

When ordering hard-copy subscription(s), be sure to specify the State(s) of interest, since subscriptions may be ordered for any or all of the seven separate volumes, arranged by State. Subscriptions include an annual edition (issued in January or February) which includes all current general wage determinations for the States covered by each volume. Throughout the remainder of the year, regular weekly updates are distributed to subscribers.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 28th day of January 1999.

**Carl J. Poleskey,**

*Chief, Branch of Construction Wage Determinations.*

[FR Doc. 99-2498 Filed 2-4-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-27-M

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration

#### 101st Full Meeting of the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefits Plan; Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to the authority contained in Section 512 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), 29 U.S.C. 1142, the 105th open meeting of the full Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans will be held Wednesday, February 24, 1999, in Room S2508, U.S. Department of Labor Building, Third and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210.

The purpose of the meeting, which will begin at 1:30 p.m. and end at approximately 3:00 p.m., is to consider the items listed below:

- I. Welcome and Introduction and Swearing In of New Council Members
- II. Assistant Secretary's Report
  - A. PWBA Priorities for 1999
  - B. Announcement of Council Chair and Vice Chair
- III. Introduction of PWBA Senior Staff
- IV. Summary of the Final Reports made by Advisory Council Working Groups for the 1998 Term
- V. Determination of Topics to Be Addressed by Council Working Groups for 1999
- VI. Statements from the General Public
- VII. Adjourn

Members of the public are encouraged to file a written statement pertaining to any topics the Council may wish to study for the year concerning ERISA by submitting 20 copies on or before February 20, 1999 to Sharon Morrissey, Executive Secretary, ERISA Advisory Council, U.S. Department Labor, Suite N-5677, 2000 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20210. Individuals or representatives of organizations

wishing to address the Advisory Council should forward their requests to the Executive Secretary or telephone (202) 219-8753. Oral presentations will be limited to ten minutes, time permitting, but an extended statement may be submitted for the record. Individuals with disabilities, who need special accommodations, should contact Sharon Morrissey by February 20 at the address indicated.

Organizations or individuals may also submit statements for the record without testifying. Twenty (20) copies of such statements should be sent to the Executive Secretary of the Advisory Council at the above address. Papers will be accepted and included in the record of the meeting if received on or before February 20, 1999.

Signed at Washington, DC this 2nd day of February, 1999.

**Leslie Kramerich,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99-2746 Filed 2-4-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-293]

### Boston Edison Company, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station; Supplemental Notice

On January 26, 1999, the NRC published (64 FR 3984) a Notice of Consideration of Approval of Transfer of Facility Operating License and Materials License and Issuance of Conforming Amendment, and Opportunity for a Hearing, with regard to Boston Edison Company and the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. Although the notice stated that the Commission is considering approving the transfer of a materials license, in addition to Facility Operating License No. DPR-35, and approving a conforming amendment, the materials license inadvertently was not specifically identified and discussed further in the notice. This supplemental notice clarifies that the Commission is considering approving the transfer of NRC Materials License No. 20-07626-04, which authorizes the possession of materials in the form of contamination on reactor components, from Boston Edison Company to Entergy Nuclear Generation Company. The Commission is also considering issuing a conforming amendment to this license. Both Materials License No. 20-07626-04 and Facility Operating License No. DPR-35 are the subject of the underlying application for approval dated

December 21, 1998, which is referenced in the original notice.

This supplemental notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice. The dates established in the original notice by which hearing requests, petitions for intervention, and written comments must be filed concerning the application for approval dated December 21, 1998, are unchanged.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 29th day of January 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**William M. Dean,**

*Director, Project Directorate I-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-2748 Filed 2-4-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Environmental Assessment: Finding of No Significant Impact Related to Amendment to Materials License No. Sub-908, BP Chemicals, Inc., Lima, OH

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering issuing an amendment to Materials License No. SUB-908, held by BP Chemicals, Inc. (BPC), to authorize the construction of Closure Cell No. 2 for onsite disposal of waste contaminated with depleted uranium (DU) and the remediation of the contaminated areas of the facility in Lima, Ohio.

#### Environmental Assessment Summary Proposed Action

In connection with decontaminating and decommissioning its Lima, Ohio facility, the licensee is proposing to construct and use an onsite disposal cell, under 10 CFR Part 20.2002, at its facility in Lima, Ohio, for disposal of the wastes with DU concentrations up to the Option 2 limit in NRC's 1981 Branch Technical Position (1981 BTP): "Disposal or Onsite Storage of Thorium or Uranium Wastes from Past Operations" (46 FR 52061). The licensee will dispose of soils, debris, and sludge currently located in SWMU 102 (Solid Waste Management Unit 102), and AN-1 (Acrylo Nitrile-1) and containerized areas in the onsite disposal cell. The disposal will be in lined Closure Cell No. 2, designed and constructed according to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) criteria.

#### Need for Proposed Action

The proposed action is necessary to complete disposal of existing DU contaminated materials from the pond

areas and for the disposal of wastes generated during remediation of SWMU 102, AN-1, and containerized areas.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC staff reviewed the levels of contamination, the proposed remediation and decommissioning methods, the licensee's preferred disposal option, and the radiological and environmental controls that will be used during the remediation and decommissioning. These controls include the as low as is reasonably achievable (ALARA) program, worker dosimetry, a bioassayed program for workers, air monitoring, routine surveys, and routine monitoring of both airborne and liquid effluent releases to meet 10 CFR part 20 radiation protection requirements. Worker and public doses will be limited so that exposures will not exceed 10 CFR part 20 requirements.

The licensee proposed to perform decommissioning in accordance with "Guidelines for Decontamination of Facilities and Equipment Prior to Release for Unrestricted Use or Termination of Licenses for Byproduct, Source, and Special Nuclear Materials," dated August 1987. The licensee also proposed disposal of the wastes contaminated with DU in the RCRA-designed onsite closure cells, in accordance with the 1981 BTP. Based on uranium solubility testing of the mixed wastes, the maximum depleted uranium concentration that is acceptable for disposal in the closure cells is 11.1 Bq/gm (300 pCi/gm) total DU.

The staff analyzed the radiological impacts to the public from the disposal of sludge, soils, and debris contaminated with DU in the proposed onsite closure cells. Radiological impacts on members of the public could result from inhalation and ingestion of releases of radioactivity in air and in water during the remediation operations, and direct exposure to radiation from radioactive materials at the site during remediation operations. The public could also be exposed to radiation as a result of the onsite disposals in the closure cells. Decommissioning workers will receive doses primarily by ingestion, inhalation, and direct exposure during the remediation activities. In addition to impacts from routine remediation activities, the potential radiological consequences of accidents were considered.

The licensee provided an estimate of the dose to the public from airborne effluents generated during the

remediation activities and onsite disposal. During normal remediation activities, the licensee and the NRC staff expect airborne concentrations to be minimal, because the sludges and soils will be handled in a moist state.

Liquids discharged to the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) permitted deep well injection system will have concentrations less than the US EPA's proposed drinking water limits for uranium, and would result in doses less than 0.057 mSv/yr (5.7 mrem/yr) to individuals hypothetically consuming 2 liters of this water each day.

The licensee performed dose assessments for Closure Cell No. 2 using RESRAD computer code, Version 5.62. The RESRAD computer code estimates radiation dose impacts assuming a resident-farmer scenario, where an individual would live in a residence on the site, grow food, and consume all their drinking water from an onsite water well. The NRC staff verified the licensee's analyses. These dose assessments include the scenario with the proposed cover over the closure cells assumed to have been removed. The predicted doses are less than NRC's limit of 1 mSv/yr (100 mrem/yr) for radiation doses to the public in 10 CFR Part 20.

During the remediation and placement of the waste into Closure Cell No. 2, workers will receive doses from direct exposure and from the inhalation of airborne depleted uranium. The maximum estimated direct exposure is for workers standing on the contaminated soil from the ponds. The estimated exposure is  $4.0\text{E}-05$  mSv/hr ( $4.0\text{E}-03$  mrem/hr). Based on a project schedule of approximately 52 weeks, the maximally exposed worker would receive an annual dose of 0.08 mSv/yr (8 mrem/yr). The resulting dose is a small fraction of the 50 mSv/yr (5000 mrem/yr) limit for workers (routine occupational exposure) in 10 CFR part 20.

Based on the above evaluations, radiation exposure of persons living or traveling near the site will be well within limits contained in NRC's regulations and will be small in comparison to natural background radiation.

The licensee and the NRC staff also evaluated the radiological impacts from potential accidents. The predicted maximum exposure to a member of the public (licensee employee not involved in the remediation project) from an accident scenario would be 0.07 mSv (7 mrem) internal exposure. This potential exposure would result when a truck, transporting contaminated soil, tipped

over, spread fuel over the spilled soil, and caught fire. The exposed individual was assumed to be standing downwind of the accident at the controlled access area boundary. The calculated dose is a small fraction of the annual dose limit to the public of 1.0 mSv/yr (100 mrem/yr) in 10 CFR part 20. The NRC staff verified these calculations used by the licensee.

The predicted maximum exposure to a worker from an accident scenario, other than the above truck accident, would be  $7.7\text{E}-04$  mSv ( $7.7\text{E}-02$  mrem). This is based on an explosion of the pug mill mixer, where the worker was immersed in a "contaminated" cloud of suspended sludge for 10 seconds while leaving the immediate area of the explosion. This resultant exposure is a small fraction of the 50 mSv/yr (5000 mrem/yr) annual exposure limit for radiation workers and would not significantly add to the worker's annual exposure. The NRC staff verified calculations used by the licensee.

Because no waste is expected to be shipped offsite to a licensed low-level waste disposal site, there are no expected impacts from the transportation or offsite disposal of radioactive materials.

The NRC staff also considered nonradiological impacts such as chemical, socioeconomic, air quality, land use, and water quality, and concluded that all such impacts are negligible.

The NRC staff examined the distribution of minority and low-income communities near the BPC site in accordance with NRC internal guidance. Based on the data and the NRC's internal guidance, there is no potential for environmental justice issues based on race, or income level because the percentage of minorities or low-income households in the study area does not exceed the State or County percentage by 20 percent or more. Because the site represents an insignificant risk to the public health and safety, and the human environment, any residual radioactivity left at the site is not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations near the licensee's site. The staff concludes that there are no environmental justice issues at the licensee's site.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Six alternatives were investigated that resulted in the selection of onsite disposal as the recommended and preferred option by BPC. They are:

- No action;
- On-site closure (with caps);
- Disposal at a commercial disposal site without treatment;

- Disposal at a commercial disposal site with treatment;
- On-site temporary storage followed by off-site permanent disposal at a future, commercial disposal site;
- On-site permanent disposal under 10 CFR Part 20.2002 (BPC's preferred option).

The advantages and disadvantages of these alternatives, are described in the Environmental Assessment available in the Public Document Room.

### Conclusions

The onsite permanent disposal under 10 CFR Part 20.2002 (the licensee's preferred option) consists of removing the contaminated material, and disposing of the materials in Closure Cell No. 2 designed and constructed according to the RCRA criteria. This disposal option complies with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 20.2002.

The environmental and public health impacts will be insignificant. No additional lands are required. There will be no adverse impacts caused by off-site waste transportation because no off-site waste transport is involved. Also, occupational exposures will be minimized. The estimated cost for the decommissioning and on-site disposal project is \$18.26 million.

The NRC staff concludes that there are no reasonably available alternatives to the licensee's preferred action that are obviously superior.

### Agencies and Persons Consulted, and Sources Used

This environmental assessment was prepared entirely by NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards staff in Rockville, Maryland, and Region III staff in Lisle, Illinois. Review comments were solicited on the draft EA from the Ohio Department of Health, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, and the Allen County Combined Health District, Lima, Ohio.

### Finding of No Significant Impact

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

### Additional Information

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see: (1) BPC's license amendment application dated August 2, 1996, and BPC's responses dated September 17, 1996, February 2, 1998, and June 19, 1998, to the NRC comments; and (2) the complete

Environmental Assessment. The documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of January 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**John W.N. Hickey,**

*Chief, Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 99-2750 Filed 2-4-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549

#### Extension:

Rule 101, SEC File No. 270-408, OMB

Control No. 3235-0464

Rule 102, SEC File No. 270-409, OMB

Control No. 3235-0467

Rule 103, SEC File No. 270-410, OMB

Control No. 3235-0466

Rule 104, SEC File No. 270-411, OMB

Control No. 3235-0465

Rule 17a-2, SEC File No. 270-189, OMB

Control No. 3235-0201

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") is soliciting comments on the collections of information summarized below. The Commission plans to submit these existing collections of information to the Office of Management and Budget for extension and approval.

Rules 101 and 102 prohibit distribution participants, issuers, and selling security holders from purchasing activities at specified times during a distribution of securities. Persons otherwise covered by these rules may seek to use several applicable exceptions such as a calculation of the average daily trading volume of the securities in distribution, the maintenance of policies regarding information barriers between their affiliates, and the maintenance of a written policy regarding general compliance with Regulation M for de minimis transactions. The Commission estimates that 1,761 respondents collect information under rule 101 and that approximately 40,641 hours in the

aggregate are required annually for these collections. In addition, the Commission estimates that 791 respondents collect information under rule 102 and that approximately 1,691 hours in the aggregate are required annually for these collections.

Rule 103 permits passive market making in Nasdaq securities during a distribution. A distribution participant that seeks use of this exception would be required to disclose to third parties its intention to engage in passive market making. The Commission estimates that 227 respondents collect information under Rule 103 and that approximately 227 hours in the aggregate are required annually for these collections.

Rule 104 permits stabilizing by a distribution participant during a distribution so long as the distribution participant discloses information to the market and investors. This rule requires disclosure in offering materials of the potential stabilizing transactions and that the distribution participant inform the market when a stabilizing bid is made. It also requires the distribution participants (i.e. the syndicate manager) to maintain information regarding syndicate covering transactions and penalty bids and disclose such information to the SRO. The Commission estimates that 641 respondents collect information under Rule 104 and that approximately 64.1 hours in the aggregate are required annually for these collections.

Rule 17a-2 requires underwriters to maintain information regarding stabilizing activities, syndicate covering transactions, and penalty bids. The Commission estimates that 641 respondents collect information under Rule 17a-2 and that approximately 3,205 hours in the aggregate are required annually for these collections.

Written 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 will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Please direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of