

### Special Emphasis Panel in Polar Programs; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting.

*Name and Committee Code:* Special Emphasis Panel in Polar Programs (#1209).

*Date and Time:* September 18-20, 1995, 9 AM-5 PM.

*Place:* 9/18 Room 380, 9/19 Room 390, 9/20 Room 320, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

*Type of Meeting:* Closed.

*Contact Person:* Scott Borg, Polar Earth Sciences Manager, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 306-1033.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

*Agenda:* To review and evaluate Polar Earth Sciences Antarctic proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

*Reason for Closing:* The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: August 28, 1995.

**M. Rebecca Winkler,**

*Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc. 95-21664 Filed 8-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-295 and 50-304]

#### Commonwealth Edison Company; Zion Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 and Unit 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of exemptions from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III, Leakage Testing Requirements, to Commonwealth Edison Company (the licensee), for operation of Zion Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Lake County, Illinois, in accordance with Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-39 and DPR-48.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential

environmental issues related to the licensee's application dated August 16, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, which were discussed in the licensee's request for enforcement discretion dated August 15, 1995. These exemptions are: (1) Paragraph III.B and III.D.2.(a), to the extent that a one-time schedular exemption would permit deferral of certain Type B and C tests for Zion Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2, until September 15, 1995; (2) Paragraph III.B and III.D.2.(a), to the extent that a one-time schedular extension would permit deferral of certain Type B and C tests that can only be performed with the unit shutdown for Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, until the next cold shutdown of sufficient duration to perform the tests, but in any case, prior to the end of the next refueling outage on each unit, currently planned for the fall of 1995 (Unit 1) and the fall of 1996 (Unit 2); and (3) Paragraph III.C and III.D, to the extent that permanent exemptions would be granted due to system and penetration design.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

The current Type B containment leak rate test requirements for Zion Nuclear Power Station, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.B and III.D.2.(a) are that local leak rate periodic tests shall be performed during reactor shutdown for refueling, or other convenient intervals, but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years. The current Type C containment leak rate test requirements for Zion Nuclear Power Station, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.C and III.D.3 are that local leak rate periodic tests shall be performed during reactor shutdown for refueling, or other convenient intervals, but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years. These requirements are reflected in the Zion Technical Specifications (TS), Paragraph 4.10.1.A.2, as requirements to perform Type B and C containment leak rate testing in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J and approved exemptions. The required tests have not been performed on the penetrations and valves that form the basis for this exemption request. If a separate forced outage were imposed to perform the Type B and C testing and operation then resumed until the scheduled refueling outages, ComEd would be subject to undue hardship or other costs that result from increased radiological exposure and unit thermal cycling. If the exemptions the licensee requested in its letter dated August 16, 1995, are

granted, the tests would be performed during the upcoming fall 1995 Unit 1 refueling outage, or during power operation on Unit 2 prior to September 15, 1995, or during the Unit 2 refueling outage in the fall of 1996, or during any outage of sufficient duration. Permanent exemptions from the requirement to perform the tests would be granted for others. The exemptions are needed to allow the licensee to schedule and perform certain tests and to be permanently exempt from performing others, which will result in a considerable cost savings, less radiological exposure and fewer unit thermal cycles with no adverse impact on public health and safety.

##### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemptions would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the possible leak paths, availability of isolation valve seal water and penetration pressurization systems, prior Type A leak test results as they are impacted by leaks from the types of penetrations and valves in question and the probability of the sequences of events necessary for significant leakage to occur through the identified pathways. The licensee discussed these as its basis for concluding that in spite of the proposed one time and permanent exemptions the containment leak rates would still be maintained within acceptable limits. The staff has evaluated the licensee's justification, and agrees that the combination of the small leak paths and the presence of the isolation valve seal water system and penetration pressurization system minimize the probability of a large leak from the types of penetrations and valves in question and this is shown by the fact that prior Type A leak tests have not been impacted by leaks from these types of valves and penetrations. In addition, the staff finds that the likelihood of occurrence of the sequence of events necessary to cause leaks from the penetrations and valves is very low. Accordingly, the Commission has concluded that the exemptions do not result in a significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released nor do they result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption only involves Type B and C testing of the containment. 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 exemption.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed exemption, 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 exemption. Such action would not reduce the environmental impacts of plant operations.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Final Environmental Statement dated December 1972, related to the operation of the Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 18, 1995, the NRC staff consulted with the Illinois State Official, Mr. Frank Niziolek; Head, Reactor Safety Section; Division of Engineering; Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety; 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated August 16, 1995, 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 Waukegan Public Library, 128 N. County Street, Waukegan, Illinois.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**George F. Dick,**

*Acting Director, Project Directorate III-2,  
Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of  
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-21619 Filed 8-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

---

### **PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION**

#### **Request for Extension of Approval Under the Paperwork Reduction Act; Collection of Information Under 29 CFR Part 2643, Variances for Sale of Assets**

**AGENCY:** Pension Benefit Corporation.

**ACTION:** Notice of request for extension of OMB approval.

**SUMMARY:** This notice advises the public that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation has requested extension of approval by the Office of Management and Budget for a currently approved collection of information (OMB control number 1212-0021) contained in its regulation on Variances for Sale of Assets (29 CFR part 2643).

**ADDRESSES:** All written comments should be addressed to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Washington, DC 20503. The request for extension will be available for public inspection at the PBGC Communications and Public Affairs Department, Suite 240, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005, between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4 p.m.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Deborah C. Murphy, Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005, 202-326-4024 (202-326-4173 for TTY and TDD).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This collection of information is contained in the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's regulation on Variances for Sale of Assets, 29 CFR part 2643.

Under Part 1 of subtitle E of Title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended (sections 4201-4225), if an employer's covered operations or obligation to contribute under a multiemployer plan ceases, the employer is generally liable to pay withdrawal liability to the plan. Section 4204 of ERISA provides an exception when the cessation results from a sale of assets if certain conditions are met. Among other things, the buyer must furnish a bond or escrow, and the

sale contract must provide that the seller will be secondarily liable if the buyer withdraws within a specified period after the sale and fails to pay withdrawal liability (section 4204(a)(1) (B) and (C)). Section 4204(c) authorizes the PBGC to vary the bond/escrow and sale-contract requirements by regulation if the variance would "more effectively or equitably carry out the purposes of [Title IV]" and to grant individual or class variances or exemptions from those requirements when warranted.

Pursuant to this authority, the PBGC has issued its regulation on Variances for Sale of Assets (29 CFR part 2643). Subpart A of the regulation establishes procedures for requesting individual variances of the bond/escrow and sale-contract requirements from the PBGC. Subpart B of the regulation establishes general variances of those requirements and authorizes plans to determine whether the variances apply in particular cases. Section 2643.2 (d) and (e) and § 2643.11(c) describe, respectively, the information that must be submitted with a request to the PBGC or to a plan. This collection of information is needed to give PBGC and plans adequate information to determine whether variance requests meet the applicable statutory and regulatory standards.

Based on past experience, the PBGC estimates that employers submit 5 variance requests per year to plans and 5 requests per year to the PBGC. The PBGC estimates that each request takes about two hours to complete, for an aggregate annual burden on the public of 20 hours.

Issued at Washington, D.C., this 28th day of August, 1995.

**Martin Slate,**

*Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.*

[FR Doc. 95-21686 Filed 8-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7708-01-M

---

#### **Request for Extension of Approval Under the Paperwork Reduction Act; Collection of Information Under 29 CFR Part 2648, Redetermination of Withdrawal Liability Upon Mass Withdrawal**

**AGENCY:** Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

**ACTION:** Notice of request for extension of OMB approval.

**SUMMARY:** This notice advises the public that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation has requested extension of approval by the Office of Management and Budget for a currently approved collection of information (1212-0034)