

Total Responses: 34,282.
Average Time Per Response: 76.75
Minutes.

Estimated Total Burden Hours:
43,858.

Activity	Total respondents	Frequency	Total responses	Average time per response (minutes)	Estimated total burden (hours)
Wage Initiations	20,003	Annually	20,003	82	27,337
Initiation updates	212	Annually	212	20	71
Wage updates	1,785	Some annually, some quarterly	1,785	20	595
Benefit tests	756	Annually	756	262	3,301
FY96 OCSP surveys	325	Annually	325	120	650
AK-HI-SJ survey	901	Annually	901	82	1,231
Service Contract Act survey	6,200	Annually	6,200	82	8,473
Quality Assurance	4,100	Annually	4,100	32	2,200
Totals			34,282		43,858

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): \$0.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance): \$0.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for Office of Management and Budget approval of the information collection request; they also will become a matter of public record.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 10th day of April, 1996.

Peter T. Spolarich,

Chief, Division of Management Systems,
Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[FR Doc. 96-9352 Filed 4-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-24-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Special Emphasis Panel in Graduate Education; 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: Special Emphasis Panel in Graduate Education (#57).

Date and Time: May 1-2, 1996; 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Carolyn Lyons Piper, Assistant Program Director, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 907, Arlington, VA 22230; Telephone: (703) 306-1696.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to the NATO Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (NATO).

Agenda: Review and evaluate NATO proposals.

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 within exemptions 4 and 6 of 5 U.S.C. 552b.(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: April 10, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-9279 Filed 4-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414]

Duke Power Company, et al.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52 issued to the Duke Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina.

The proposed amendments would change the containment hydrogen mitigation system Technical Specifications (TS) to provide that, if neither the Train A or Train B igniter is operable in any one containment region, then there is an allowance of 7 days to restore one hydrogen ignitor to OPERABLE status, or be in Hot Shutdown within the next 6 hours. This would be consistent with the guidance of the Standard TS for Westinghouse plants, NUREG-1431. The current TS does not provide for inoperable ignitors on the two redundant trains being in the same containment region. Other administrative and editorial changes

were proposed to TS 3/4.6.4.3 to provide consistency of format and text with the Standard TS (NUREG-1431). Associated changes were also proposed for the Bases. A recent performance of the 92-day ignitor surveillance test determined that one ignitor in Train B did not energize and had failed. The area of the containment covered by this ignitor cannot be accessed during power operation for repairs due to the radiation levels in this area.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Criterion 1

The requested amendments will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. No impact upon accident probabilities will be created, since the HIS [Hydrogen Ignition System] System is not an accident initiating system. In addition, allowance for a single location in the containment to be without an operable ignitor, is afforded by the low probability of the occurrence of a degraded core event that would generate hydrogen in amounts

equivalent to a metal water reaction of 75% of the core cladding and the length of time after the event that operator action would be required to prevent hydrogen accumulation from exceeding this limit. Adjacent areas to the single area without an operable hydrogen ignitor provide capability to maintain the hydrogen concentrations during degraded core accidents [within] acceptable limits by flame propagation to the region without operable hydrogen ignitors. No impact on the plant response to any accident will be created (either design basis or beyond-design basis).

Criterion 2

The requested amendments will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. As stated previously, the HIS System is not an accident initiating system. No new accident causal mechanisms will be created as a result of adopting the requirements of NUREG-1431. Plant operation will not be affected by the proposed amendments and no new failure modes will be created.

Criterion 3

The requested amendments will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. No adverse impact upon any plant safety margins will be created. As discussed previously, the allowance for a single containment region to be without operable hydrogen ignitors for 7 days will have no adverse consequences. No fission product barriers are being degraded. No change to the manner in which the units are operated is being made.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will

publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By May 15, 1996, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petitioner should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted

with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The

final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Herbert N. Berkow: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Mr. Paul R. Newton, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, NC 28202-0001, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1) (i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 3, 1996, 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 York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of April 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Robert E. Martin,
Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate II-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
[FR Doc. 96-9296 Filed 4-15-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-498]

Houston Lighting and Power Company, et al.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-76 issued to Houston Lighting and Power Company, et. al., (the licensee) for operation of the South Texas Project (STP), Unit 1, located in Matagorda County, Texas. The original application dated January 22, 1996, was previously published in the Federal Register on February 28, 1996, (61 FR 7552). That application was supplemented by letter dated April 4, 1996.

The proposed amendment would modify the steam generator tube plugging criteria in Technical Specification 3/4.4.5, Steam Generators, and the allowable leakage in Technical Specification 3/4.4.6.2, Operational Leakage, and the associated Bases. The amendment would allow the implementation of steam generator voltage-based repair criteria for the tube support plate (TSP)/tube intersections for Unit 1.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Structural Considerations

Industry testing of model boiler and operating plant tube specimens for free span tubing at room temperature conditions show typical burst pressures in excess of 5000 psi for indications of outer diameter stress corrosion cracking with voltage measurements at or below the current structural limit of 4.7 volts. One model boiler specimen with a voltage amplitude of 19 volts also exhibited a burst pressure greater than 5000 psi. Burst testing performed on one intersection pulled from STP Unit 1 in 1993 with a 0.51 volt indication yielded a measured burst pressure of 8900 psi at room temperature. Burst testing performed on another intersection pulled from STP Unit 1 in 1995 with a 0.48 volt indication yielded a measured burst pressure of 9950 psi at room temperature.

The next projected end-of-cycle (EOC) voltage compares favorably with the current structural limit considering the EPRI voltage growth rate for indications at STP. Using the methodology of Generic Letter 95-05, the structural limit is reduced by allowances for uncertainty and growth to develop a beginning-of-cycle (BOC) repair limit which should preclude EOC indications from growing in excess of the structural limit. The non-destructive examination (NDE) uncertainty to be applied per Generic Letter 95-05 is approximately 20 percent. The growth allowance will be 30 percent/EPFY [effective full power year] or a STP Unit 1 plant specific growth value, to be calculated in accordance with Generic Letter 95-05, which ever is greater. The use of 30%/EPFY growth is conservative when compared to the actual STP growth experience. Each succeeding cycle upper voltage repair limit will also be conservatively established based on Generic Letter 95-05 methodology. By adding NDE uncertainty allowances and a growth allowance to the repair limit, the structural limit can be validated.

The upper voltage repair limit could be applied to bobbin coil voltages between the lower and upper repair limits to leave such indications in service independent of RPC [rotating pancake coil-probe] confirmation. However, RPC confirmed indications will be conservatively removed from service consistent with Generic Letter 95.05.

Leakage Considerations

As part of the implementation of voltage-based repair criteria, the distribution of EOC degradation indications at the TSP intersections has been used to calculate the primary-to-secondary leakage which is bounded by the maximum leakage required to remain within the applicable dose limits of 10 CFR 100 and GDC [General Design Criterion] 19. This limit was calculated using the Technical Specification RCS [reactor coolant system] Iodine-131 transient spiking values consistent with NUREG-0800. Application of the voltage-based repair criteria requires the projection of postulated MSLB [main steamline break] leakage based on the projected EOC voltage distribution