5. The number of annual respondents: 1,320 (300 for the Financial EDI Form and 1,020 for the Credit Card Authorization Form).

6. The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 105.6 (24 hours for the Financial EDI Form and 81.6 hours for the Credit Card Authorization Form).

7. Abstract: The U.S. Department of Treasury encourages the public to pay monies owed the government through use of the Automated Clearinghouse Network and credit card. These two methods of payment are used by licensees, applicants, and individuals to pay civil penalties, full cost licensing fees, and inspection fees to the NRC.

Submit, by January 4, 1999, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site (http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/PUBLIC/OMB/index.html). The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T–6 F33, Washington, DC, 20555–0001, by telephone at 301–415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of October 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–29496 Filed 11–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 55–32443–SP and ASLBP No. 99–755–01–SP]

Michael A. Philippon; Designation of Presiding Officer

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972, published in the **Federal Register**, 37 FR 28710 (1972), and Sections 2.105, 2.700, 2.702, 2.714, 2.714a, 2.717 and 2.1207 of the Commission's Regulations, a single member of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel is hereby designated to rule on requests for hearing and/or petitions to intervene, and, if necessary, to serve as the Presiding Officer to conduct an informal adjudicatory hearing in the following proceeding.

Michael A. Philippon

(Denial of Senior Reactor Operator's License)

The hearing, if granted, will be conducted pursuant to 10 CFR Part 2 Subpart L of the Commission's Regulations, ''Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operator Licensing Proceedings.'' This proceeding concerns a denial by NRC Staff of Mr. Philippon's senior reactor operator's license application and Mr. Philippon's request for a hearing pursuant to 10 CFR 2.103.

The Presiding Officer in this proceeding is Administrative Judge Thomas S. Moore. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.722, the Presiding Officer has appointed Administrative Judge Charles N. Kelber to assist the Presiding Officer in taking evidence and in preparing a suitable record for review.

All correspondence, documents and other materials shall be filed with Judge Moore and Judge Kelber in accordance with 10 CFR 2.701. Their addresses are:

Administrative Judge Thomas S. Moore, Presiding Officer, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Charles N. Kelber, Special Assistant, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of October 1998.

B. Paul Cotter, Jr.,

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 98–29498 Filed 11–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7002]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–2 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Portsmouth, Ohio

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 described 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 Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PORTS). 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 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: May 26, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: On May 26, 1998, the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) requested an amendment to the certificate of compliance for PORTS. The request is to revise Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) 2.1.3.9, Low Cylinder Pressure Shutoff, to reduce the shutoff pressure level setpoint from 20 psia to an allowable value of 15 psia and to reflect an improved description of the system operation through changes to the TSR's Surveillance Requirements and the Basis Statement wording.

Specifically, USEC has proposed to revise the Surveillance Requirements of TSR 2.1.3.9 to: (1) Require the quarterly channel functional test and the semiannual calibration to be based on an allowable pressure reading of greater than or equal to 15 psia, instead of a setpoint of 20 psia and (2) to specify a definitive, initial period of time when the channel functional test and calibration are performed—an allowable value of less than or equal to 65 minutes from an open ended ''after the first hour of heating.'' USEC has also proposed to revise the Basis Statement wording to reflect the revised system operation.

PORTS uses thirteen cylindrical (6, 7, and 8 foot diameter) steam autoclaves in buildings X–342, X–343 and X–344 to feed, transfer and sample UF_6 contained in cylinders. Cylinder heating is accomplished by pressurizing the autoclave with live steam. The feed, transfer and sample operations of the cylinders are protected against cylinder overpressure by instrumentation that measures cylinder pressure through sensors downstream in the UF_6 process line. If the cylinder has either a plugged cylinder valve or pigtail, the protection afforded by the cylinder high pressure shutoff system would be negated because the high pressure instrumentation would be unable to measure the UF_6 cylinder pressure. The low cylinder pressure shutoff system's sole function is to ensure line clarity by measuring for an expected pressure after a given time period. This is performed early in the heating evolution to ensure the availability of the pressure instrumentation well before the maximum allowable working pressure of the UF_6 cylinder.

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 low cylinder pressure shutoff system is in place to verify the clarity of the UF_6 process line and the availability of the cylinder pressure instrumentation. The system is not involved in the generation of effluents; therefore, the proposed amendment will not change the types or increase the 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 amendment which involves changing the surveillance requirements and actuation setpoints of the low cylinder pressure shutoff system will not affect operability. The low cylinder pressure shutoff system will still be capable of ensuring UF_6 process line clarity and the availability of the UF_6 cylinder high pressure autoclave steam shutdown system. The changes will not increase the probability or consequences of a UF_6 release associated with any postulated accident currently identified in the SAR. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

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

The proposed amendment does not involve any construction activities; 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 amendment which involves changing the surveillance requirements and actuation setpoints of the low cylinder pressure shutoff system will not affect operability. The low cylinder pressure shutoff system will still be capable of ensuring UF_6 process line clarity and the availability of the UF_6 cylinder high pressure autoclave steam shutdown system. The changes will not increase the probability or consequences of any postulated radiological or chemical accident currently identified in the SAR. The proposed changes will also not result in an increase in the potential for, or radiological consequences from, previously evaluated criticality accidents. Therefore, the proposed changes will 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.

Releases of UF_6 involving autoclave feed, sampling and transfer operations have been analyzed in the SAR. The proposed amendment will not result in any changes to any of the operations; therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

The proposed changes, lowering the low cylinder pressure shutoff system setpoint from 20 psia to an allowable value of 15 psia will not affect the system operability. The function of the low cylinder pressure shutoff system is to ensure line clarity to the pressure instrumentation to allow for over pressure protection provided by the high UF_6 cylinder pressure shutoff system. The proposed revisions will

allow for improved system operability by lowering the setpoint from being set too close to the expected pressure measured at the particular time of the heating evolution. The revised methodology allows for the control system to accommodate for instrument uncertainty when determining the actual setpoint (a procedurally controlled value). The revised allowable value of 15 psia still allows for a 50% rise in pressure from the administratively controlled starting pressure of 10 psia, which allows for the low cylinder pressure control system to suitably demonstrate line clarity.

The change from the current surveillance requirements specifying ''. . . after the first hour of heating . . .'' to the proposed allowable value of less than or equal to 65 minutes will not lead to a significant increase in measured pressure. The proposed value provides a definitive time for the surveillance requirements to be performed within an expected pressure range that is well below the maximum allowable working pressure of the UF_6 cylinder.

The changes will not result in a significant 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 amendment which involves changing the surveillance requirements and actuation setpoints of the low cylinder pressure shutoff will not affect system operability. The low cylinder pressure shutoff system will still be capable of ensuring UF_6 process line clarity and the availability of the UF_6 cylinder high pressure autoclave steam shutdown system. Therefore, the proposed modifications will not result in a decrease in the overall effectiveness of the plant's safety program. The staff has also not identified any safeguards or security related implications from the proposed amendment.

Effective date: 60 days after issuance of amendment.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–2: Amendment will revise the Technical Safety Requirement.

Local Public Document Room location: Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of October 1998.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–29493 Filed 11–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Dockets 70–7001 and 70–7002]

Notice of Amendment to Certificates of Compliance GDP–1 and GDP–2 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation (Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant and Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, Kentucky and Piketon, Ohio)

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following administrative amendments are 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 amendments is shown below.

The NRC staff has concluded that the administrative amendments provide 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 amendments to the Certificates of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant and the Portsmouth 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 these amendments satisfy the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22(c)(19). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments.

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 the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report.

Date of amendment request: There was no formal amendment request. USEC, Inc. was formally privatized by the U.S. Treasury Department on July 28, 1998. These amendments will impose the conditions of transfer attached to the privatization action.

Brief description of amendment: The Commission conditionally consented to the transfer of the certificates of compliance to the privatized USEC. This transfer was subject to USEC consenting to three proposed conditions that related to foreign ownership, control or domination and the Russian High Enriched Uranium Agreement. On July 20, 1998, USEC consented to the conditions. USEC, Inc. was formally privatized by the U.S. Treasury Department on July 28, 1998. These amendments do not approve the transfer; they are administrative amendments to add the conditions of transfer to the certificates of compliance.