Kathy Plowitz-Worden, Committee Management Officer, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C. 20506, or call 202/682–5691.

Dated: December 1, 1997.

Kathy Plowitz-Worden,

Panel Coordinator, Office of Guidelines and Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 97–31868 Filed 12–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Final Standard Review Plan for Antitrust Reviews: Issuance, Availability

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing this final Standard Review Plan (SRP) for Antitrust Reviews to describe the procedures (prescribed in Sections 105 and 186 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended) for performing antitrust reviews and enforcing antitrust license conditions. This SRP reflects current regulations and policy and will be updated as necessary to reflect changes in NRC regulations.

The revised text for the SRP for Antitrust Reviews includes the resolution of public comments received in response to the draft version issued on December 27, 1996 (61 FR 68309). The purpose of the draft SRP was to solicit comments on the current NRC staff practice in carrying out the NRC's antitrust mandate in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act, to review construction permit and operating license applications and transfer requests, and to enforce antitrust license conditions.

The NRC has published its Standard Review Plan for Antitrust Reviews (NUREG–1574), under Section 109, Nuclear Regulatory Commission Appropriation Authorization, Public Law 96–295. The SRP describes the procedures used to implement the antitrust review and enforcement provisions in Sections 105 and 186 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The final SRP for Antitrust Reviews is a ''rule'' for the purposes of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (5 U.S.C., Chapter 8). The staff, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), has confirmed that this SRP is a not a major rule.

The final SRP for Antitrust Reviews does not, by itself, establish any new or revised requirements. It incorporates previously established NRC staff positions, public comments on the draft SRP for Antitrust Reviews, and lessons learned from completed reviews of various restructuring and reorganization applications. The review guidance in the SRP will be used by the NRC staff in evaluating future submittals in connection with applications for construction permits, operating licenses, combined operating licenses, and operating license transfer requests.

The final SRP for Antitrust Reviews is being made available to the public as part of the NRC's policy to inform the nuclear industry and the general public of regulatory procedures and policies. The SRP will be revised periodically to reflect changes to statutes and NRC rules and regulations.

Copies of NUREG–1574 may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013–7082. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161. A copy is also available for inspection and/or copying for a fee in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of November, 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Thomas H. Essig,

Acting Chief, Generic Issues and Environmental Projects Branch, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–31799 Filed 12–3–97; 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, Portsmouth, 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 described 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. 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: July 1, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: On July 1, 1997, United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) submitted a request to revise Issue 3 of the Plan for Achieving Compliance with NRC Regulations at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Compliance Plan) and Chapter 3 of the Safety Analysis Report (SAR). The proposed amendment corrects statements made in Issue 3 of the Compliance Plan and Chapter 3 of the SAR which incorrectly depict the Autoclave Locking Ring Interlock System as having two redundant pressure ''switches'' set at +0.5 psig to prevent the autoclave from being inadvertently opened while under pressure. In fact, the autoclaves have always had only one ''switch'' set at +0.5 psig.

The existing Commitments section of Issue 3 of the Compliance Plan states:

''In addition to the safety systems summarized above, the following systems and limits are present to enhance safety:

• The Locking Ring Interlock contains pressure limit switches which interlock with the hydraulic system to prevent opening the autoclave shell while under pressure (above 0.5 psig). Although only * * *''

USEC has proposed to replace the phrase ''pressure limit switches'' with ''a pressure limit switch.''

The existing Justification for Continued Operation section of Issue 3 of the Compliance Plan states:

4. * * * alarm condition. Also, the autoclave locking ring interlock contains pressure limit switches which lock out the hydraulics to prevent the autoclaves from being opened when the internal pressure is greater than 0.5 psig. The autoclave * * *

USEC has proposed to replace the phrase ''pressure limit switches which lock'' with ''a pressure limit switch which locks.''

Accordingly, the pertinent SAR Chapter 3 sections have also been modified to address this oversight made when the initial certificate application was submitted.

PORTS uses thirteen cylindrical (6, 7, and 8 foot diameter) steam autoclaves in buildings X–342, X–343 and X–344 to feed, transfer and sample UF6 contained in cylinders. These autoclaves were designed and constructed in accordance with ASME Section VIII and provide safety by confining UF6 and any reaction products in the event of a major UF6 release inside an autoclave. Steam used to heat UF6 cylinders within autoclaves is typically controlled at approximately 5 psig. This pressure differential between the autoclave and the outside environment is maintained by way of a locking ring between the autoclave's hydraulically mobile shell and fixed head. An Autoclave Locking Ring Interlock (ALRI) system, which permits steam to be supplied to an autoclave only while it is closed, also contains a pressure switch set at −0.5 psig, which prevents the opening of an autoclave while it has an internal pressure greater than 0.5 psig. This system protects workers, who may be located in close proximity to the autoclave, from steam burns and possible contamination, in the event an autoclave is inadvertently opened while its internal pressure is greater than 0.5 psig. This pressure switch is considered to be important to safety. The ALRI system includes another pressure switch set at -0.5 psig to prevent possible damage to the autoclave hydraulic system if the autoclave is opened at a significant internal vacuum. This pressure switch is not considered to be important to safety.

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 ALRI is designed to protect workers, from exposures to UF6 and the products of its reaction with steam, while they are in close proximity to a closed autoclave. Such exposures could only occur following an inadvertent opening of the autoclave while it is pressurized with UF6 and its reaction products resulting from a UF6 release accident in a closed autoclave. In addition, the ALRI is designed to protect workers from steam burns while they are in close proximity to an inadvertently opened autoclave that was pressurized with steam.

USEC has identified the ALRI systems, including the pressure switches and control relays, as Augmented Quality (AQ) systems. As such, USEC is required to apply a high level of quality control (portions of ASME NQA–1) as committed to in the Quality Assurance Plan. Application of additional QA requirements to the ALRI augments the reliability of the system (no such failure events have been reported since March 3, 1997). In addition, the interlocks are fail safe in that while the autoclave is closed, an electrical interruption to the interlock would cause the pressure switch contact and the control relay contact to remain open, which in turn would deactivate the hydraulic system keeping the locking ring from disengaging.

The UF6 containment boundaries provided by the cylinder, pigtail and valves inside an autoclave, and steam and UF6 reaction product confinement boundaries provided by the autoclave shell and piping and valves out to and including the second containment valve, are designated as ''Q'' systems. As such, USEC is required to apply the highest level of quality control (ASME NQA–1) to ensure that the pressure boundaries within these systems are maintained. Taking into consideration the applicable safety requirements (administrative and installed hardware) for preventing and/or mitigating UF6 releases associated with autoclaves, and past operational history at PORTS, the staff concludes that a major accidental release of UF6 inside a closed autoclave is highly unlikely. However, if such an accident were to occur, the pressure rise inside the autoclave would activate the autoclave containment system and the operators would be promptly alerted. Small releases of UF6 are also unlikely to occur in a closed autoclave. However, in the event of a small release, the condensate conductivity monitoring cells, which are not considered as important to safety but rather as enhancements to safety, would also activate the autoclave containment system and the operators would be promptly alerted.

The staff has concluded that having a single pressure switch in the ALRI set at +0.5 psig, which has always been the operating condition at PORTS, as opposed to having redundant pressure switches, which is indicated in USEC's Compliance Plan and SAR approved by the NRC, will not significantly increase the risk of an inadvertent release of UF6, or of the products of its reaction with steam, from the autoclave. Therefore, this amendment will not result in a

significant change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

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

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 1, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a UF6 release. Therefore, having a single pressure switch in the ALRI set at +0.5 psig, as opposed to having redundant pressure switches, will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures.

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

The proposed amendment does not involve any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 1, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a release of UF6 or of the products of its reaction with steam. Therefore, having a single pressure switch in the ALRI set at +0.5 psig, as opposed to having redundant pressure switches, 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.

Based on the staff's review of the proposed amendment, no new or different accidents were identified.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 1, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a release of UF6 or of the products of its reaction with steam. Based on the staff's review of the proposed amendment, the staff concludes that there will be no significant reduction of 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.

For similar reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 1, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a release of UF6 or of the products of its reaction with steam. In addition, the staff has not identified any criticality related implications from the proposed amendment. Based on the staff's review of the proposed amendment, the staff concludes that there will be no decrease in the effectiveness of the overall plant's safety program.

The staff has not identified any safeguards or security related implications from the proposed amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safeguards or security programs.

Effective date: The amendment to GDP–2 will become effective 5 days after issuance by NRC.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–2: The amendment will revise the Compliance Plan and the SAR.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of November 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97–31797 Filed 12–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 72–22]

Private Fuel Storage Limited Liability Company Establishment of Local Public Document Room

Notice is hereby given that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has established a local public document room (LPDR) for records pertaining to Private Fuel Storage Limited Liability Company's (PFS) proposed independent spent fuel storage facility (ISFSI) to be constructed on the Skull Valley Goshute Indian Reservation, Utah.

Members of the public may now inspect and copy documents related to the proposed ISFSI at the University of Utah, Marriott Library, Documents Division, 295 S. 1500 East, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112–0860. The library documents division is open on the following schedule when school is in session: Monday through Thursday 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.; Friday 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; Saturday 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; and Sunday 11:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Confirm the hours of operation during holiday and vacation periods.

For further information interested parties in the Tooele County area may contact the LPDR directly through Mr. Lee Warthen, Documents Division, telephone number (801) 581–8394. Parties outside the service area of the LPDR may address their requests for records to the NRC's Public Document Room, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone number toll-free 1–800–397–4209.

Questions concerning the NRC's local public document room program or the availability of documents should be addressed to Ms. Jona Souder, LPDR Program Manager, Freedom of Information/Local Public Document Room Branch, Information Management Division, Office of the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone number (301) 415–7170 or toll-free 1–800–638–8081.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of December, 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Russell A. Powell,

Chief, Freedom of Information/Local Public Document Room Branch, Information Management Division, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–31798 Filed 12–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–39366; File No. SR–NASD–97–60]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change Filed by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. Relating to Trading Halts

November 26, 1997.

I. Introduction

On August 20, 1997, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (''NASD'' or ''Association'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission'') pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Exchange Act'')[1] the proposed rule change, prepared by the Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc. (''Nasdaq''), relating to trading halts. The proposed rule change was published for comment in Securities Exchange Act Release No. 39196 (October 3, 1997), 62 FR 53361 (October 14, 1997) (''Notice of Proposed Rule Change''). No comments were received on the proposal. For the reasons discussed below, the

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).