the Department to identify individuals requesting certain records under the Privacy Act. Without this form an individual cannot obtain the information requested.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 34,390 respondents at 1 hour per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 34,390 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: December 10, 1997.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 97–32622 Filed 12–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–26–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Registration

By Notice dated August 20, 1997, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 3, 1997, (62 FR 46512), Arenol Corporation, 189 Meister Avenue, Somerville, New Jersey 08876, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
N-Ethylamphetamine (1475)	I.
Difenoxin (9168)	I.
Amphetamine (1100)	II.
Methamphetamine (1105)	II.

The firm plans to manufacture the listed controlled substances to produce pharmaceutical products for its customers.

DEA has considered the factors in Title 21, United States Code, Section 823(a) and determined that the registration of Arenol Corporation to manufacture the listed controlled substances is consistent with the public interest at this time. Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 823 and 28 C.F.R. §§ 0.100 and 0.104, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, hereby orders that the application submitted by the above firm for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed above is granted.

Dated: November 25, 1997.

John H. King,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–32586 Filed 12–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–293]

Boston Edison Company; Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval under 10 CFR 50.80, by issuance of an Order, of the transfer of control of Facility Operating License No. DPR–35, for the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, located in Plymouth County, Massachusetts, to the extent such transfer would be effected by the proposed corporate restructuring of Boston Edison Company (BECo, the licensee), holder of the license.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would consent to the transfer of control of the license, to the extent effected by the restructuring of BECo by establishment of a newly created holding company, BEC Energy. BECo would become a wholly owned subsidiary of the holding company and would continue to be the licensee for Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. No direct transfer of the license would occur. The proposed action is in accordance with BECo's application dated June 9, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to the extent the proposed restructuring of BECo will effect a transfer of control of the license to permit the restructuring to occur. BECo has submitted that the proposed restructuring will enable it to better prepare to implement changes resulting from electric utility industry restructuring, and will enhance the insulation of BECo's utility business from business risks associated with non-utility enterprises.

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 the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. The corporate restructuring will not affect the qualifications or organizational affiliation of the personnel who operate or maintain the facility, as BECo will continue to be responsible for the operation, maintenance and possession of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station.

The Commission has evaluated the environmental impact of the proposed action and has determined that the probability or consequences of accidents would not be increased by the proposed action, and that post-accident radiological releases would not be greater than previously determined. Further, the Commission has determined that the proposed action would not affect routine radiological 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 would not affect nonradiological plant effluents and would have no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

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

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested 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 identical.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, dated May 1972.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on December 9, 1997, the staff consulted with the Massachusetts State Official, James Muckerheide, of the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency 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 the licensee's application dated June 9, 1997, which is 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 Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th 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. 97–32620 Filed 12–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40–7580]

Consideration of License Amendment Request for the Fansteel, Inc., Facility in Muskogee, Oklahoma

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

ACTION: Finding of No Significant Impact for the Fansteel, Inc., Facility in Muskogee, Oklahoma.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering the amendment of Source Material License SMB–911 to authorize processing of waste treatment pond residues at the Fansteel, Inc., facility located in Muskogee, Oklahoma.

Summary of the Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

Fansteel, Inc. is currently authorized to process residues designated as ''work-in-progress'' (WIP) materials to extract tantalum, niobium, and scandium for commercial use. The WIP residues contain natural uranium, thorium, and daughter decay products in quantities sufficient to be classified as source material by the NRC. Fansteel has proposed to modify this currently authorized operation to concurrently process wastewater treatment residues, which contain mostly calcium fluoride (CaF_2) and are located in ponds 6, 7, 8, and 9 at the site. This modification will result in production of three additional products: sodium fluoroaluminate, sodium sulfate, and calcium sulfate. The proposed action is to amend Fansteel License SMB–911 to authorize this modified process.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Fansteel has proposed the modified process, which includes processing of the wastewater treatment residues, in order to chemically improve the input stream for the operation, produce additional products for sale, and reduce the volume of solid waste requiring off-site disposal.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

Normal Operations

The NRC staff evaluated impacts from operations at the Fansteel site for both normal and accident conditions. During normal operations, small quantities of radiological and non-radiological effluents will be released to the environment. Radionuclides which may be released to the atmosphere include uranium-238, uranium-235, thorium-232, and their decay daughters, such as radon-222. Sources of the releases are the off-gas treatment system, fugitive dust, and radon emanation from the WIP ponds (ponds 2, 3, and 5) and the wastewater treatment ponds (ponds 6, 7, 8, and 9). The majority of the releases are expected to be in the form of insoluble oxide chemicals.

The staff performed a dose assessment to estimate the impact from radiological releases to the air. Atmospheric release exposure pathways included inhalation, ingestion of contaminated crops and resuspended dirt, and external exposure to the airborne plume and contaminated groundwater. For the combined sources (pond residue processing, fugitive dust, and pond residue radon), the largest tissue dose was estimated to be 1.9×10^{-5} Sv/yr (1.9 mrem/yr) to the lungs primarily from inhalation of radon-222. For the maximally exposed individual, the committed effective dose equivalent (CEDE) for combined releases from processing pond residues and fugitive dust was estimated as 3.2×10^{-7} Sv/yr (0.03 mrem/yr), while the CEDE for radon release was estimated as 5.4×10^{-7} Sv/yr (0.054 mrem/yr). External doses are a factor of 10,000 times less than internal doses.

For radionuclides released to the atmosphere other than radon, NRC regulations specified in 10 CFR 20.1101(d) require that the annual effective dose equivalent not exceed 1.0×10^{-4} Sv (10 mrem). The total effective dose equivalent (TEDE) from releases to the atmosphere was estimated at 8.6×10^{-7} Sv/yr (0.086 mrem/yr). This is a small fraction of the NRC limit.

Liquid effluents containing radiological contaminants will be released after treatment to the Arkansas River and will ultimately flow into the Mississippi River. Although downstream residents do not use the Arkansas River as a drinking water source, the NRC analysis conservatively assumes that an individual along the river and the surrounding population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles) uses this potentially contaminated water. Liquid release exposure pathways included ingestion of drinking water, fish, and irrigated crops and external exposure during recreational activities.

The largest tissue dose due to contaminated surface water was conservatively estimated to be 2.7×10^{-5} Sv/yr (2.7 mrem/yr) to the bone surface, and external doses are a factor of 1000 times smaller than internal doses. The CEDE for the maximally exposed individual was estimated as 3.0×10^{-6} Sv/yr (0.3 mrem/yr). For both the maximally exposed individual and other members of the population, doses are a small fraction of that from background sources.

NRC regulations specified in 10 CFR 20.1301 require that the TEDE from all pathways for members of the public not exceed 1.0×10^{-3} Sv (100 mrem) per year. For the maximally exposed individual, the annual TEDE from all releases from the proposed operation was estimated as 3.0×10^{-6} Sv (0.3 mrem). The largest annual tissue dose was estimated to be 2.7×10^{-5} Sv (2.7 mrem) to the bone surface. Estimated doses are small fractions of applicable limits and of the background dose, which is on the order of 1×10^{-3} to 4×10^{-3} Sv/yr (100 to 400 mrem/yr).

The NRC staff also assessed impacts from releases of non-radiological contaminants to air, surface water, and groundwater. The most significant non-radiological gaseous effluent from processing is expected to be hydrogen fluoride (HF). However, normal operation of the only stack at the facility is not expected to have a significant effect on off-site nonradiological air quality. Assuming the stack operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with an average fluoride emission rate of 0.008 gram per second (1.5 pounds per day), the average fluoride concentration at the nearest site boundary was estimated to be 0.7 $\mu g/m^3$. There is no Oklahoma air standard for HF, but this concentration