

uncertainties in the material properties and the radiation environment. As the NRC staff accumulates more surveillance data from licensees, it periodically evaluates the data to determine whether the Regulatory Guide 1.99 methodology needs revision. The licensee surveillance database consists of data from several hundred licensee capsules.

The Heavy Section Steel Irradiation Program provides experimental evaluation of the effects of chemistry and radiation environment on the irradiation embrittlement of reactor pressure vessel steels, including the effects of thermal aging, recovery of fracture toughness by thermal annealing, and reembrittlement trends on annealed reactor vessel materials. This program, in conjunction with the Radiation Embrittlement and Prediction Program, is developing improved methods for predicting irradiation embrittlement. Both programs are evaluating, experimentally and analytically, the mechanisms that control irradiation embrittlement to justify extrapolation of the empirical model to predict plant-specific irradiation embrittlement. These programs are validating the analytical and empirical models through the testing of service degraded reactor vessel materials.

The NRC staff's recommended methodology for determining the effect of thermal annealing on RPV embrittlement is documented in Regulatory Guide 1.162, "Format and Content of Report for Thermal Annealing of Reactor Pressure Vessels." NUREG/CR-6327, "Models for Embrittlement Recovery due to Annealing of Reactor Pressure Vessel Steels," contains the data and evaluation that form the bases for the percent recovery of radiation embrittlement from thermal annealing that is documented in Regulatory Guide 1.162. The thermal annealing rule, 10 CFR 50.66, requires that each licensee performing a thermal anneal must monitor the post-anneal reembrittlement trend using a surveillance program that conforms with the intent of appendix H. The effect of thermal annealing on RPV embrittlement is adequately addressed by requiring licensees to monitor the post-anneal reembrittlement trend through a surveillance program and by use of the Regulatory Guide 1.162 methodology.

Based on analysis performed by licensees and the NRC, the staff has concluded that the overall integrity analyses, including the various margins, are conservative and that they provide reasonable assurance that the vessels can withstand normal operation and accident conditions. Furthermore, each licensee must bear the burden of demonstration the adequacy of its pressure vessel to withstand the effects of a transient causing overcooling concurrent with or followed by significant pressure when the methodology of Regulatory Guide 1.99, Revision 2, does not predict an acceptable result. Should a licensee not be able to demonstrate, or be unwilling to expend the resources to demonstrate, the adequacy of its pressure vessel (which may include actual

samples of base material), the plant must be shutdown as was the case for Yankee Rowe.

Test material from the Yankee Rowe pressure vessel would not be of value in estimating the level of embrittlement, thermal annealing recovery, and reembrittlement after annealing at currently operating U.S. facilities. The Yankee Rowe reactor operated at a lower temperature than typical of operating plants, making any data on embrittlement from Yankee Rowe difficult to correlate with other light water reactor designs in the U.S.

Samples from the Rancho Seco vessel would not provide useful information since equivalent weld material and vessel wall samples are available from the Babcock and Wilcox Owners Group and from the canceled Midland Nuclear Plant. These samples are currently being evaluated in a program that irradiates the samples in test reactors. These components and samples, taken from power reactors and irradiated in test reactors, will provide data that could be correlated to other sample research programs that utilize research reactors.

The licensee for the San Onofre 1 reactor has submitted a decommissioning plan to the NRC that proposes SAFSTOR, or long-term storage of the facility, until the licenses for San Onofre Units 2 and 3 expire, sometime after 2013. Therefore, the Unit 1 vessel will remain onsite and in a condition that would allow samples of test material to be obtained for a substantial period of time, should it be determined that such samples would be useful for study.

The Trojan Nuclear Plant is currently undergoing active dismantlement. Portland General Electric, the licensee, is planning to remove the reactor vessel and dispose of it at the Hanford, Washington low-level burial site no earlier than 1998. The staff currently is pursuing the possibility of obtaining samples from the reactor vessel once the reactor vessel reaches the burial site.

For the above reasons, the staff concludes that sufficient information is already and will be available to appropriately and timely address the radiation embrittlement phenomenon.

#### IV. Conclusion

The Petitioners have not provided sufficient bases to warrant the suspension of decommissioning plans or activities at the four nuclear power plants in order to take specimens of reactor vessels for the purpose of studying nuclear power reactor pressure vessels radiation embrittlement phenomena. Moreover, as explained above, sufficient information is available to the staff to address such radiation embrittlement phenomena in a manner which protects public health and safety without the issuance of an order. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, the Petition, including the request to take emergency actions is denied.

A copy of this Director's Decision will be filed with the Office of the Secretary for the Commission to review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c). As provided by § 2.206(c), this

decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance, unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 14th day of June 1996.

Frank J. Miraglia,  
*Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 96-15838 Filed 6-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

### Cumulative Report on Rescissions and Deferrals

June 1, 1996.

This report is submitted in fulfillment of the requirement of section 1014(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344). Section 1014(e) requires a monthly report listing all budget authority for the current fiscal year for which, as of the first day of the month, a special message had been transmitted to Congress.

This report gives the status, as of June 1, 1996, of 24 rescission proposals and six deferrals contained in seven special messages for FY 1996. These messages were transmitted to Congress on October 19, 1995; and on February 21, February 23, March 5, March 13, April 12, and May 14, 1996.

#### Rescissions (Attachments A and C)

As of June 1, 1996, 24 rescission proposals totaling \$1.4 billion had been transmitted to the Congress. Congress approved eight of the Administration's rescission proposals in P.L. 104-134. A total of \$963.4 million of the rescissions proposed by the President was rescinded by that measure. Attachment C shows the status of the FY 1996 rescission proposals.

#### Deferrals (Attachments B and D)

As of June 1, 1996, \$2,376.5 million in budget authority was being deferred from obligation. Attachment D shows the status of each deferral reported during FY 1996.

#### Information From Special Message

The special messages containing information on the rescission proposals and deferrals that are covered by this cumulative report are printed in the

editions of the Federal Register cited  
below:

60 FR 55154, Friday, October 27, 1995

61 FR 8691, Tuesday, March 5, 1996  
61 FR 10812, Friday, March 15, 1996  
61 FR 13350, Tuesday, March 26, 1996

61 FR 17915, Tuesday, April 23, 1996  
61 FR 26226, Friday, May 24, 1996  
Alice M. Rivlin,  
*Director.*

### ATTACHMENT A—STATUS OF FY 1996 RESCISSIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Budgetary resources
Rescissions proposed by the President .....	1,425.9
Rejected by the Congress .....	– 62.1
Amounts rescinded by P.L. 104–134 .....	– 963.4
Currently before the Congress .....	400.4

### ATTACHMENT B—STATUS OF FY 1996 DEFERRALS

[In millions of dollars]

	Budgetary resources
Deferrals proposed by the President .....	3,689.6
Routine Executive releases through May 1, 1996 .....	– 1,313.2
(OMB/Agency releases of \$1,313.2 million, partially offset by cumulative positive adjustment of \$4 thousand.)	
Overtaken by the Congress .....	.....
Currently before the Congress .....	2,376.5

### ATTACHMENT C—STATUS OF FY 1996 RESCISSION PROPOSALS—AS OF JUNE 7, 1996

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

Agency bureau account	Amounts pending before Congress			Date of message	Pre-viously withheld and made available	Date made available	Amount rescinded	Congressional action
	Rescission No.	Less than 45 days	More than 45 days					
<b>Department of Agriculture</b>								
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:								
Buildings and facilities .....	R96–8	.....	12,000	3–5–96	12,000	5–6–96		
<b>Department of Defense</b>								
Procurement:								
Aircraft procurement, Army .....	R96–11	140,000	.....	4–12–96				
Procurement of ammunition, Army.	R96–12	47,200	.....	4–12–96				
Other procurement, Army .....	R96–13	5,800	.....	4–12–96				
Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps.	R96–15	10,000	4–12–96					
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy.	R96–14	9,200	.....	4–12–96				
Missile procurement, Air Force	R96–1	.....	310,000	2–21–96	.....	.....	310,000	P.L. 104–134
Other procurement, Air Force ...	R96–2	.....	265,000	2–21–96	.....	.....	265,000	P.L. 104–134
National guard and reserve equipment.	R96–16	13,600	.....	4–12–96				
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Research, development, test, and evaluation								
Army .....	R96–4	.....	19,500	2–23–96	.....	.....	19,500	P.L. 104–134
	496–17	9,600		4–12–96				
Research, development test, and evaluation:								
Navy .....	R96–5	.....	35,000	2–23–96	.....	.....	35,000	P.L. 104–134
	R96–18	39,800		4–12–96				
Research, development, test, and evaluation:								
Air Force .....	R96–3	.....	245,000	2–21–96	.....	.....	245,000	P.L. 104–134
	R96–6	.....	44,900	2–23–96			44,900	P.L. 104–134
	R96–19	58,000	.....	4–12–96				
Research, development, test, and evaluation:								

## ATTACHMENT C—STATUS OF FY 1996 RESCISSION PROPOSALS—AS OF JUNE 7, 1996—Continued

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

Agency bureau account	Amounts pending before Congress			Date of message	Pre-viously withheld and made available	Date made available	Amount rescinded	Congressional action
	Rescission No.	Less than 45 days	More than 45 days					
Defense-wide .....	R96-7 R96-20	..... 67,200	40,600	2-23-96 4-12-96	.....	.....	40,600	P.L. 104-134
Military Construction:								
Military construction, Army .....	R96-21	.....	10,000	3-13-96	10,000	6-7-96		
Military construction, Navy .....	R96-22	.....	8,000	3-13-96	8,000	6-5-96		
Military construction, Air Force .....	R96-23	.....	15,000	3-13-96	15,000	5-23-96		
Military construction, Defense-wide.	R96-24	.....	13,000	3-13-96	13,000	6-7-96		
Military construction, Air National Guard.	R96-25	.....	4,000	3-13-96	4,000	6-7-96		
<b>General Services Administration</b>								
Real Property Activities:								
Federal buildings fund .....	R96-9	.....	3,500	3-5-96	( <sup>1</sup> )	.....	3,400	P.L. 104-134
Total Rescissions .....		400,400	1,025,500	.....	62,000	.....	963,400	

[FR Doc. 96-15809 Filed 6-20-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3110-01-M

**POSTAL RATE COMMISSION**

[Docket No. MC96-3; Order No. 1115]

**Special Services Fees and Classifications; Notice of Request for Changes in Domestic Mail Classification Schedule Provisions and Rates for Special Services and Order Instituting Proceedings**

[Issued June 12, 1996].

Before Commissioners: Edward J. Gleiman, Chairman; W.H. "Trey" LeBlanc III, Vice-Chairman; George W. Haley; and H. Edward Quick, Jr.

Notice is hereby given that on June 7, 1996, the United States Postal Service filed a request with the Postal Rate Commission pursuant to section 3623 of the Postal Reorganization Act [39 USC § 3623] for a recommended decision on proposed changes in provisions of the Domestic Mail Classification Schedule (DMCS) and rates that affect selected special services. See Request of the United States Postal Service for a Recommended Decision on Special Service Changes (June 7, 1996) (referred to herein as "Request").

*Contents of the filing.* The Service's Request proposes changes to the terms of service and rates for post office boxes (including caller service), certified mail, return receipt, insurance, and registry service. It proposes to treat the production of postal cards as a new special service distinct from the postage that such cards require, and to rename postal cards "stamped cards." It also

proposes to eliminate special delivery service. The Postal Service's Request does not encompass any changes to the rates for the classes and subclasses of mail, nor the fees for other special services not specifically addressed by its proposals. Request at 3. The changes proposed may be summarized as follows:

*Post Office Boxes*

- Increase basic Group I fees by an average of 24 percent.
- (Group I fees apply at city delivery offices).
- Increase basic Group II fees by 100 percent.
- (Group II fees apply at non-city delivery offices).
- Eliminate basic fees for offices with no carrier delivery.
- Institute an annual \$36 non-resident fee.
- Refine definitions of the fee categories.

*Certified Mail/Return Receipts*

- Increase certified mail fee by 40 cents.
- Replace the two basic return receipt options with one option.
- Replace the two return receipts for merchandise options with one option.
- Clarify the categories of mail eligible to use return receipt for merchandise service.

*Insurance*

- Raise the indemnity limit from \$600 to \$5000.
- Raise the indemnity limit for Express Mail merchandise from \$500 to \$5000.

- Reduce the limit for Express Mail document reconstruction from \$50,000 to \$500.

*Registry*

- Simplify fee schedule by eliminating uninsured registry service over \$100.

*Postal Cards*

- "Postal cards," which are sold to customers by the Postal Service, renamed "stamped cards".
- Institute a 2-cent fee (above postage) for stamped cards.

*Special Delivery*

- Eliminate special delivery service. See Direct Testimony of W. Ashley Lyons on Behalf of United States Postal Service (hereafter "USPS-T-1") at 4-5.
- Effect on net revenue.* Unlike the Postal Service's other recent classification reform proposals, its proposal in this docket is not intended to have a neutral effect on its overall net revenue. The Postal Service estimates that if its proposals in this docket had been in effect throughout FY 1996, they would have increased system revenues by \$339.9 million while increasing system costs by only \$0.5 million, for a net increase in system revenue of \$339.4 million. USPS-T-1 at 8-9.
- A request that would increase system net revenue so substantially is normally considered in an omnibus rate proceeding.<sup>1</sup> In this request the Postal

<sup>1</sup> The Postal Service has submitted documentation bearing an "MC," or mail classification designation. While the proposals to increase net revenue appear to fit the pattern of an "R," or rate designation, there is no apparent substantive reason to change the designation for the case at this time, and in the