

Commodore Drive, San Bruno, California 94066-5006, telephone (415) 244-3022, fax (415) 244-3737. For information concerning the EIR, please contact Ms. Anu Raud, City of Oakland, Community and Economic Development Agency, telephone (415) 238-6346, or fax (510) 238-4730. For further information regarding the Oakland Base Reuse Planning Process, please contact Mr. Mel Blair, City of Oakland Base Reuse Authority, telephone (510) 238-6908, or fax (510) 238-2936.

Dated: October 21, 1996.

M.A. Waters,
LCDR, JAGC, USN, Alternate Federal Register
Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-27277 Filed 10-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. § 552b), notice is hereby given of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board's (Board) meeting to inform the public on the status of the Board's oversight of the Department of Energy's (DOE) initiatives to simplify existing safety orders and to promulgate new rules.

TIME AND DATE: November 7, 1996, 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Public Hearing Room, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20004.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: 42 U.S.C. § 2286a requires that the Board review and evaluate the content and implementation of standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy. Those standards include rules, DOE safety orders, and other requirements. Since 1990, the Board, acting pursuant to its enabling statute, has issued a series of recommendations designed to foster the development and implementation of an effective standards-based nuclear safety program within DOE.

The Secretary of Energy has accepted each of these recommendations. In the meantime, DOE has engaged in a number of initiatives designed to simplify existing safety orders and the promulgation of new safety rules. The streamlining of safety orders affecting defense nuclear facilities and the promulgation of new rules has required the Board to commit substantial

resources to assure that DOE did not eliminate sound engineering practices codified in existing safety orders that are necessary to adequately protect the public health and safety. During the past two years, the Board's staff has conducted reviews of all DOE revisions to safety orders and rules.

DOE's efforts continue, as does the Board's oversight to ensure full development and implementation of safety standards tailored to each DOE defense nuclear facility's hazards. The Board believes that the public interest will be served by holding a public meeting to assess DOE's progress in streamlining the safety orders and promulgating new safety rules pertaining to its defense nuclear facilities, and to assure that DOE's activities in streamlining DOE's nuclear safety order system and converting to its new regulatory system do not eliminate the sound engineering practices now codified in its safety orders that are necessary to adequately protect public health and safety.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Robert M. Andersen, General Counsel, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004, (800) 788-4016. This is a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board has a responsibility for oversight of DOE's development and implementation of nuclear health and safety requirements as a transition is being made from the use of safety orders to rules. The Board understands DOE's desire to streamline its system of directives. Nevertheless, the Board continues to be concerned that the conversion process not compromise the requirements-based safety program not embodied in the DOE's safety orders and existing regulations.

During the past two years, the Board has held three Board meetings, open to the public, regarding its review of DOE efforts to revise and improve nuclear safety requirements. This will be the fourth in that series. On May 31, 1995, the Board met to lay the groundwork for a full assessment of how Standards/Requirements Identification Documents, rules, orders, and other safety requirements are integrated into an overall safety management program for defense nuclear facilities. This meeting was continued on July 18, 1995. The Board's staff reported on their comprehensive review of existing orders and rules, their adequacy, and the status of DOE revisions to safety orders and rules. Individual Board members presented their views. Then, in a joint meeting with DOE officials on

September 20, 1996, DOE's representatives reported on the status of DOE's review and revision of nuclear safety orders and rules, and the Board identified safety issues requiring resolution, including inappropriate application of "sunset provisions" to safety orders, the need for "crosswalks" showing the disposition of requirements in superseded safety orders, the need to preserve sound engineering practice embodied in guidance documents. The Board reserved its right to further comment after it completed its integrated review of how rules, orders, and other safety requirements are being revised and integrated into an overall safety management program for defense nuclear facilities. The Board reiterated its concern that DOE's streamlining and conversion process not compromise the requirements-based safety program currently embodied in contracts which incorporate applicable DOE safety orders.

In accordance with the statute establishing the Board, a public meeting will be conducted to assess DOE's activities in streamlining DOE's nuclear safety order system and converting to a regulatory program and to determine if DOE is taking sufficient steps to assure that this effort not eliminate the engineering practices now codified in its safety orders that are necessary to adequately protect public health and safety. To assist the Board and inform the public, individual Board members will present their views, and the Board's staff will brief the Board on several related topics, including, but not limited to:

1. A comprehensive report on the status of staff reviews conducted over the past two years of DOE's revision of safety orders, rules, and "crosswalks" which track the original set of fifty-two orders of interest to the Board through the revision process and/or conversion to rules.

2. Identification and discussion of the superseding streamlined order system.

3. DOE's new rules affecting health and safety at defense nuclear facilities.

4. Actions taken to address the Board's concerns that the safety envelope currently in place to ensure adequate protection of the public health and safety is not inadvertently compromised by DOE's effort to streamline its directive.

5. Lessons learned regarding the managerial tools needed to assure that DOE's activities in streamlining its nuclear safety order system and converting to a regulatory program not eliminate the engineering practices now codified in its safety orders that are necessary to adequately protect public

health and safety at defense nuclear facilities. Specifically, DOE's development and use of "crosswalks" used to track the disposition of good engineering practices embodied in the superseded safety orders.

6. Further Board actions needed to ensure that there is no relaxation of commitments made to achieve compliance with safety requirements in contracts while proposed rules are developed and processed.

DOE officials will be present to provide additional Departmental views, comment and such additional information the Board may require.

A transcript of this proceeding will be made available by the Board for inspection by the public at the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board's Washington office.

The Board reserves its right to further schedule and otherwise regulate the course of these meetings and hearings, to recess, reconvene, and otherwise exercise its power under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Dated: October 22, 1996.

Kenneth M. Pusater,
General Manager.

[FR Doc. 96-27470 Filed 10-22-96; 3:11 am]

BILLING CODE 3670-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[FERC Form No. 538]

Proposed Information Collection and Request for Comments

October 18, 1996.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Energy.

ACTION: Notice of proposed information collection and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirements of Section 3506(c)(2)(a) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. No. 104-13), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is soliciting public comment on the specific aspects of the information collection described below.

DATES: Consideration will be given to comments submitted on or before December 23, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the proposed collection of information can be obtained from and written comments may be submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Attn: Michael P. Miller, Information Services Division, ED-12.4, 888 First Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael P. Miller may be reached by telephone at (202) 208-1415, by fax at (202) 273-0873, and by e-mail at mmiller@ferc.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The information collected under the requirements of FERC Form No. 538 "Gas Pipeline Certificates: Initial Service" (OMB No. 1902-0061) is used by the Commission to implement the statutory provisions of Sections 7(a), 10(a) and 16 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) (P.L. 75-688) (15 U.S.C. 717-717w). The reporting requirements contained in this collection of information are used by the Commission to determine whether a distributor applicant can economically construct and manage its facilities. Requests are made to the Commission by individuals or entities to have the Commission, by order, direct a natural gas pipeline to extend or improve its transportation

facilities, and sell gas to an individual, entity or municipality for the specific purpose indicated in the order, and to extend the pipeline's transportation facilities to communities immediately adjacent to the municipality's facilities or to territories served by the natural gas company. In addition, the Commission reviews the supply data to determine if the pipeline company can provide the service without curtailing certain of its existing customers. The flow data and market data are also used to evaluate existing and future customer requirements on the system to find if sufficient capacity will be available. Likewise, the cost of facilities and the rate data are used to evaluate the financial impact of the cost of the project to both the pipeline company and its customers. The Commission implements these filing requirements in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) under 18 CFR Part 156.

Action

The Commission is requesting a three-year extension of the current expiration date, with no changes to the existing collection of data.

Burden Statement

Public reporting burden for this collection is estimated as:

Number of respondents annually	Number of responses per respondent	Average burden hours per response	Total annual burden hours
(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)×(2)×(3)
1	1	240 hours	240 hours.*

* The Office of Management and Budget's current inventory indicates a total of 320 hours. Based on Commission staff's knowledge and familiarity with gas pipeline practices, this estimate should be adjusted downwards to 240 hours as stated above.

Estimated cost burden to respondents: 320 hours/2,087 hours per year × \$102,000 per year=\$15,640.

The reporting burden includes the total time, effort, or financial resources expended to generate, maintain, retain, disclose, or provide the information including: (1) Reviewing instructions; (2) developing, acquiring, installing, and

utilizing technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, verifying, processing, maintaining, disclosing and providing information; (3) adjusting the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; (4) training personnel to respond to a collection of information; (5) searching

data sources; (6) completing and reviewing the collection of information; and (7) transmitting, or otherwise disclosing the information.

The estimate of cost for respondents is based upon salaries for professional and clerical support, as well as direct and indirect overhead costs. Direct costs include all costs directly attributable to