

discovered some off-site areas that may require some remediation. Umetco will need to characterize those areas to determine volumes of materials affected and where necessary to generate a plan for their disposal. If the current A-9 design capacity is exceeded, a design change may be required. Based on review of Umetco's submittal, the NRC staff concludes that the delays are attributable to factors beyond the control of Umetco, the proposed work is scheduled to be completed as expeditiously as practicable, and the added risk to the public health and safety is not significant.

An environmental assessment is not required since this action is categorically excluded under 10 CFR 51.22(c)(11), and an environmental report from the licensee is not required by 10 CFR 51.60(b)(2).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Umetco's license, including an amended License Condition 59, and the NRC staff's technical evaluation of the amendment request are being made available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC 20555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mohammad W. Haque, Uranium Recovery Branch, Division of Waste Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone (301) 415-6640.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of February 1996.

Daniel M. Gillen,

*Acting Chief, Uranium Recovery Branch,
Division of Waste Management, Office of
Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 96-5497 Filed 3-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-440 and 50-346]

**Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1;
Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station,
Unit 1; Receipt of Petition for
Director's Decision Under 10 CFR
2.206**

Notice is hereby given that by Petition from the City of Cleveland, Ohio, for the "Expedited Issuance of Notice of Violation, Enforcement of License Conditions, and Imposition of Appropriate Fines" (Petition), dated January 23, 1996, the City of Cleveland (Petitioner) requests, *inter alia*, that the NRC, pursuant to 10 CFR 2.201, 2.202, 2.205 and 2.206, find that the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (CEI) is obligated to provide the wheeling and interconnection services as specified in the Petition and allegedly required by

the Antitrust License Conditions that are a part of CEI's license for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, and Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1. In addition, the Petitioner has filed a Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on this issue, and has also requested in the alternative that if partial summary judgment is denied, the Commission sever the matter from the remainder of the Petitioner's other requests contained in the Petition and initiate "an expedited hearing procedure."

More specifically, the Petitioner requests the following NRC actions on an expedited schedule: (1) That the NRC issue a Notice of Violation against CEI for its failure to comply fully with the obligations under the Antitrust License Conditions; (2) that the NRC require CEI to submit a timely reply admitting or denying that CEI is in violation of these obligations, setting forth the steps it is taking to ensure compliance with the Antitrust License Conditions, and providing other compliance information required by the NRC; (3) that the NRC direct CEI to comply immediately with the portions of the Antitrust License Conditions at issue, including requiring CEI to withdraw immediately from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission portions of its filings in Docket No. ER93-471-000 that are inconsistent with the Antitrust License Conditions, to withdraw the \$75.00/KW-month "deviation charge" from the rate schedules, and to withdraw that portion of the "Agreement" providing Toledo Edison "highest priority" treatment for its purchases of emergency power from CEI; (4) that the NRC impose the maximum appropriate fines for CEI's repeated violations of the Antitrust License Conditions; and (5) that the NRC direct CEI to provide firm wheeling service during 1996 in the amounts requested by the Petitioner in its August 11, 1995, letter to CEI and in accordance with CEI's obligation under Antitrust License Condition No. 3.

The Petition asserts the following as bases for the requests enumerated above: (1) That CEI violated Antitrust License Condition No. 3 by refusing to provide firm wheeling service to the Petitioner; (2) that CEI violated Antitrust License Condition Nos. 6 and 11 by entering into a contract to provide Toledo Edison Company with emergency power on a preferential basis; (3) that CEI violated Antitrust License Condition No. 2 by failing to offer the Petitioner a fourth interconnection point upon reasonable terms and conditions; and (4) that CEI violated Antitrust License Condition No. 2 by unreasonably burdening use of the existing interconnections through

unilateral imposition of a \$75.00/KW-month "deviation charge." The Petitioner asserts that expedited action is by the Commission appropriate and necessary because of the "ongoing, intensive, and unique door-to-door competition" in which the Petitioner and CEI are engaged and that CEI stands to gain enormously, and the Petitioner to lose by equal measure, for each day that CEI refuses to comply with its license condition obligations. The Petitioner also expresses concern that expedited action by the Commission is required by reason of the Petitioner's 40 MW power purchase from Ohio Power Company to be supplied to the Medical Center Company scheduled to begin by September 1, 1996, which will require wheeling by CEI.

The Petition has been referred to the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation for action in accordance with 10 CFR § 2.206. The request for partial summary judgment, the consideration of which is not provided for under 10 CFR § 2.206, is accordingly not being considered, as described in a letter dated March 4, 1996. The request for an expedited Director's Decision that would implement the requested actions was also denied in that letter.

As provided by 10 CFR § 2.206, the NRC will take appropriate action on the Petitioner's requests, other than Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for: Perry Nuclear Power Plant—Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, Ohio; and Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station—Government Documents Collection, William Carlson Library (Depository) University of Toledo, 2801 West Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 4th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 96-5496 Filed 3-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL
MANAGEMENT**

[RI 95-4]

**Proposed Collection; Comment
Request for Reclearance of
Information Collection****AGENCY:** Office of Personnel
Management.**ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-13, October 1, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for reclearance of an information collection. RI 95-4, Marital Information Required of Refund Applicants, is used by OPM to pay refunds of retirement contributions. OPM must know about the applicant's marital status and whether any spouse and any former spouses have been informed of the proposed refund. All applicants for refund must respond.

Approximately 5,000 RI 95-4 forms are completed annually. Each form takes approximately 30 minutes to complete. The annual estimated burden is 2,500 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 May 7, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—

Daniel A. Green, Chief, FERS Division,
Retirement and Insurance Service,
U.S. Office of Personnel Management,
1900 E Street, NW., Room 4429,
Washington, DC 20415.

FOR INFORMATION REGARDING

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

Office of Personnel Management.

Lorraine A. Green,

Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 96-5479 Filed 3-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-M

**Agriculture Department; Alternative
Personnel Management System;
Demonstration Project****AGENCY:** Office of Personnel
Management.**ACTION:** Notice of amendment of the
Department of Agriculture
demonstration project plan.**SUMMARY:** This action provides for
changes in the final project plan

published March 9, 1990, to modify the list of experimental and comparison sites under the project. The project was originally conceived to test an alternative to the traditional recruiting and hiring system in an anticipated tight labor market as described in Workforce 2000 and Civil Service 2000. This change provides the opportunity to test these flexibilities in a downsizing environment with a more than adequate high-quality labor market even though there are occasional shortages of qualified candidates.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 8, 1996.**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mary Ann Jenkins, (202) 720-0515, at the Department of Agriculture; Joan Jorgenson, (202) 606-1315, at the Office of Personnel Management.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 9, 1990, the Office of Personnel Management published in the Federal Register (55 FR 9062) the final plan to demonstrate an alternative personnel management system at the Department of Agriculture under chapter 47 of title 5, U.S.C. The purpose of this demonstration project is to develop and evaluate a recruitment and selection program for new hires that is flexible and responsive to local recruitment needs and which will facilitate the attainment of a quality workforce reflective of society.

In support of this goal, the following project objectives have been identified:

(1) Increase the flexibility and responsiveness of the recruitment and hiring system.

(2) Increase the reliability of the decision to grant career tenure for employees in scientific positions. These objectives will be realized through the following interventions:

(a) Decentralize the decision to authorize direct hire in shortage categories.

(b) Implement an alternative candidate assessment method which uses categorical grouping instead of numeric score.

(c) Provide the option of awarding monetary incentives for recruitment purposes.

(d) Provide the option of reimbursing relocation travel and transportation expenses beyond those currently authorized for travel to first post of duty.

(e) Increase automation of examining process.

(f) Extend the 1-year probationary period to 3 years for employees in scientific positions. The demonstration covers up to 5,000 newly hired employees, at any given time, at over 140 locations within the Forest Service

and Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture. Covered employees represent all occupational groups and grade levels (excluding the Senior Executive Service) at the project sites.

The list of approximately 210 experimental and comparison sites of the Agricultural Research Service and Forest Service are identified in the March 9, 1990, Federal Register (55 FR 9062). The comparison sites for both agencies will be included as experimental sites. With the addition of the sites, project participation will still not exceed the statutory limit of 5,000 employees at any given time. Anyone wishing more information may telephone the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

Office of Personnel Management.

James B. King,

Director.

Project Plan Modification

The project plan which appeared in the Federal Register on March 9, 1990 (55 FR 9062) is hereby modified to include the comparison sites as experimental sites for the Agricultural Research Service and Forest Service.

Appendix B is changed to include all sites as experimental.

Agricultural Research Service*Experimental Sites*

Aberdeen, ID
Akron, CO
Albany, CA
All Hawaiian Islands
Ames/Ankeny, IA
Athens, GA
Auburn, AL
Baton Rouge, LA
Beaumont, TX
Beckley, WV
Beltsville, MD
Boise, ID
Booneville, AR
Boston, MA
Bozeman, MT
Brawley, CA
Brookings, SD
Brooksville, FL
Brownwood, TX
Burns, OR
Bushland, TX
Byron, GA
Canal Point, FL
Charleston, SC
Cheyenne, WY
Clay Center, NE
Clemson, SC
College Station, TX
Columbia, MO
Columbus, OH
Corvallis, OR
Coshocton, OH