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

The proposed amendment does not propose any new or unanalyzed activity for the facility. Therefore, the amendment does not raise 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 amendment would lower the fluorine flow rate possible in the new (Cell Floor) Freon Degrader and lower the safety system trip point. The lowering of the flow rate and trip point decreases the possibility of an accident and would increase 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 would lower the fluorine flow rate possible in the new (Cell Floor) Freon Degrader and lower the safety system trip point and does not change the frequency of surveillances. Therefore, it does not decrease the effectiveness of the plant's safety program. The staff has not identified any safeguards or security related implications from the proposed amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safeguards or security programs.

Effective date: The amendment to GDP–2 will become effective 60 days after issuance by NRC.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–2: Amendment will revise TSR 2.7.3.9.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–25064 Filed 9–17–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Paducah, Kentucky

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 shown 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 Paducah 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 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, 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 27, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to revise Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) 2.6.4.1 to reflect the addition of new, permanent criticality accident alarm system (CAAS) clusters in Building C–710. The amendment will also remove four buildings from the facility listing requiring CAAS coverage because the buildings do not contain fissile material.

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 changes to the TSR will have no effect on the generation or disposition of effluents. Therefore, the proposed TSR modifications will not result in a change to the types or 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 changes to the TSR to reflect CAAS coverage for C–710 and to remove buildings that do not contain fissile material from the listing requiring

CAAS coverage will not increase any exposure to radiation. Therefore, the changes will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative radiation exposure.

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

The proposed changes will not result in any building construction, 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 changes to TSR 2.6.4.1 will add the newly installed CAAS clusters in C–710 to the TSR so that the TSR will reflect the modified plant configuration. The changes also reflect the removal of four buildings from the listing of buildings required to have CAAS. These four buildings do not contain fissile material; therefore, a criticality accident cannot occur in the facilities and CAAS coverage is not required. CAAS is utilized to mitigate the consequences of criticality accidents by alerting personnel of the need to evacuate. The addition/deletion of CAAS has no impact on the potential for or occurrence of an accident. These changes will not increase the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously identified accidents.

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

The proposed TSR modifications add CAAS clusters and remove buildings from the list of buildings requiring CAAS coverage. The new CAAS in C–710 uses the same components and operational methodology as the existing system components. The new clusters improve detection coverage of the system. The proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different type of equipment malfunction or 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 changes to the TSR reflect an upgrade in the CAAS system for C–710 and reflect the buildings that are required to have CAAS coverage. The removal of the four buildings that do not contain fissile material from the list will not alter the margin of safety. Therefore, these changes do not decrease the margins 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.

Implementation of the proposed changes do not change the safety, safeguards, or security programs. Therefore, the effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

Effective date: The amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 becomes effective 15 days after being signed by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–1: Amendment will revise TSR 2.6.4.1 to reflect the newly installed CAAS clusters in C–710. Four buildings that do not contain fissile material will also be removed from the listing of areas required to have CAAS detection ability.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–25065 Filed 9–17–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Notice

In accordance with the purposes of Sections 29 and 182b. of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2232b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on September 30–October 2, 1998, in Conference Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the **Federal Register** on Thursday, November 20, 1997 (62 FR 62079).

Wednesday, September 30, 1998

8:30 A.M.–8:45 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding conduct of the meeting.

8:45 A.M.–10:00 A.M.: Preparation of ACRS Report (Open)—The Committee will discuss the proposed ACRS report on Impact of PRA Results and Insights on the Regulatory System.

10:15 A.M.–11:45 A.M.: NEI Petition To Modify 10 CFR 50.54(a) Related to Quality Assurance Programs (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) regarding the NEI petition to modify 10 CFR 50.54(a) to negate the requirement for licensees to obtain NRC approval prior to making changes to their quality assurance programs.

12:45 P.M.–2:15 P.M.: Risk-Informed Pilot Application for Hydrogen Monitoring at Arkansas Nuclear One (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the nuclear industry regarding a pilot application of a risk-informed approach for post-accident hydrogen monitoring at Arkansas Nuclear One.

2:30 P.M.–3:30 P.M.: Performance Technology Views on Criteria for Safety Decisions (Open)—The Committee will hear a presentation by and hold discussions with a representative of Performance Technology, Inc., on criteria for safety decisions and comments on Regulatory Guide 1.174 (previously DG–1061).

3:30 P.M.–4:30 P.M.: Industry Initiatives To Certify Probabilistic Risk Assessments (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and Owners' Groups, as appropriate, regarding industry initiatives to certify probabilistic risk assessments (PRAs).

4:45 P.M.–7:00 P.M.: Preparation of ACRS Reports (Open)—The Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports on matters considered during this meeting. In addition, the Committee will discuss proposed ACRS reports on: lessons learned from the review of the AP600 passive plant design; proposed resolution of Generic Safety Issue-171, ''Engineered Safety Features Failure From Loss of Offsite Power Subsequent to a Loss-of-Coolant Accident''; and prioritization of Generic Safety Issues.

Thursday, October 1, 1998

8:30 A.M.–8:35 A.M.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding conduct of the meeting.

8:35 A.M.–10:00 A.M.: Lessons Learned From the Independent Safety Assessment of the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station and Associated Generic Safety Implications (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding lessons learned from the independent safety assessment of the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station and associated generic safety implications.

10:15 A.M.–12:00 Noon: ACRS Reports to the Congress and the Commission (Open)—The Committee