Public comment is invited on these collections.

DATES: Comments should be submitted by July 17, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the proposed information collections and supporting documentation can be obtained from the Policy and Planning Division (PIRM-POL), 8601 Adelphi Road, Room 3200, College Park, MD 20740–6001. Telephone requests may be made to (301) 713–6730, extension 226.

Written comments should be sent to Director, Policy and Planning Division (PIRM-POL), National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road, Room 3200, College Park, MD 20740–6001. A copy of the comments should be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for NARA, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Ann Hadyka or Nancy Allard at (301) 713–6730.

The following proposed information collections have been submitted to OMB:

1. *Statistical research in archival records contaning personal information.*

Description: The information collection, which is contained in 36 CFR 1256.4, is a written request for access to archival records that are restricted because they contain highly personal information. The access must be for the purpose of conducting biomedical research.

Purpose: The information is used to evaluate whether the research proposal meets the conditions imposed by NARA on access to restricted archival records containing highly personal information.

Frequency of response: On occasion.
Number of respondents: 1.
Reporting hours per response: 7.
Annual reporting burden hours: 7.

2. *NARA Class Evaluation Forms (NA Forms 2019A, 2019B, 2019C, and 2019D).*

Description: The information collection is a an evaluation form completed by participants in traing courses and workshops that NARA conducts on archival and records management topics and on use of the **Federal Register**. The version of the form used depends on the length and format of a class.

Purpose: The information collection will help NARA to assess customer satisfaction with the course content and delivery, and to correct problems with classes to ensure that future classes meet the customers' needs.

Frequency of response: On occasion.

Number of respondents: 4,850.

Reporting hours per response: 5 minutes for NA Forms 2019A, 2019B, and 2019C, which are used in most classes. 10 minutes for NA Form 2019D, which is used for certain multi-day classes.

Annual reporting burden hours: 509 hours.

3. *Application and Permit for Use of Space in Presidential Library and Grounds (NA Form 16011).*

Description: The information collection is an application form completed by organizations that want to hold meetings or other activities at a Presidential Library. When approved, the form also serves as the permit for the activity.

Purpose: The information is used to determine whether the proposed use will meet the criteria specified in 36 CFR 1280.42 and to schedule the dates.

Frequency of response: On occasion. Most respondents request use of the library space for a specific one-time event.

Number of respondents: 1,000.

Reporting hours per response: 20 minutes.

Annual reporting burden hours: 334 hours.

Dated: May 23, 1995.

Rudy Huskamp Peterson,

Acting Archivist of the United States.

[FR Doc. 95–13378 Filed 5–31–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

All Licensees; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Enforcement, has issued a decision concerning the Petition filed by Mr. Thomas J. Saporito, Jr., (Petitioner) on March 8, 1995. The Petition requested that the NRC issue a generic letter of instruction to all licensees requiring them to review their station operating procedures to determine whether those procedures include any restrictions that would prevent or dissuade a licensee employee from bringing perceived safety concerns directly to the NRC without following the normal chain of command. The Petition requests that each licensee be required to report to the Commission, under oath or affirmation, that the review has been completed, that its employees are free to bring concerns to the NRC without following the normal chain of command, and that this information has been communicated to all of its employees.

Based on a review of Petitioner's request and the Secretary of Labor's Decision and Remand Order of June 3, 1994 and Order of February 16, 1995, the Director, Office of Enforcement, has denied this Petition. The reasons for the denial are explained in the ''Director's Decision under 10 CFR 2.206'' (DD–95–08) which is available for public inspection in the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555.

A copy of this Decision will be filed with the Secretary for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206. As provided by this regulation, the Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after the date of issuance of the Decision unless the Commission on its own motion institutes a review of the Decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 25th day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James Lieberman,

Director, Office of Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 95–13356 Filed 5–31–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–606]

Arkansas Tech University; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Construction Permit and Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Arkansas Tech University (the applicant) to withdraw its November 13, 1989, application for issuance of a construction permit and subsequently a facility operating license for a non-power reactor for educational, training, and research purposes on the campus of the applicant in Russellville, Arkansas.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Proposed Issuance of Construction Permit and Facility Operating License published in the **Federal Register** on November 13, 1990 (55 FR 47408). However, by letter dated April 10, 1995, the applicant withdrew the application.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for construction permit and facility operating license dated November 13, 1989, and the letter from the applicant dated April 10, 1995, which withdrew the application. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–13355 Filed 5–31–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–443 (License No. NPF–86)]

Exemption

In the Matter of North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation (Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1).

I

North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation (North Atlantic or the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. NPF–86, which authorizes operation of Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 (the facility or Seabrook), at a steady-state reactor power level not in excess of 3411 megawatts thermal. The facility is a pressurized water reactor located at the licensee's site in Rockingham County, New Hampshire. The license provides among other things, that it is subject to all rules, regulations, and Orders of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) now or hereafter in effect.

II

Section III.D.I.(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 requires the performance of three Type A containment integrated leakage rate tests (ILTRs) at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period of the primary containment. The third test of each set shall be conducted when the plant is shutdown for the 10-year inservice inspection.

III

By letter dated February 17, 1995, North Atlantic requested temporary relief from the requirement to perform a set of three Type A tests at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period of the primary containment. The requested exemption would permit delaying performance of the of the second Type A test by approximately 22 months (from the 1995 refueling outage currently scheduled to being November 4, 1995, to the 1997 refueling outage projected to start September 1997). The last Type A test was completed October 30, 1992. Thus, if the next Type A test is delayed until the 1997 refueling outrage, the interval between tests will be 59 months.

North Atlantic's request cites the special circumstances provision of 10 CFR 50.12, paragraph (a)(2)(ii), as the basis for the exemption. North Atlantic notes that the existing Type B and C testing programs are not being modified by its request and that these testing programs will continue to detect effectively containment leakage caused by the degradation of active containment isolation components as well as containment penetrations. It has been the consistent and uniform experience at Seabrook during the three Type A tests conducted from 1986 to date, that any significant containment leakage paths are detected by the Type B and C testing. The Type A test results have been only confirmatory of the results of the Type B and C tests results. Therefore, application of the regulation in this particular circumstances would not serve, nor is it necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

Additionally, North Atlantic stated that the exemption request meets the requirements of 10 CFR 50.12, paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2)(ii), for the following reasons:

- Based on the excellent performance of the Appendix J Type B and C test program and companion programs, the exemption would not result in undue risk to the health and safety of the public.
- The Type A test results demonstrate that Seabrook has a low-leakage containment. Three Type A tests have been performed at Seabrook without a single test failure, and the highest [as-found] leakage rate of 0.07092 percent per day is well below the acceptance limit of 0.1125 percent per day and the design limit of 0.15 percent per day.
- An assessment of the risk-impact of the exemption concludes that there would be no undue risk to the public health and safety as a result of the proposed schedular extension of the Type A test.
- Resources now being expended on meeting the requirements of Appendix J for the fourth refueling outage Type A test could be better utilized to prepare for and execute other functions with a higher impact on safety during the remainder of Cycle 4 and during the refueling outage.
- The proposed exemption only extends the ILRT from the fourth refueling outage to the fifth refueling outage. North Atlantic is requesting a one time exemption from Section III.D.1(a) of Appendix J that refers to performing ILRTs ''* * * at approximately equal intervals'' during each 10-year service period.

IV

Section III.D.1.(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR part 50 states that a set of three Type A leakage rate tests shall be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year period.

North Atlantic has proposed an exemption to this section which would provide a one-time interval extension for the second Type A test in the current 10-year service period by approximately 22 months.

The Commission has determined that pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(1) this exemption is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security. The Commission further determines that special circumstances, as provided in 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), are present justifying the exemption; namely, that application of the regulation in the particular circumstances is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

The underlying purpose of the requirement to perform Type A containment leak rate tests at intervals during the 10-year service period is to ensure that any potential leakage pathways through the containment boundary are identified within a time span that prevents significant degradation from continuing or becoming unknown. The NRC staff has reviewed the basis and supporting information provided by North Atlantic in the exemption request. The NRC staff has noted that North Atlantic has a good record of ensuring a leak-tight containment. All Type A tests have passed with significant margin and North Atlantic has noted that the results of the Type A testing have been confirmatory of the Type B and C tests which will continue to be performed. North Atlantic also has committed to perform, notwithstanding the granting of the proposed exemption, a general inspection of the containment and containment enclosure during the fourth refueling outage even though such an inspection is required by Appendix J, Section V.A. and the Seabrook Appendix A Technical Specifications to be performed only prior to Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary.

The licensee performed a risk analysis which demonstrates that the extension in the Type A test interval would result in a negligible increase in risk. These results are consistent with calculations performed for EPRI (as reported in EPRI