submission requesting that OMB clearance of this collection for no longer than 3 years.

SEND COMMENTS TO: Mary Lou Higgs, Acting Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send email to mlhiggs@nsf.gov. Written comments should be received within 60 days of the date of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Higgs on (703) 306–1125 x 2010 or send email to mlhiggs@nsf.gov. You may also obtain a copy of the data collection instrument and instructions from Ms. Higgs.

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 shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information on respondents, including through the use of automatic collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Proposed Project: The 1998 Survey of Science and Engineering Research Facilities at Colleges and Universities conducted by NSF collected data on the status of academic science and engineering (S&E) research facilities. This proposed survey will build on that data collection methodology and assess the quantity, quality, and needs for instructional facilities in all academic fields at the nation's colleges and universities.

Use of Information: Currently there exists no nationwide inventory of postsecondary instructional facilities. The demand for college-level education is expected to rise sharply in the near future due to at least three factors:

1. Current enrollments are at alltime highs and not expected to decline soon;
2. An increasing number of students are nearing typical college age;
3. ''Mature'' (older) students continue to return to campus in growing numbers.

By establishing an inventory of postsecondary instructional facilities, Federal legislators and policymakers can better assess and plan for the future educational needs of the country.

Burden on the Public: The pre-test will include no more than nine colleges and universities, requiring approximately 1.5 hours each. The pilot test instrument will be sent to 150. We expect each to spend approximately 1.5 hours to 6 hours, for a total annual burden of 225–900 hours.

Dated: September 17, 1998.

Mary Lou Higgs,

Acting NSF Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–25411 Filed 9–22–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–269, 50–270 and 50–287–LR ASLBP No. 98–752–02–LR]

Duke Energy Corporation; Establishment of Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

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 2.721 of the Commission's Regulations, all as amended, an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is being established in the following proceeding to rule on petitions for hearing and for leave to intervene and to preside over the proceeding in the event that a hearing is ordered.

Duke Energy Corporation; Oconee Nuclear Station

Facility Operating Licenses No. DPR–38, DPR–47 and DPR–55

This Board is being established pursuant to a notice published by the Commission on August 11, 1998, in the **Federal Register** (63 FR 42885) and the Commission's Order Referring Petition for Intervention and Request for Hearing to Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, CLI–98–17 (September 15, 1998). The proceeding involves an application by Duke Energy Corporation to renew operating licenses for Units 1, 2 and 3 of its Oconee Nuclear Station pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR Part 54. The renewal license, if granted, would authorize the applicant to operate those units for an additional 20-year period.

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges:

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555

Dr. Richard F. Cole, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555

Dr. Peter S. Lam, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555

All correspondence, documents and other materials shall be filed with the Judges in accordance with 10 CFR 2.701.

Issued at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of September 1998.

B. Paul Cotter, Jr.,

Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.

[FR Doc. 98–25416 Filed 9–22–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–213]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (Haddam Neck Plant); Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(w) and 10 CFR 140.11 regarding financial protection requirements to Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCo or the licensee) for the Haddam Neck Plant (HNP) located in Middlesex County, Connecticut.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption would allow an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(w) regarding the amount of onsite property insurance required for the licensee and from the requirements of 10 CFR 140.11 regarding the amount of offsite liability insurance required by the licensee.

By letter dated September 26, 1997, the licensee presented the results of an analysis of the capability of spent fuel stored in the spent fuel pool (SFP) to heat up in the absence of cooling water. The licensee provided information that as of October 1, 1997, the spent fuel could not heat up above 538 °C in the absence of any cooling water. In order to achieve the results presented, the licensee had to arrange the spent fuel in a configuration consistent with the analysis.

By letter dated October 7, 1997, the licensee requested the exemption on the basis that HNP is permanently shut down and defueled, and, therefore, the potential risk to public health and safety is substantially reduced. The requested action would allow CYAPCo to reduce onsite insurance coverage to $50 million and offsite coverage to $100 million for HNP.

By letter dated December 18, 1997, the licensee stated that movement of the spent nuclear fuel into the configuration consistent with the fuel heat-up analysis had been completed on October 23, 1997.

Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption is needed because the licensee's required insurance coverage significantly exceeds the potential cost consequences of radiological incidents possible at a permanently shutdown and defueled nuclear power plant with spent fuel that will have cooled for two years on July 22, 1998.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC's evaluation of the proposed exemption from 10 CFR 50.54(w) and 10 CFR 140.11 indicates that issuance of the proposed exemption is an administrative action and will not have any environmental impact. The HNP facility permanently ceased reactor power operations on July 22, 1996, and completed the permanent transfer of all reactor fuel to the SFP on November 15, 1996. The licensee maintains and operates the plant in a configuration necessary to support the safe storage of spent fuel and to comply with the facility operating license and NRC's rules and regulations.

No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other nonradiological environmental impact.

Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological or nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no significant environmental impact associated with the proposed exemption, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request, thereby requiring the licensee to maintain insurance coverage required of an operating plant (no-action alternative); such an action would not enhance the protection of the environment. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The impacts of the proposed action and the alternative are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for HNP issued in October 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy on August 19, 1998, the NRC staff consulted with the Connecticut State Official, Mr. D. Galloway, Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the staff concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission will not prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

For further details with respect to the proposed exemption, see letters from the licensee dated September 26, October 7, and December 18, 1997, which are available at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 and at the Local Public Document Room, Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Micheal T. Masnik,

Acting Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–25413 Filed 9–22–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–155]

Consumers Energy Company (Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant); Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License No. DPR–6, a license held by the Consumers Energy Company (Consumers or the licensee). The exemption would apply to the Big Rock Point (BRP) plant, a permanently shutdown and defueled reactor power facility located at the Consumers site in Charlevoix County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption would modify emergency response plan requirements due to the permanently shutdown and defueled status of the BRP facility.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated September 19, 1997, as supplemented or modified by letters of October 29, 1997, and March 2, July 30, and August 28, 1998. The requested action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to discontinue offsite emergency planning activities and to reduce the scope of onsite emergency planning.

The Need for the Proposed Action

On June 26, 1997, Consumers certified that it would permanently cease reactor power operations at its BRP facility. On August 30, 1997, the reactor was shut down. By letter dated September 23, 1997, the licensee certified the permanent removal of all fuel from the reactor vessel. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.82(a)(2), upon docketing of the certifications, Facility Operating License DPR–6 no longer authorizes operation of the reactor or emplacement or retention of the fuel into the reactor vessel. In this permanently shutdown and defueled condition, the facility poses a reduced risk to public health and safety. Because of this reduced risk, certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) are no longer required. An exemption is required from portions of 10 CFR 50.54(q) to allow the licensee to implement a revised Defueled Emergency Plan (DEP) that is appropriate for the permanently shutdown and defueled reactor facility.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

Before issuing the proposed exemption, the Commission will have concluded that the granting of the exemption from certain portions of 10 CFR 50.54(q) is acceptable, as described in the safety evaluation accompanying issuance of the exemption. The proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.