need to perform certain plant modifications during outages as opposed to those that can be performed while the plant is at power, and (4) integration with other significant but unrelated issues that TU Electric is addressing at its plant. In order to remove compensatory measures such as fire watches, it has been determined that resolution of the Thermo-Lag corrective actions by TU Electric must be completed in accordance with current TU Electric schedules. By letter dated May 20, 1998, the NRC staff notified TU Electric of its plan to incorporate TU Electric's schedule commitment into a requirement by issuance of an order and requested consent from the Licensee. By letter dated June 2, 1998, the Licensee provided its consent to issuance of a Confirmatory Order.

III

The Licensee's commitment as set forth in its letter of June 2, 1998, is acceptable and is necessary for the NRC to conclude that public health and safety are reasonably assured. To preclude any schedule slippage and to assure public health and safety, the NRC staff has determined that the Licensee's commitment in its June 2, 1998, letter be confirmed by this Order. The Licensee has agreed to this action. Based on the above, and the Licensee's consent, this Order is immediately effective upon issuance.

IV

Accordingly, pursuant to sections 103, 161b, 161i, 161o, 182, and 186 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 2.202 and 10 CFR Part 50, it is hereby ordered, effective immediately, that:

TU Electric shall complete final implementation of Thermo-Lag 330–1 fire barrier corrective actions at Comanche Peak, Unit 1, described in TU Electric submittals to the NRC dated April 9 and May 1, 1998, by December 31, 1998.

The Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, may relax or rescind, in writing, any provisions of this Confirmatory Order upon a showing by the Licensee of good cause.

V

Any person adversely affected by this Confirmatory Order, other than the Licensee, may request a hearing within 20 days of its issuance. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the time to request a hearing. A request for extension of time must be made in writing to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555 and include a statement of good cause for the extension. Any request for a hearing shall be submitted to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, Washington, D.C. 20555. Copies of the hearing request shall also be sent to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, to the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Enforcement at the same address, to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region IV, 611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400, Arlington, Texas, 76011 and to the Licensee. If such a person requests a hearing, that person shall set forth with particularity the manner in which his/her interest is adversely affected by this Order and shall address criteria set forth in 10 CFR 2.714(d).

If a hearing is requested by a person whose interest is adversely affected, the Commission will issue an Order designating the time and place of any such hearing. If a hearing is held, the issue to be considered at such hearing shall be whether this Confirmatory Order should be sustained.

In the absence of any request for hearing, or written approval of an extension of time in which to request a hearing, the provisions specified in Section IV above shall be final 20 days from the date of this Order without further order or proceedings. If an extension of time for requesting a hearing has been approved, the provisions specified in Section IV shall be final when the extension expires if a hearing request has not been received. An answer or a request for hearing shall not stay the immediate effectiveness of this Order.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 28 day of July 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–20601 Filed 7–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subcommittee Meeting on Reliability and Probabilistic Risk Assessment; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Reliability and Probabilistic Risk Assessment will hold a meeting on August 26, 1998, Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, August 26, 1998—10:00 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will discuss issues in the Staff Requirements Memorandum dated April 20, 1998, regarding situation-specific cases where probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) results and insights have improved the existing regulatory system and specific areas in which PRA, when applied properly, can have a positive impact on the regulatory system. 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, its consultants, and other interested persons regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, and 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. Michael T. Markley (telephone 301/415–6885) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT). 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: July 28, 1998.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 98–20599 Filed 7–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Draft NUREG Report; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued for public comment Draft NUREG–1521 titled ''Technical Review of Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Methods for Nuclear Power Plant Fire Protection Analyses.''

As part of the staff's efforts to focus licensee and NRC resources on risk-significant activities, and to decrease the prescriptiveness of its regulations through performance-based methods that allow licensees increased flexibility in implementing NRC regulations, the staff has conducted a technical review to identify opportunities in the fire protection area. Draft NUREG–1521 presents a technical review and analysis of risk-informed, performance-based methods that are alternatives to those in current prescriptive fire protection requirements or guidance that could allow cost-effective methods for implementing safety objectives, focusing licensee efforts, and achieving greater efficiency in the use of resources for plant safety. A technical analysis of the usefulness of the results and insights derived from these methods (including accounting for the uncertainties in the results) in improving regulatory decision making is presented.

Public comments are being solicited on Draft NUREG–1521. Comments may be accompanied by additional relevant information or supporting data. The staff specifically requests comments on (1) whether information on any other technical methods and models for risk-informed, performance applications not covered in the report exist and should be reviewed and included, and (2) risk-informed, performance-based applications beyond those discussed in the report that would provide regulatory focus on risk significant issues, and flexibility to licensees in implementing NRC safety objectives.

A free single copy of Draft NUREG–1521 may be requested by written request to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Distribution and Mail Services Section, Office of Administration, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Hand deliver comments on draft NUREG–1521 to 11545 Rockville Pike, Maryland between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m on Federal Workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Comments will be most helpful if received by November 30, 1998. This document is also available at the NRC Web Site, http://www.nrc.gov. See the link under ''Technical Reports in the NUREG Series'' on the ''Reference Library'' page. You may also provide comments at this NRC Web Site. Instructions for sending comments electronically are included with the document, NUREG–1521, at the web site.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of July 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Thomas L. King,

Director, Division of Systems Technology, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 98–20600 Filed 7–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Budget Rescissions and Deferrals

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one proposed rescission of budgetary resources, totaling $5.2 million.

The proposed rescission affects programs of the Department of the Interior.

William J. Clinton

THE WHITE HOUSE,
July 24, 1998.

Rescission Proposal No. R98–25

PROPOSED RESCISSION OF BUDGET AUTHORITY

Report Pursuant to Section 1012 of P.L. 93–344

Agency: DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau: Bureau of Land Management

Account: Mineral leasing and associated payments

New budget authority: $5,200,000

Other budgetary resources:——

Total budgetary resources: 5,200,000

Amount proposed for rescission: 5,200,000

Proposed appropriations language:

The budget authority provided by section 503 of Public Law 105–83 is hereby rescinded.

Justification: The proposal would rescind $5,200 thousand for a conveyance to the State of Montana of Federal mineral rights. This amount was canceled under the Line Item Veto Act, which the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional on June 25, 1998.

In connection with the Crown Butte/New World Mine acquisition (addressed in section 502 of P. L. 105–83), section 503 provides for the uncompensated conveyance to the State of Montana of either $10 million in Federal mineral rights in Montana or the Federal mineral rights in Otter Creek Tracts 1, 2, and 3 (in Montana).

Section 503 would cause Federal taxpayers to lose their share of royalties from Federally-owned lands, which would normally be split between the State where the Federally-owned lands are located and the U.S. Treasury upon development of Federal mineral rights. The Federal share would be $5.2 million. The section would set a costly, unnecessary precedent by requiring the Federal Government to ''compensate'' a State for a purchase or exchange of lands between the Federal Government and a willing seller. This precedent could, therefore, discourage innovative, cost-effective land protection solutions in the future.

This proposed rescission applies to the budget authority under each of the alternative conveyances under sections 503(a)(1) and 503(a)(2).

This action is taken pursuant to the Antideficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1512).

Estimated programmatic effect: As a result of the proposed rescission, net Federal outlays will decrease, as specified below.

(Note: The amount of the effect depends on whether mineral rights would have been conveyed under section 503(a)(1) or under section 503(a)(2). As discussed below, the Administration estimates that mineral rights would more likely have been conveyed under section 503(a)(1).) This will have a commensurate effect on the Federal budget deficit.