

Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operator Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of June 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Joseph J. Holonich,

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

[FR Doc. 97-16861 Filed 6-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-255]

Consumers Power Company, Palisades Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, for Facility Operating License No. DPR-20, issued to Consumers Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Palisades Plant located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option A, section III.D.2.(b)(ii) and III.D.2.(b)(iii), for Type B testing of the emergency escape air lock. The proposed action would allow performance of alternative testing of the emergency escape air lock door seals following air lock leak rate testing.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated January 10, 1996, as supplemented February 20, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is necessary to allow the licensee to use different testing requirements for the emergency escape air lock. During special testing in 1992, the licensee showed that the annulus between the door seals could not be successfully tested without the door strongback installed even at pressures as low as 2 psig. This testing, along with information from the vendor, confirms that between-the-seal pressure testing on the emergency escape air lock doors cannot be properly measured or evaluated if the door strongbacks are not installed. Similarly, the inner door does

not fully seal with the reverse-direction pressure of a full air lock pressure test unless the strongback is installed.

Since the removal of the inner door strongback after pressure testing requires the outer door to be opened, a between-the-seals test of the outer door would be required by the regulation. This test would require the installation of a strongback on the outer door. Further, full pressure testing or the pressure induced by the strongback may cause the door seals to take a set. It is therefore necessary to open both doors (one at a time) after any pressure testing to ensure full seal contact, and there is a potential need to readjust the seals to restore seal contact. Option A of Appendix J requires a leak rate test after opening an air lock door, with the idea that the door opening is a relatively isolated event. In this case, requiring another test immediately after a valid test simply because the door was opened again to remove test equipment or to perform seal adjustment would require performance of another air lock leak rate test to comply with the regulation. In this case, compliance with the rule would lead to an infinite series of tests.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. As an alternative to the final pressure test required by Appendix J for verification of door seal functionality, the licensee has proposed a final door seal contact verification. This seal performance verification is completed following the full pressure air lock test, after the removal of the inner door strongback, and just prior to final closure of the air lock doors. The requested exemption would not affect compliance with the present requirement to perform a full pressure emergency escape air lock test at 6-month intervals. It would also not affect the requirement to perform a full pressure emergency escape air lock test within 72 hours of opening either door during periods when containment integrity is required. The seal contact check replaces the pressure test required by Appendix J for the door opening(s) and/or seal adjustments associated with test restoration.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be

released off site, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for Palisades dated June 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 23, 1997, the NRC staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Dennis Hahn, of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Drinking Water and Radiological Protection Division, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letters dated January 10, 1996, and February 20, 1997, which 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 located at the Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of June, 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert G. Schaaf,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-16859 Filed 6-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Options for Promoting Privacy on the National Information Infrastructure

AGENCY: Office of Management and Budget.

ACTION: Notice; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On April 28, 1997, OMB announced the availability of "Options for Promoting Privacy on the National Information Infrastructure" (Options Paper) on behalf of the Information Policy Committee of the National Information Infrastructure Task Force (IITF) and requested public comments to be submitted on or before June 27, 1997. (62 Fed. Reg. 22978). Pursuant to public request, this notice serves to extend the deadline for receipt of comments through July 11, 1997.

The Options Paper results from work performed by the Privacy Working Group and refined by the Committee. The Committee is chaired by the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB). None of the options presented has been adopted as Administration policy; they are set forth in this document in the belief that they are worthy of public discussion.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 11, 1997.

ELECTRONIC AVAILABILITY AND ADDRESSES: The options paper is available electronically from the IITF site on the World Wide Web: <http://www.iitf.nist.gov/ipc/ipc-pub.html> and in paper form from the OMB Publications Office, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20503, telephone: 202/395-7332, facsimile: 202/395-6137.

Comments may be sent to the Information Policy Committee c/o the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and

Budget, Room 10236, Washington, D.C. 20503. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile to 202-395-5167, or by electronic mail to BERNSTEIN_M@A1.EOP.GOV. Comments submitted by facsimile or electronic mail need not also be submitted by regular mail.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Maya A. Bernstein, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503. Voice telephone: 202-395-4816. Facsimile: 202-395-5167. Electronic mail: BERNSTEIN_M@A1.EOP.GOV.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The paper describes the status of electronic data protection and fair information practices in the United States today, beginning with a discussion of the "Principles for Providing and Using Personal Information," issued by the Information Infrastructure Task Force in 1995. It then provides an overview of new information technologies, which shows that personal information is currently collected, shared, aggregated, and disseminated at a rate and to a degree unthinkable just a few years ago. Government is no longer the sole possessor of extensive amounts of personal information about U.S. citizens: in recent years the acquisition of personal information by the private sector has increased dramatically.

The paper next considers in more detail the laws and policies affecting information privacy in four specific areas: government records, communications, medical records, and the consumer market. The paper then turns to the core question: in the context of the Global Information Infrastructure (GII), what is the best mechanism to implement fair information practices that balance the needs of government, commerce, and individuals, keeping in mind both our interest in the free flow of information and in the protection of information privacy? At one end of the spectrum there is support for an entirely market-based response. At the other end of the spectrum, the federal government is encouraged to regulate fair information practices across all sectors of the economy. In between these poles, the paper reviews some of the myriad of options.

In particular, the paper considers a number of options that involve creation of a federal privacy entity. It discusses some of the many forms that such an entity could take and considers the advantages and disadvantages of the various choices. It also considers the functions that such an entity might perform, as well as various options for

locating a privacy entity within the federal government.

This paper presents a host of options for government and private sector action. The ultimate goal is to identify the means to maintain an optimal balance between personal privacy and freedom of information values in the digital environment. The next step is to receive and respond to public comment on the report in order to develop consensus regarding the appropriate allocation of public and private sector responsibility for implementation of fair information practices.

Sally Katzen,

Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97-16784 Filed 6-26-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3110-01-P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Firms With Significant Pension Plan Underfunding

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of request for extension of OMB approval.

SUMMARY: The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation has requested that the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") extend the approval for a collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act. The information collection relates to the opportunity the PBGC gives companies maintaining single-employer pension plans with significant underfunding to correct data that the PBGC has on their plans' underfunding. This notice informs the public of the PBGC's request and solicits public comment on the collection of information.

DATES: Comments should be submitted by July 28, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be mailed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Washington, DC 20503. Requests for information, including copies of the proposed collection and supporting documentation, should be sent to the PBGC's Communication and Public Affairs Department, Suite 240, 1200 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005-4026. The request for extension will be available for public inspection at that same address, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. on business days.