

public document room located at the Ocean County Library, Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of December 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Ronald B. Eaton,**

*Acting Director, Project Directorate I-3,  
Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of  
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-33056 Filed 12-17-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-410]

### Long Island Lighting Company Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2; Environmental Assessment And Finding Of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an Order approving, under 10 CFR 50.80, an application regarding a proposed indirect transfer of control of ownership and possessory rights held by Long Island Lighting Company (LILCO) under the operating license for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2 (NMP2). The indirect transfer would be to the Long Island Power Authority (LIPA), a corporate municipal instrumentality of New York State. LILCO is licensed by the Commission to own and possess an 18 percent interest in NMP2, located in the town of Scriba, Oswego County, New York.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would consent to the indirect transfer of control of the license to the extent affected by LILCO becoming a subsidiary of LIPA. This restructuring of LILCO as a subsidiary of LIPA would result from LIPA's proposed purchase of LILCO stock through a cash merger at a time when LILCO consists of its electric transmission and distribution system, its retail electric business, substantially all of its electric regulatory assets, and its 18 percent share of NMP2. LILCO would continue to exist as an "electric utility" as defined in 10 CFR 50.2 providing the same electric utility services it did immediately prior to the restructuring. No direct transfer of the operating license or interests in the station would result from the proposed restructuring. The transaction would not involve any change to either the management organization or technical

personnel of Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (NMPC), which is responsible for operating and maintaining NMP2 and is not involved in the LIPA acquisition of LILCO. The proposed action is in accordance with LILCO's application dated September 8, 1997, as modified and supplemented October 8, 1997, and November 7, 1997.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to enable LIPA to acquire LILCO as described above.

##### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed corporate restructuring and concludes that there will be no physical or operational changes to NMP2. The corporate restructuring will not affect the qualifications or organizational affiliation of the personnel who operate and maintain the facility, as NMPC will continue to be responsible for the maintenance and operation of NMP2 and is not involved in the acquisition of LILCO by LIPA.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational 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 restructuring would not affect nonradiological plant effluents and would have no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

##### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated.

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

#### Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements Related to the Operation of Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2, (NUREG-1085) dated May 1985.

#### Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on December 10, 1997, the staff consulted with the New York State official, Mr. Jack Spath, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see LILCO's application dated September 8, as modified and supplemented by letters dated October 8 and November 7, 1997, which 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 Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of December 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Darl S. Hood,**

*Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-33057 Filed 12-17-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

### Revision of a Currently Approved Collection of Information

**AGENCY:** Panama Canal Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 109 Stat. 163), this notice announces the Panama Canal Commission (PCC) is planning to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a Paperwork Reduction Act Submission (83-I) for a revision of a currently approved collection of information entitled

"Personnel Administration Forms," OMB Number 3207-0005.

**DATES:** Written comments on this proposed action regarding the collection of information must be submitted by February 17, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Address all comments concerning this notice to Edward H. Clarke, Desk Officer for Panama Canal Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ruth Huff, Office of the Secretary, Panama Canal Commission, 202-634-6441.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520), Federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. Collection of information is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1.1320.3(c). Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 requires Federal agencies to provide a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register**, and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information, by soliciting comments to: (a) evaluate 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) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**Title:** Personnel Administration Forms.

**Type of Request:** Revision of a currently approved collection.

**Background:** The information requested is authorized by 35 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Parts 251 and 253, and sections 3652, 3654, and 3661-3664 of Title 22, United States Code. The information is needed to determine the qualifications, suitability and availability of applicants for Federal employment in the Panama Canal area so U.S. Federal agencies can be supplied with eligibles to fill vacant positions.

**Abstract:** On December 30, 1981, PCC requested OMB approval for a collection of information entitled "Personnel

Administration Forms." OMB approved this collection for use through January 31, 1985 and assigned it OMB Number 3207-0005. On December 17, 1984, PCC requested another extension and received OMB approval and use through March 31, 1988. Prior to the expiration of the collection in subsequent years, PCC continued requesting approval for a revision of the collection and received approval through July 31, 1991, September 30, 1994, and February 28, 1998. The information requested is used by Recruitment and Examining Division (HRR) employees performing examining and suitability duties, by subject-matter experts on rating panels, and by agency officials making selections to fill vacancies.

**Estimated Burden:** The estimated burden of providing the information varies, depending upon the applicant's individual circumstances. The burden time for a full application is estimated to vary from 40 to 300 minutes with an average of 120 minutes per response, including supplemental qualifications forms when required, and 10 to 60 minutes with an average of 30 minutes to update applications already on file.

**Estimated Number of Respondents:** 7453.

**Total Annual Reporting Hour Burden:** 9082.

**Respondents:** Applicants for employment.

**Frequency of Collection:** When persons apply or update applications.

**Jacinto Wong,**

*Chief Information Officer, Senior Official for Information Resources Management.*

[FR Doc. 97-33003 Filed 12-17-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3640-04-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)

#### Denial of Motor Vehicle Defect Petition

**AGENCY:** National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

**ACTION:** Denial of motor vehicle defect petition.

**SUMMARY:** This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a June 19, 1997 petition submitted to NHTSA under 49 U.S.C. 30162 by Donald Friedman, requesting that the agency commence a proceeding to determine the existence of defects related to motor vehicle safety in the air bag systems and the two-point automatic seat belt systems in all vehicles manufactured since 1987. After reviewing the petition and other

information, NHTSA has concluded that further expenditure of the agency's investigative resources on the allegations in the petition does not appear to be warranted. The agency accordingly has denied the petition.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Thomas Cooper, Chief, Vehicle Integrity Branch, Office of Defects Investigation (ODI), NHTSA, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-5218.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 19, 1997, Mr. Donald Friedman submitted a petition requesting the agency to investigate "the safety performance of certain motor vehicles built in compliance with the automatic crash protection requirements of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) No. 208: 'Occupant crash protection.'" The petition concerns vehicles with "driver air bags built from 1987 to the present." It also "concerns some automobiles with two-point automatic belts."

The petition alleges two distinct defects in the subject vehicles. One alleged defect involves the safety of those individuals who are of a "short stature (around 5 feet tall)" who position the seat so that they can both reach the pedals and see "safely" through the windshield. By positioning themselves in such a manner, they may be very close to the air bag. The petitioner alleges that this positioning, when combined with air bags which deploy at a delta V<sup>1</sup> of 12 miles per hour (mph) and less and which deploy with aggressive force, can cause serious and fatal injuries.

The petition alleges a second defect in vehicles with automatic seat belts that restrain only the torso portion of the body. It alleges that if shorter people "ride without the lap belt and with their seat in a rearward position" they are "likely to submarine" in a crash, and that "[w]hen this happens, the two-point belt can catch the occupant's chin and cause serious neck injuries including paraplegia or quadriplegia."

NHTSA is denying the petition for the following reasons:

#### I. Alleged "Aggressive Air Bags"

The petition covers all vehicles with driver side air bags built since 1987. Essentially, this includes all vehicles sold with air bags in the United States. Previously, NHTSA studied this class of vehicles and found that the performance

<sup>1</sup> Delta V is the rapid change of a vehicle's speed due to a crash. A 12 mph delta V is the equivalent of a vehicle traveling at 12 mph crashing into an immovable solid object such as a heavy concrete wall.