

(3) The willingness and ability of the library staff to maintain the LPDR collection and assist the public in locating records;

(4) The nature and extent of related research resources, such as government documents;

(5) The public accessibility of the library, including handicap accessibility, parking, ground transportation, and hours of operation, particularly evening and weekend hours;

(6) The proximity of the library to existing user groups of the collection, if known.

Comment period expires April 25, 1997. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except as to comments filed on or before this date.

Written comments may be submitted to Mr. David Meyer, Chief, Regulatory Publications Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW, Washington, DC.

Questions concerning the NRC's LPDR Program should be addressed to Ms. Jona L. Souder, LPDR Program Manager, Freedom of Information/Local Public Document Room Branch, Office of Information Resources Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone number 301-415-7170, or toll-free 1-800-638-8081.

Dated at Rockville, Md., this 20th day of March, 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Russell A. Powell,

Chief, Freedom of Information/Local Public Document Room Branch, Office of Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 97-7640 Filed 3-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a revision to a guide in its Regulatory Guide Series. This 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.

Revision 2 of Regulatory Guide 1.160, "Monitoring the Effectiveness of

Maintenance at Nuclear Power Plants," has been issued to endorse Revision 2 of NUMARC 93-01, "Industry Guideline for Monitoring the Effectiveness of Maintenance at Nuclear Power Plants" (April 1996), which has been updated by the Nuclear Energy Institute. When used in conjunction, these revisions to Regulatory Guide 1.160 and NUMARC 93-01 provide methods acceptable to the NRC staff for complying with the NRC's maintenance rule, 10 CFR 50.65.

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 Publications Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection or copying for a fee at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Single copies of regulatory guides, both active and draft, may be obtained free of charge by writing the Office of Administration, Attn: Distribution and Mail Services Section, USNRC, Washington, DC 20555-0001, or by fax at (301) 415-2260. Issued 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. 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 13th day of March 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David L. Morrison,

Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 97-7637 Filed 3-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 70-7002]

Amendment to Certificate of Compliance for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Portsmouth, OH

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination the staff concluded that (1) there is no change in the types or significant increase in the

amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previous analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safe guards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is described below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PORTS). The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfied the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after the filing of the petition.

If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items are 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.

Date of amendment request:
December 23, 1996.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment, in accordance with a commitment made in the USEC certificate application, changes the administrative Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) that limits the working hours of facility staff who perform safety functions.

Basic for finding of no significance: 1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

Administrative TSR 3.2.2.b limits working hours of facility staff who perform safety functions (operators, health physics personnel, maintenance personnel, etc.). The proposed change revises TSR 3.2.2.b.2 as specified in Issue 37 of DOE/ORO-2027 Revision 3, Change A, Plan for Achieving Compliance with NRC Regulations at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, by reducing the currently authorized limits, excluding shift turnover time, of 32 hours in any 48 hour period and 80 hours in any 7 day period, to 24 hours in any 48 hour period and 72 hours in any 7 day period, respectively. These two 8-hour reductions in overtime limits may enhance safety by reducing occupational stresses and burdens on facility staff who perform safety functions. Therefore, this TSR amendment will not result in significant

amounts of effluents that may be released offsite.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

Operations at PORTS do not result in significant occupational radiation exposures. Some of the reasons being that (1) occupancy factors are low, (2) distances from radioactive sources are generally high, (3) significant shielding is provided by solid and liquid UF6 (self-shielding) and by piping and equipment, (4) depleted and low enriched uranium has low specific activities and are also comparatively low gamma radiation emitters, (5) most of the uranium in process is in gaseous form (low density), and (6) UF6 is confined within quality controlled cylinders, equipment and piping. The proposed reductions in overtime limits would not significantly affect any of these six reasons. Therefore, reducing overtime limits, as described in the assessment of criterion 1, will not measurably modify individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

Since the proposed changes do not involve any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed changes which involve reductions in overtime limits will not result in a significant increase in the potential for UF6 releases. The proposed changes will also not result in a significant increase for, or radiological consequences from previously evaluated critical accidents. In fact, the reductions in overtime limits described in the assessment of criterion 1, may enhance safety by reducing occupational stresses and burdens on facility staff who perform safety functions. Therefore, this TSR amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed changes will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. In fact, the reductions in overtime limits described in the assessment of criterion 1, may enhance safety by reducing occupational stresses

and burdens on facility staff who perform safety functions.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The proposed change, which is described in the assessment of criterion 1, will not result in the violation of any limiting condition of operation. Therefore, it will not significantly reduce any margin of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

Reductions in limits to overtime would not result in a decrease in the overall effectiveness of the plant's safety program. In fact, as discussed in the assessment of criterion 1, it may enhance the effectiveness of the plant's safety program.

The staff has not identified any safeguards or security related implications from the proposed amendment. Therefore reducing the limits on overtime as discussed in the assessment of criterion 1 will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safeguards or security programs.

Effective date: 30 days after issuance.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-2: Amendment will revise the Technical Safety Requirements.

Local Public Document Room location: Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of March 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John T. Greeves,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97-7639 Filed 3-25-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Budget Rescissions and Deferrals

To the Congress of the United States

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one proposed rescission of budgetary resources, totaling \$10 million.

The proposed rescission affects the Department of Energy.

William J. Clinton

The White House

March 19, 1997.

BILLING CODE 3110-01-P