radioactive contaminated materials at an above-grade disposal cell. The notice of the amendment request was published in the **Federal Register** at 64 FR 31023 (June 9, 1999).

The Presiding Officer in this proceeding is Administrative Judge Charles Bechhoefer. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.722, 2.1209, Administrative Judge Thomas D. Murphy has been appointed 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 Bechhoefer and Judge Murphy in accordance with 10 CFR 2.1203. Their addresses are:

Administrative Judge Charles Bechhoefer, Presiding Officer, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001

Administrative Judge Thomas D. Murphy, Special Assistant, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of July, 1999.

G. Paul Bollwerk III,

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 99–19853 Filed 8–2–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001 and 70–7002]

Notice of Amendments to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 and GDP–2 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, Kentucky, and the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Portsmouth, OH

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment requests 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 plants' safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment requests is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment applications and concluded that they 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 for 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 needs to 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 amendments to the Certificates of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment applications 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 amendments 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 Rooms.

Date of amendment requests: February 12, 1999.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments propose to revise the Paducah and Portsmouth Quality Assurance Program (QAP) descriptions to include additional ways to approve suppliers for inclusion on the Approved Suppliers List and clarify the audit requirements applied to suppliers conducting work under the USEC QAP.

Basis for finding of no significance:

1. The proposed amendments 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 revisions to the QAP provide for additional ways to approve suppliers for inclusion on the Approved Suppliers List and clarify the audit requirements applied to suppliers conducting work under the USEC QAP. 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 amendments will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed revisions to the QAP provide for additional ways to approve suppliers for inclusion on the Approved Suppliers List and clarify the audit requirements applied to suppliers conducting work under the USEC QAP; they have no affect on occupational radiation exposure. Therefore, the proposed change does not increase individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

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

The proposed change is only a change to the QAP and does not involve any construction. Therefore, it does not result in a significant construction impact.

4. The proposed amendments will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed revisions to the QAP provide for additional ways to approve suppliers for inclusion on the Approved Suppliers List and clarify the audit requirements applied to suppliers conducting work under the USEC QAP. It 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 amendments will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed revisions to the QAP provide for additional ways to approve suppliers for inclusion on the Approved Suppliers List and clarify the audit requirements applied to suppliers conducting work under the USEC QAP. The proposed change does not introduce any new or different kind of accident. Therefore, this change will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

The proposed revisions to the QAP provide for additional ways to approve suppliers for inclusion on the Approved Suppliers List and clarify the audit requirements applied to suppliers conducting work under the USEC QAP. Margins of safety are not affected by this change. Therefore, the proposed change does not represent a reduction in any margin of safety.

7. The proposed amendments will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

The proposed revisions to the QAP provides for additional ways to approve suppliers for inclusion on the Approved Suppliers List and clarify the audit requirements applied to suppliers conducting work under the USEC QAP. These changes do not decrease the overall effectiveness of the plants' safety, safeguards, and security programs.

Effective date: The amendments to Certificates of Compliance GDP–1 and GDP–2 will become effective no later than 90 days after being signed by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Certificates of Compliance Nos. GDP–1 and GDP–2: These amendments will revise the QAPs to provide for additional ways to approve suppliers for inclusion on the Approved Suppliers List and to clarify the audit requirements applied to suppliers conducting work under the USEC QAP.

Local Public Document Room locations: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003 and Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 99–19859 Filed 8–2–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

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

Extension:

Rule 11a1–1(T), SEC File No. 270–428, OMB Control No. 3235–0478

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'') is soliciting comments on the collection of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit this existing collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

• Rule 11a1–1(T)—Transaction Yielding Priority, Parity, and Precedence

On January 27, 1976, the Commission adopted Rule 11a1–1(T) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Exchange Act'') to exempt transactions of exchange members for their own accounts that would otherwise be prohibited under Section 11(a) of the Exchange Act. The rule provides that a member's proprietary order may be executed on the exchange of which the trader is a member, if, among other things: (1) The member discloses that a bid or offer for its account is for account to any member with whom such bid or offer is placed or to whom it is communicated; (2) any such member through whom that bid or offer is communicated discloses to others participating in effecting the order that it is for the account of a member; and (3) immediately before executing the order, a member (other than a specialist in such security) presenting any order for the account of a member on the exchange clearly announces or otherwise indicates to the specialist and to other members then present that he is presenting an order for the account of a member.

There are approximately 1,000 respondents that require an aggregate total of 333 hours to comply with this rule. Each of these approximately 1,000 respondents makes an estimated 20 annual responses, for an aggregate of 20,000 responses per year. Each response takes approximately 1 minute to complete. Thus, the total compliance burden per year is 333 hours (20,000 minutes/60 minutes per hour = 333 hours). The approximate cost per hour is $100, resulting in a total cost of compliance for the respondents of $33,333 (333 hours @ $100).

Written comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Please direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, NW Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: July 27, 1999.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–19873 Filed 8–2–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M