section of the TSs and placed these details in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 1997 (62 FR 11495). However, by letter dated September 30, 1998, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated January 28, 1997, and the licensee's letter dated September 30, 1998, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents 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 located at the Wharton County Junior College, J.M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, TX 77488.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of December 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Thomas W. Alexion,

Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–32631 Filed 12–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7002]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation (Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant) Piketon, 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 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 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(c)(19). 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: October 14, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment involves extension of the PORTS Compliance Plan completion date related to the removal of residual quantities of highly enriched uranium (HEU) (uranium enriched to 10 percent by weight U–235 or more) from cylinders and the cleaning of the emptied HEU cylinders from December 31, 1998, to March 31, 2000. The amendment also involves extension of the PORTS Compliance Plan completion date, for transition of regulatory oversight responsibility from the Department of Energy (DOE) to the NRC, for the section of the X–705 decontamination building where HEU cylinder cleaning operations are ongoing, from January 31, 1999, to April 30, 2000. All Compliance Plan completion date changes require prior DOE approval. As such, USEC requested DOE approval for the above-mentioned date changes on September 25, 1998. On October 13, 1998, DOE approved the revision.

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 amendment, which involves extensions of the PORTS Compliance Plan completion dates, does not involve any need for cleaning of additional HEU cylinders and therefore would not increase the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite or result in any impact to the environment.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed amendment does not involve any need for cleaning of additional HEU cylinders. Therefore, it will not significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

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

The proposed change will not result in any construction, nor will this change effect any planned or existing construction project, therefore, there will be no construction impact.

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 does not involve any need for cleaning of additional HEU cylinders and 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.

The proposed amendment only involves extensions of the PORTS Compliance Plan completion dates. Therefore, this change 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 amendment only involves extensions of the PORTS Compliance Plan completion dates. Therefore, the proposed change does not represent a 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.

Currently, at PORTS, the X–705 West Annex is the only area leased by USEC from DOE which has not been certified by the NRC. Based on the agreement signed between DOE and USEC on October 11, 1995, the Regulatory Oversight Agreement between DOE and USEC is required to apply to all areas leased by USEC from DOE but not certified by the NRC. As such, operations in the X–705 West Annex will continue to be conducted under regulation of the ROA until the HEU cylinder cleaning operations have been completed and the X–705 West Annex is certified by the NRC. While the ROA is in effect, DOE staff has informed the NRC staff, that they will maintain regulatory staff in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and a resident inspector at PORTS, to ensure that HEU cylinder cleaning is conducted in a safe and secure manner. In addition, the NRC staff has also reviewed the controls in place in the X–705 West Annex, which are relied upon by USEC to prevent it from exceeding the NRC-possession limits by accidentally transferring significant quantities of HEU from the X–705 West Annex to NRC-certified areas. The NRC staff has determined these controls, as well as DOE's regulatory oversight of the X–705 West Annex operations, to be sufficient for preventing USEC from exceeding its possession limits in NRC-certified areas at PORTS. Therefore, the Compliance Plan date extensions will not result in undue risk to the public health and safety, common defense and security, or the environment.

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

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–2: This amendment will revise Issue A.4 of the PORTS Compliance Plan.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2d day of December, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–32637 Filed 12–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–160]

Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia Tech Research Reactor; 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 its regulations to Facility Operating License No. R–97, a license held by the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech or the licensee). The exemption would apply to the Georgia Tech Research Reactor (GTRR), a shutdown and defueled facility located in Atlanta, Georgia.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption would eliminate emergency response plan requirements due to the shutdown and defueled status of the GTRR facility.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated August 20, 1998. The requested action would grant an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) for emergency planning.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The nuclear fuel was removed from the GTRR in February 1996. By NRC License Amendment No. 12, dated April 2, 1998, the authority to operate the reactor was removed and the licensee was authorized to possess the residual by-product material. The tritiated heavy water was removed from the facility in July 1998. In this shutdown and defueled condition, the facility poses a reduced risk to public health and safety. Because of this reduced risk, the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(q) are no longer required. An exemption is required from 10 CFR 50.54(q) to allow the licensee to drop the requirement to maintain and implement the Emergency Plan for the GTRR.

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 describe in 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.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the exemption would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed