh@nrc.gov or dkw@nrc.gov.

Dated: March 12, 1998.

William M. Hill, Jr.,

SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–6984 Filed 3–13–98; 11:40 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Extension: Rule 206(3)–2 SEC File No. 270–216 OMB Control No. 3235–0243

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

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'') has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for extension of the previously approved collections of information discussed below.

Rule 206(3)–2 permits investment advisers to comply with section 206(3) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 by obtaining a blanket consent from a client to enter into agency cross transactions, provided that certain disclosures are made to the client. The information requirements of the rule consist of the following: (1) Prior to obtaining the client's consent appropriate disclosure must be made to the client as to the practice of, and the conflicts of interest involved in, agency cross transactions; (2) at or before the completion of any such transaction the client must be furnished with a written confirmation containing specified information and offering to furnish upon request certain additional information; and (3) at least annually, the client must be furnished with a written statement or summary as to the total number of transactions during the period covered by the consent and the total amount of commissions received by the adviser or its affiliated broker-dealer attributable to such transactions.

The information required by rule 206(3)–2 is used by the Commission in connection with its investment adviser inspection program to ensure that advisers are in compliance with rule 206(3)–2. The information is also used by clients. Without the information collected under the rule, the Commission would be less efficient and effective in its inspection program and clients would not have information valuable for monitoring the adviser's handling of their accounts.

The Commission estimates that approximately 233 respondents utilize the rule annually, necessitating about 122 responses per respondent each year, for a total of 28,426 responses. Each response requires about .5 hours, for a total of 14,213 hours.

These collections of information are found at 17 CFR 275.206(3)–2 and are necessary in order for the investment adviser to obtain the benefits of rule 206(3)–2. Commission-registered investment advisers are required to maintain and preserve certain information required under rule 206(3)–2 for five years. The long-term retention of these records is necessary for the Commission's inspection program to ascertain compliance with the Investment Advisers Act.

The estimated average burden hours are made solely for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act and are not derived from a comprehensive or even representative survey or study of the cost of Commission rules and forms.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number.

General comments regarding the above information should be directed to the following persons: (i) Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Room 3208, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503; and (ii) Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20549. Comments must be submitted to OMB within 30 days of this notice.

Dated: March 4, 1998.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–6764 Filed 3–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M