

NUREG-1431. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a limiting condition for operation on plant equipment that is not required by the present TS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

4. Less restrictive requirements, which are relaxations of corresponding requirements in the existing Catawba TSs that provide little or no safety benefit and place unnecessary burdens on the licensee. These relaxations were the result of generic NRC actions or other analyses. They have been justified on a case-by-case basis for Catawba and will be described in the staff's Safety Evaluation to be issued in support of the license amendments.

In addition to the changes previously described, the licensee proposed certain changes to the existing TSs that deviated from the STS in NUREG-1431. These additional proposed changes are described in the licensee's application and in the staff's Notices of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Opportunity for a Hearing (63 FR 25106, 63 FR 27760, 63 FR 40553). Where these changes represent a change to the current licensing basis for Catawba, they have been justified on a case-by-case basis and will be described in the staff's Safety Evaluation to be issued in support of the license amendments.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed TS conversion would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents.

Changes that are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TSs, and are acceptable. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TSs are expected to improve the operator's control of the plant in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements to licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which ensures continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found to be in conformance with the guidelines of NUREG-1431 and the

Final Policy Statement, and, therefore, are acceptable.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to be acceptable and are likely to enhance the safety of plant operations.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit or to place unnecessary burdens on the licensee, their removal from the TSs was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic NRC action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG and found to be acceptable for Catawba. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1431 as well as proposed deviations from NUREG-1431 have also been reviewed by the NRC staff and have been found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revision to the TSs was found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided so that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

These TS changes 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 proposed action involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has 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 is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed amendments, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to this action would be to deny the request for the amendments. Such action would not reduce the environmental impacts of plant operations.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to the operation of Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1 and Unit 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 25, 1998, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Mr. Virgil Autry, Director, Division of Radioactive Waste Management. 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, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.31 and 51.32, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated May 27, 1997, which was supplemented by letters dated March 9, March 20, April 20, June 3, June 24, July 7, July 21, and August 5, 1998, 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 York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Peter S. Tam,

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

[FR Doc. 98-24566 Filed 9-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40-8912]

Grace Estate

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Final finding of no significant impact and notice of opportunity for hearing.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) proposes to amend NRC Source Material License SUA-1480 to authorize the licensee, the estate of Michael P. Grace (Grace Estate), to perform radiological cleanup and surface reclamation of three non-

operating uranium extraction sites in New Mexico. Site 1 is located approximately 20 miles northeast of Gallup, New Mexico. Site 2 is located near Bibo, New Mexico. Site 3 is located approximately 20 miles northwest of Magdalena, New Mexico. This license currently authorizes the Grace Estate to possess, at the three sites, byproduct material in the form of uranium waste tailings, as well as other radioactive wastes generated by past operations. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was performed by the NRC staff in support of its review of the Grace Estate's license amendment request, in accordance with the requirements of Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 51. The conclusion of the EA is a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed licensing action.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ken Hooks, Uranium Recovery Branch, Mail Stop TWFN 7-J9, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone 301/415-7777. E-mail: KRH1@NRC.GOV.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Three sites in New Mexico, which were once uranium extraction sites, and are no longer in operation, are now administered by the Estate of Michael P. Grace (licensee). The estate is represented by Jon J. Indall of Comeau, Maldegen, Templeman and Indall, LLP, in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Site 1, approximately 3 acres, was an in situ leach operation approximately 20 miles northeast of Gallup, New Mexico. Site 2, approximately 11 acres, was an in situ leach operation near Bibo, New Mexico. Site 3, approximately 160 acres, was a heap leach operation located approximately 20 miles northwest of Magdalen, New Mexico.

The licensee proposes to reclaim the sites by plugging or capping existing wells and removing the contaminated material at each of the three sites for disposal at an existing uranium mill and tailings site licensed by the NRC. The estimated amount of contaminated material to be removed during the radiological cleanup is 6 cubic yards at each of Sites 1 and 2, and 800 cubic yards at Site 3. The sites will be cleaned up to the extent necessary to comply with regulatory standards. Subsequent to verification of the radiological cleanup, excavated areas will be filled with local material, regraded to approximate original contours, and planted with native grasses. Wells on the three sites will be plugged or capped

for future use for livestock watering in accordance with State of New Mexico requirements.

The Environmental Assessment

The NRC staff performed an assessment of the environmental impacts associated with the radiological cleanup of the three Grace Estate sites, in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51, Licensing and Regulatory Policy Procedures for Environmental Protection. In conducting its assessment, the NRC staff considered amending the license to allow radiological cleanup of the sites, and denying the amendment. The staff also consulted with the New Mexico Environment Department, the New Mexico State Historical Preservation Officer, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The technical aspects of the reclamation plan are discussed separately in a Technical Evaluation Report (TER) that will accompany the final agency licensing action.

Environmental Assessment Conclusions

The results of the staff's assessment are documented in an Environmental Assessment placed in the docket file. Based on its review, the NRC staff determined that the proposed radiological cleanup of the three sites and disposal of the contaminated material at a licensed uranium mill and tailings site can be accomplished with no significant environmental impacts or effects on worker or public health and safety, and is consistent with Criterion 2 of 10 CFR 40, Appendix A.

Because the staff has determined that there will be no significant impacts associated with approval of the license amendment, there can be no disproportionately high and adverse effects or impacts on minority and low income populations. Consequently, further evaluation of Environmental Justice concerns, as outlined in Executive Order 12898 and NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards Policy and Procedures Letter 1-50, Revision 1, is not warranted.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Denial of the proposed action would result in the contaminated material remaining on the sites and the continued existence of whatever hazards may be due to the material, or the material being reclaimed in place. On-site reclamation would result in the sites being placed under State of New Mexico or U.S. Department of Energy control for long-term surveillance and monitoring, with possible future maintenance requirements, requiring continuing expenditure of funds and no

significant reduction in effects on the environment or worker or public health and safety.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The NRC staff has prepared an EA for the proposed amendment of NRC Source Material License SUA-1480. On the basis of this assessment, the NRC staff has concluded that the environmental impacts that may result from the proposed action would not be significant and, therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not warranted.

The EA and other documents related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at the NRC Public Document Room, in the Gelman Building (lower level), 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555.

Notice of Opportunity for Hearing

The Commission hereby provides notice that this is a proceeding on an application for a licensing action falling within the scope of Subpart L, "Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operators Licensing Proceedings," of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings and Issuance of Orders in 10 CFR Part 2. Pursuant to § 2.1205(a), any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a request for a hearing. In accordance with § 2.1205(c), a request for a hearing must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. The request for a hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary either:

(1) By delivery to the Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff of the Office of the Secretary at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., Federal workdays; or

(2) By mail or telegram addressed to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

Each request for a hearing must also be served by delivering it personally, or by mail, to:

(1) The applicant, Estate of Michael P. Grace, in care of Jon J. Indall, Comeau, Maldegen, Templeman & Indall, LLP, Coronado Building, 141 E. Palace Avenue, Post Office Box 669, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0669.

(2) The NRC staff, by delivery to the Executive Director of Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., Federal workdays; or

(3) By mail addressed to the Executive Director for Operations, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

In addition to meeting other applicable requirements of 10 CFR Part 2 of the Commission's regulations, a request for a hearing filed by a person other than an applicant must describe in detail:

(1) The interest of the requestor in the proceeding;

(2) How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing, with particular reference to the factors set out in § 2.1205(g);

(3) The requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and

(4) The circumstances establishing that the request for a hearing is timely in accordance with § 2.1205(c).

Any hearing request that is granted will be held in accordance with the Commission's "Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operator Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Joseph J. Holonich,

Chief, Uranium Recovery Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98-24569 Filed 9-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Twenty-Sixth Water Reactor Safety Information Meeting

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Twenty-Sixth Water Reactor Safety Information Meeting will be held on October 26-28, 1998, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Bethesda Marriott Hotel, 5151 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Maryland.

The Water Reactor Safety Information Meeting will be opened by NRC Chairman Shirley Ann Jackson as the keynote speaker for the plenary session on Monday, October 26, 1998 at 8:30 a.m. and Commissioner Diaz will speak at lunch. There will be a panel discussion on Tuesday morning, October 27, 1998 at 8:30 a.m. which will focus on the Future of Research. Carlos Vitanza will be Tuesday's luncheon

speaker presenting an overview of the OECD Halden Reactor Project and main issues for the year 2000 and beyond.

This meeting is international in scope and includes presentations by personnel from the NRC, U.S. Government, laboratories, private contractors, universities, the Electric Power Research Institute, reactor vendors, and a number of foreign agencies. This meeting is sponsored by the NRC and conducted by the Brookhaven National Laboratory.

The preliminary agenda for this year's meeting includes 12 sessions, along with the panel discussions, on the following topics: Pressure Vessel Research, Severe Accidents Research and Fission Product Behavior, Nuclear Materials Issues and Health Effects Research, Materials Integrity Issues, Digital Instrumentation and Control, Structural Performance, The Halden Program, PRA Methods and Applications, Thermal Hydraulic Research, Plant Aging (2 sessions), and High Burn-up Fuel.

Those who wish to attend may register at the meeting or in advance by contacting Susan Monteleone, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Department of Nuclear Energy, Building 130, Upton, NY 11973, telephone (516) 344-7235; Sandra Nesmith (301) 415-6437, or Christine Bonsby (301) 415-5838, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd Day of September, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Alois J. Burda,

Deputy Director, Financial Management, Procurement and Administration Staff, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 98-24565 Filed 9-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

PRESIDIO TRUST

Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act

AGENCY: The Presidio Trust.

ACTION: Interim policy statement and notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the Presidio Trust's adoption of interim procedures and guidelines for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

The Presidio Trust assumed administrative jurisdiction of approximately 80% of the Presidio of San Francisco by transfer from the National Park Service on July 1, 1998.

The National Park Service has adopted and ordinarily follows certain procedures and guidelines in fulfilling its obligations under NEPA, including the current versions of "Standard Operating Procedure 601" and "NPS-12: National Environmental Policy Act Guidelines." In consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality, the Presidio Trust has adopted these National Park Service procedures and guidelines as its own interim procedures and guidelines for implementing NEPA, to the extent that the National Park Service procedures and guidelines do not conflict with the Presidio Trust Act or regulations of the Presidio Trust. These interim procedures and guidelines will remain in effect until such time as the Presidio Trust adopts final procedures and guidelines implementing NEPA.

The Presidio Trust has adopted these interim procedures and guidelines pursuant to the Presidio Trust Act (Pub. L. 104-333, 110 Stat. 4097 (16 U.S.C. 460bb note)), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1507.3).

Copies of these procedures and guidelines, as well as the Presidio Trust's resolution adopting them, are available upon request to the Presidio Trust.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Karen A. Cook, General Counsel, The Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, California 94129-0052, Telephone: 415/561-5300.

Dated: August 27, 1998.

Karen A. Cook,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 98-24495 Filed 9-11-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-4R-U

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-40407; File No. SR-CHX-98-19]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc.; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change and Notice of Filing and Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Amendment No. 1 and Amendment No. 2 to Proposed Rule Change Relating to the Qualification by Market Makers for Exempt Credit

September 4, 1998.

I. Introduction

On July 2, 1998, the Chicago Stock Exchange, Inc. ("CHX" or "Exchange")