Each automatic sprinkler would be a standard ½-inch orifice pendant-type with fusible link actuation temperature for each sprinkler between 200 and 230 degrees Fahrenheit. The petitioner proposes to conduct a functional test annually for each water sprinkler system. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method would provide at least the same measure of protection as would the mandatory standard.

Request for Comments

Persons interested in these petitions are encouraged to submit comments via e-mail to ''comments@msha.gov'', or on a computer disk along with an original hard copy to the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Room 627, Arlington, Virginia 22203. All comments must be postmarked or received in that office on or before April 12, 1999. Copies of these petitions are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: March 5, 1999.

Carol J. Jones,

Acting Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances.

[FR Doc. 99–6038 Filed 3–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–43–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR Part 32—Specific Domestic Licenses to Manufacture or Transfer Certain Items Containing Byproduct Material.

2. *Current OMB Approval Number:* 3150–0001.

3. *How often the collection is required:* There is a one-time submittal of information to receive a license. Renewal applications are submitted every 10 years. In addition, recordkeeping must be performed on an on-going basis, and reports of transfer of byproduct material must be reported every 10 years.

4. *Who is required or asked to report:* All specific licensees who manufacture or initially transfer items containing byproduct material for sale or distribution to general licensees or persons exempt from licensing.

5. *The number of annual respondents:* 265 NRC licensees and 333 Agreement State licensees.

6. *The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 53,333 hours or 201.26 hours per NRC licensee and 95,306.9 hours or 286.21 hours per Agreement State licensee.

7. *Abstract:* 10 CFR Part 32 establishes requirements for specific licenses for the introduction of byproduct material into products or materials and transfer of the products or materials to general licensees or persons exempt from licensing. It also prescribes requirements governing holders of the specific licenses. Some of the requirements are information which must be submitted in an application for a specific license, records which must be kept, reports which must be submitted, and information which must be forwarded to general licensees and persons exempt from licensing. In addition, 10 CFR Part 32 prescribes requirements for the issuance of certificates of registration (concerning radiation safety information about a product) to manufacturers or initial transferors of sealed sources and devices. Submission or retention of the information is mandatory for persons subject to the 10 CFR Part 32 requirements. The information is used by NRC to make licensing and other regulatory determinations concerning the use of radioactive byproduct material in products and devices.

Submit, by May 10, 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/NEWS/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, or by telephone at 301–415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of March 1999.

For the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 99–6060 Filed 3–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7002]

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

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 Nuclear Regulatory Commission (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.

The United States Enrichment Corporation (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: December 23, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment involves deleting a commitment in the PORTS Compliance Plan Issue A.2, Action 3, regarding physical modifications to the existing UF6 cylinder sampling autoclaves and installation of new UF6 cylinder sampling autoclaves at PORTS. When Issue A.2 was developed, it was determined that to meet NRC sampling requirements for 2.5-ton enriched UF6 cylinders received from Russian plants, it would be necessary to install additional sampling autoclaves at PORTS. An alternative scheme was subsequently implemented as of April 1998, whereby a USEC-contractor would witness the filling of sample cylinders at the same time the material was also being placed into a product cylinder in Russia. This allows USEC to not have to draw liquid UF6 samples at PORTS from Russian receipts and thereby reduces the need for additional autoclave sampling capacity at PORTS.

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 deleting a commitment regarding physical modifications to UF6 sampling autoclaves at PORTS 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 introduce operations that could 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, 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 reduces the probability of a UF6 release by reducing the number of liquid UF6 operations at PORTS. Therefore, the proposed amendment 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 involves deleting a commitment to install additional UF6 sampling capacity at PORTS. 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 reduces the probability of a UF6 release by reducing the number of liquid UF6 operations at PORTS. 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.

The proposed amendment only involves deleting a commitment to install additional UF6 sampling capacity at PORTS. USEC has committed to implementing an alternative witnessed UF6 cylinder sampling program. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

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.2 of the PORTS Compliance Plan.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of March 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 99–6061 Filed 3–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P