dated March 1987), the NRC staff also concluded that the overall seismic margin of the plant, including the containment, was well above the 0.18g value and, therefore, no upgrading of the seismic design was considered necessary. Further, in the staff report ''An Approach to the Quantification of Seismic Margins in Nuclear Power Plants'' (NUREG/CR–4334, dated August 1985), it is also noted that prestressed and reinforced concrete containment structures have a large seismic margin above the SSE level earthquake.

Additionally, numerous tests and studies conducted since the operating license review of the Maine Yankee Plant, specifically on shear stress in biaxially cracked reinforced concrete without diagonal reinforcement bars, have led to the acceptance of specified allowable shear stress by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code), Section III, Division 2, CC–3421.5, for reinforced-concrete containment structures. An analysis of the Maine Yankee containment structure was conducted in December 1984 by the licensee and submitted on the Docket as an attachment to letter MN–85–27, dated February 5, 1985. The results of the study indicate that the controlling peak ground acceleration value is 0.39g for the ASME Code allowable tangential shear stress caused by the SSE loading in combination with design-basis internal pressure and dead loads. This provides additional confidence on the ruggedness of the Maine Yankee containment.

Based on the above, with regard to the Petitioner's concern about the adequacy of the Maine Yankee containment structural design for earthquakes (seismic), the staff concludes that the Maine Yankee containment is satisfactory and has adequate margin. The NRC staff has determined that the design of the Maine Yankee containment structure without diagonal reinforcement bars is supported by analysis and poses no undue risk to public health and safety. Accordingly, Petitioner's requests for NRC action based on the seismic design of the containment are denied.

b. Microfissuring of Low-Ferrite Stainless Steel Weldments

The Petitioner asserts that the Maine Yankee emergency core cooling system (ECCS), reactor coolant piping, and other large piping have not been adequately analyzed for materials degradation to ensure integrity at power operation in excess of the originally licensed power level or under accident conditions. The Petitioner states further that the Atomic Energy Commission's concern with ''microfissures'' in reactor coolant system welds led to the appointment of a task force, and prompted studies and reports in 1971 (before heightened awareness of embrittlement phenomena) that concluded that the microfissures would not propagate or grow under foreseeable conditions. The Petitioner asserts that large pipe welds next to the reactor vessel have endured 23 years of corrosion, stress, vibration, and radiation and may fail, initiating a loss-of-coolant accident, or may be subject to thermal shock failure initiated by use of the ECCS.

In a safety evaluation dated February 25, 1972, the NRC staff concluded that the low-ferrite stainless steel weldments in large piping at Maine Yankee are acceptable because the micro-fissures of the type and density found in the low-ferrite stainless steel weldments of the Maine Yankee facility do not significantly impair the strength and capability of the welds, and that removal of the welds and rewelding could introduce other problems of greater safety significance than those resulting from the presence of microfissures. This evaluation was based on information provided by Battelle Columbus Laboratories, Stone and Webster Engineering Corporation, and Dr. Ernest F. Nippes of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Furthermore, the Maine Yankee reactor vessel meets the requirements of 10 CFR 50.61, ''Fracture Toughness Requirements for Protection Against Pressurized Thermal Shock.'' In addition, the large diameter pipe welds attached to, or next to, the reactor vessel do not receive sufficient radiation to cause embrittlement. Finally, Type 316 stainless steel weld material, in which the microfissures were discovered, is resistant to corrosion in a PWR coolant environment, and the vibratory loads are insufficient to be a concern for large diameter piping.

In a letter to the Petitioner dated May 13, 1996, the staff stated that in order to determine if there is any long-term safety significance of the microfissures, the staff will review the inservice inspection results for the welds identified as being susceptible to microfissures. The staff has now completed its review of the inservice inspection tests results for welds susceptible to microfissures. The staff's review confirmed that no unacceptable indications have been observed during inservice inspection. In addition, pressure tests have not identified any leakage. These tests indicate that 23 years of plant operation have not caused the microfissures to grow to a size detectable by inservice inspection or through-wall leakage. Plug sample testing was performed by Battelle, Columbus Laboratories, on the primary coolant system low-ferrite welds (Reference: Battelle's report dated September 17, 1971, which was transmitted by the licensee to the NRC by letter dated September 21, 1971). As part of the inservice inspection program in accordance with 10 CFR 50.55a(g), the licensee has been performing and continues to perform ASME Code inspections of large piping welds that may have been susceptible to microfissures at the time of construction. Additional plug sample testing would not yield any pertinent additional information and is not needed.

On the basis of the above analyses, inservice inspection, and pressure test results, microfissures are not considered a long-term safety-significant issue for Maine Yankee. Accordingly, the Petitioner's remaining requests for NRC action based on asserted microfissures in large piping welds is denied.

III. Conclusion

As explained above, and as requested by the Petitioner, the staff examined the adequacy of containment design and susceptibility of welds to microfissures. For the reasons stated above, no basis exists for taking any further action in response to the Petition. Accordingly, no action pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 is being taken in this matter.

A copy of this Director's Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for Commission review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c) of the Commission's regulations. As provided by this regulation, this Director's 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, Maryland, this 20th day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank J. Miraglia,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–30155 Filed 11–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Regulatory Guides; Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has updated the Regulatory Guide List to advise of the wide range of regulatory guides that are available and to list all published versions of each guide. The Regulatory Guide Series has been

developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

Single copies of the Regulatory Guide List may be obtained free of charge by writing the Office of Administration, Attention: Distribution and Services Section, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001; or by fax at (301) 415–2260. Single copies of regulatory guides, both final and draft guides, may also be obtained free of charge at this address.

Regulatory guides may also be purchased from the National Technical Information Service on a standing order basis. Details on this service may be obtained by writing NTIS, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

Comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time. Written comments may be submitted 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.

Regulatory guides and the list of guides are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Regulatory guides are not copyrighted, and Commission approval is not required to reproduce them.

(5 U.S.C. 552(a))

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank A. Costanzi,

Deputy Director, Division of Regulatory Applications, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 96–30151 Filed 11–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

[RI 25–41]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request for Extension of a Currently Approved Information Collection

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for extension of a currently approved information collection. RI 25–41, Initial Certification of Full-Time School Attendance, is used to determine whether a child is unmarried and a full-time student in a recognized school. OPM must determine this in order to pay survivor annuity to children who are age 18 or older.

Approximately 1,200 RI 25–41 forms are completed annually. It takes approximately 90 minutes to complete the form. The annual burden is 1,800 hours.

For copies of this proposal, contact Jim Farron on (202) 418–3208, or E-mail to jmfarron@mail.opm.gov

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before December 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—

Lorraine E. Dettman, Chief, Operations Support Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW, Room 3349, Washington, DC 20415

and

Joseph Lackey, OPM Desk Officer, Office of Information & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management & Budget, New Executive Office Building, NW, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR INFORMATION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION—CONTACT: Mary Beth Smith-Toomey, Management Services Division, (202) 606–0623.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Lorraine A. Green,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 96–30181 Filed 11–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–01–M

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request for a Revised Information Collection

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management will submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for reclearance of a revised information collection. Application to Participate as a Carrier Under 5 U.S.C. 8903(4), is used by OPM to determine if Comprehensive Medical Plans applying for participation in the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program meet the requirements for participation. The revised application considerably lessens the information collection burden of the current application. This revision needs to be in place by the end of 1996 so plans can use it during the next application cycle.

The total annual reporting burden is estimated to be 4,500 hours based on 50 applications at an average time burden of 90 hours per plan.

For copies of this proposal, contact Jim Farron on (202) 418–3208, or E-Mail to jmfarron@mail.opm.gov

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before December 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—

Abby L. Block, Chief, Insurance Policy and Information Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, 1900 E Street, NW, Room 3451, Washington, DC 20415–0001

and

Joseph Lackey, OPM Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, NW, Room 3002, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR INFORMATION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION CONTACT: Mary Beth Smith-Toomey, Team Leader, Management Services Division (202) 606–0623.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Lorraine A. Green,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 96–30182 Filed 11–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–01–M

Privacy Act of 1974: Computer Matching Programs—OPM/Social Security Administration

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Publication of notice of computer matching to comply with Public Law 100–503, the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988.

SUMMARY: OPM is publishing notice of its computer matching program with the Social Security Administration (SSA) to meet the reporting and publication requirements of Pub. L. 100–503. The purpose of this match is for SSA to disclose benefit information to OPM to offset specific benefits.