

In determining the PORV setpoint for LTOP events, the licensee proposed to use safety margins based on an alternate methodology consistent with the proposed ASME Code N-514 guidelines. The ASME Code Case N-514 allows determination of the setpoint for LTOP events such that the maximum pressure in the vessel would not exceed 110 percent of the P/T limits of the existing ASME Appendix G. This results in a safety factor of 1.8 on the principal membrane stresses. All other factors, including assumed flaw size and fracture toughness, remain the same. Although this methodology would reduce the safety factor on the principal membrane stresses, use of the proposed criteria will provide adequate margins of safety to the reactor vessel during LTOP transients.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed change involves use of more realistic safety margins for determining the PORV setpoint during LTOP events. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

#### *Alternative to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the 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 did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements related to operation of Braidwood Station.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 15, 1995, the staff consulted with the Illinois State Official, Mr. Frank Niziolek; Head, Reactor Safety Section; Division of Engineering; Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety; regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

Based upon the foregoing 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, see the request for exemption dated November 30, 1994, as supplemented May 11, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room located at the Wilmington Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of July 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

#### **Ramin R. Assa,**

*Project Director, Project Directorate III-2, Division of Reactor Projects-III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-16809 Filed 7-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

#### **Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena; Notice of Meeting**

The ACRS Subcommittee on Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena will hold a meeting on July 26 and 27, 1995, Room T-2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

Most of the meeting will be closed to public attendance to discuss Westinghouse Electric Corporation proprietary information pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4).

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

*Wednesday, July 26, 1995—8:30 a.m.*

*until the conclusion of business*

*Thursday, July 27, 1995—8:30 a.m. until*

*the conclusion of business*

The Subcommittee will continue its review of the Westinghouse COBRA/TRAC best-estimate ECCS thermal hydraulic code. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only

by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff.

Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, their consultants, and other interested persons regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, the scheduling of sessions which are open to the public, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff engineer, Mr. Paul A. Boehnert (telephone 301/415-8065) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (edt). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes in the proposed agenda, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: June 30, 1995.

#### **Sam Duraiswamy,**

*Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.*

[FR Doc. 95-16810 Filed 7-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

#### **[Docket 70-364]**

#### **Babcock and Wilcox Company; Parks Township Facility; Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206**

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has taken action with regards to the remaining issues (Sections Q and X) referred to the Commission's Executive Director for Operations, by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, in its Initial Director's Decision, dated January 3, 1995, *Babcock and Wilcox Company* (Pennsylvania Nuclear Service Operation Parks Township, PA), LBP-95-1, 41 NRC 1, 35 (1995). Section Q was interpreted as a request that the NRC test for radioactive contamination in the general vicinity of Kepple Hill and Riverview in Parks Township, and Section X was interpreted as a request

for the NRC to investigate radiological contamination on the Farmers Delight Dairy Farm. Notice of Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision under 10 CFR 2.206, dated March 3, 1995, was published in the **Federal Register** on March 13, 1995, (60 FR 13478).

The Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards has determined, after taking actions with respect to each request discussed in the Decision, that no further action by the Commission is warranted. The reasons for this Decision are explained in the "Director's Decision under 10 CFR 2.206" (DD-95-12), which is published below.

A copy of the Decision will be filed with the Office of the Secretary of the Commission in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c). 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.

A copy of the Petition, Initial Decision, Notice of Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision under 10 CFR 2.206, and other documents related to the Petition are available for inspection in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555, and the Local Public Document Room located at the Apollo Memorial Library, 219 N. Pennsylvania Avenue, Apollo, Pennsylvania 15613.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 26th day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Malcolm R. Knapp,**

*Deputy Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

## I. Introduction

By Petition dated January 5, 1994, Citizens' Action for a Safe Environment (CASE) and the Kiski Valley Coalition To Save Our Children (the Coalition) (together referred to as Intervenor or Petitioners) filed a joint request for an informal hearing pursuant to 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L, with regard to Babcock & Wilcox Company's (Licensee) application for renewal of Special Nuclear Material (SNM) License SNM-414 issued to the Licensee by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) for the Pennsylvania Nuclear Service Operations facility located in Parks Township, Armstrong County, Pennsylvania (Parks Township facility). In a Memorandum and Order dated April 22, 1994, the Presiding Officer granted the request for hearing and admitted the Petitioners as

Intervenor.<sup>1</sup> An informal hearing was conducted pursuant to Subpart L of the Commission's procedural regulations. In the Initial Decision, dated January 3, 1995, authorizing the renewal of the materials license, the Presiding Officer, pursuant to 10 CFR 2.1205(k)(2), referred to the Commission's Executive Director for Operations for consideration, as a request for action under 10 CFR 2.206, 12 areas of concern raised in that proceeding by the Intervenor.<sup>2</sup> These concerns were referred to my office for review. Each of these concerns were reviewed with respect to the requirements of 10 CFR 2.206. Two concerns<sup>3</sup> (Sections Q and X) were found to satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 2.206. On March 7, 1995, a letter was sent to the Intervenor acknowledging the treatment of the Intervenor's Sections Q and X as requests for action under 10 CFR 2.206.<sup>4</sup>

Section Q has been interpreted as a request for the Commission to test for radioactive contamination in the general vicinity of Kepple Hill and Riverview in Parks Township. The apparent concern is that this area is downwind of the Apollo facility, which the Intervenor assert had been releasing radioactivity at a rate above regulatory limits. The Intervenor rely on letters dated April 20, 1966, and May 26, 1969, concerning the need for experimental data for an air surveillance program at the Apollo plant and authorization by the Commission's predecessor, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), for the discharge of radioactive materials in concentrations exceeding 10 CFR Part 20 limits.

Section X has been interpreted as a request for the Commission to investigate radiological contamination on the Farmers Delight Dairy Farm (apparently located in Parks Township). The apparent concern is that past operations of the Parks Township facility caused radioactive contamination of the farm. As basis for this request, the Intervenor assert that there is information in a 1966 U.S.

<sup>1</sup> *Babcock and Wilcox Company* (Pennsylvania Nuclear Service Operations, Parks Township, PA), LBP-94-12, 39 NRC 215 (1994).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, LBP-95-1, 41 NRC 1, 35 (1995).

<sup>3</sup> As the Commission recently noted, there were three concerns (Sections Q, R, and X). However, one of the concerns (Section R) was included within Section Q. See *Babcock and Wilcox Company* (Pennsylvania Nuclear Service Operations, Parks Township, PA), CLI-95-04, slip op. at 7 (April 26, 1995), 41 NRC \_\_\_\_.

<sup>4</sup> In the acknowledgement letter it was noted that the other concerns (Sections B, H, I, M, P, S, T, U, W, and Y) had been addressed by the Commission staff in affidavits of Michael A. Lamastra and Heather M. Astwood. These affidavits were submitted to the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in the Subpart L proceeding on September 22, 1994.

Department of Agriculture (USDA) study that indicates that the cattle on the farm were having thyroid problems and that radionuclides were showing up in the cows' milk.

I have completed my evaluation of the matters raised by the Intervenor and have determined that, for the reasons stated below, no further action by the Commission is warranted.

## II. Background

The Nuclear Material and Equipment Company (NUMEC) began operations at the Apollo and Parks Township facilities in the late 1950s. The Atlantic Richfield Company (ARCO) purchased the stock of NUMEC in 1967. In 1971, Babcock & Wilcox (B&W) purchased NUMEC and is the current owner of the Apollo and Parks Township facilities.

The primary function of the NUMEC Apollo facility was the conversion of low-enriched (less than 5 wt. percent U-235) uranium hexafluoride to uranium oxide for use in fuel for light-water-moderated power reactors and to produce high-enriched (> 93 wt. percent U-235) nuclear fuel material for use in naval reactors. The B&W Apollo facility ceased manufacturing nuclear fuel in 1983 and has completed site decommissioning. The Commission staff expects to terminate the Apollo facility license in 1995.

The primary function of the NUMEC Parks Township facility was the fabrication of plutonium fuel, the preparation of high-enriched uranium fuel, and the production of zirconium/hafnium bars. The Parks Township facility ceased fuel fabrication activities in 1980 and is currently conducting decontamination and refurbishment of nuclear reactor components and equipment. The Parks Township license was last renewed on May 16, 1984, with an expiration date of May 31, 1989, and the license is currently under timely renewal.<sup>5</sup>

## III. Discussion

The NRC staff has evaluated the Intervenor's two requests for action pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206. The evaluation and my disposition for each request are discussed below.

1. Test for radioactive contamination in the general vicinity of Kepple Hill and Riverview areas in Parks Township. The Intervenor's request is based on their interpretation of letters dated April 20, 1966, and May 26, 1969, from Roger D. Caldwell, Manager, Health, Safety

<sup>5</sup> The Commission on April 26, 1995, denied the Intervenor's petition for review of the Presiding Officer's January 3, 1995, Initial Decision (License Renewal), LBP-95-1 ("Initial Decision"). The staff expects to renew the license in 1995.

and Licensing, of NUMEC concerning the need for experimental data for an air surveillance program at the NUMEC Apollo plant<sup>6</sup> and authorization by the Atomic Energy Commission for the discharge of radioactive materials in concentrations exceeding 10 CFR Part 20 limits.<sup>7</sup>

By application dated November 13, 1968, and supplement dated March 5, 1969, and pursuant to 10 CFR 20.106(b), NUMEC requested that License SNM-145 be amended to permit concentrations up to 100 times the limits specified in Part 20, Appendix B, Table II, in any stack effluent, provided that concentrations at the roof edge and in the local environment complied with 10 CFR Part 20 limits. By License Amendment 31, dated May 26, 1969, the AEC authorized NUMEC to discharge radioactive material from any stack, in concentrations up to 100 times the values specified in Appendix B, Table II, of 10 CFR Part 20<sup>8</sup> subject to the following conditions:

(a) Concentrations of radioactive material measured by the continuously operating air samplers positioned at the plant roof perimeter shall not exceed the values specified in Appendix B, Table II, of 10 CFR Part 20; and

(b) an environmental air sampling program shall be conducted in the neighboring unrestricted areas<sup>9</sup> of the plant.

Accordingly, even though NUMEC was authorized to discharge *at the stack* up to 100 times the value specified in Appendix B, Table II, NUMEC was still required to meet the limits *at the site boundary* (see footnote 8). Moreover,

<sup>6</sup> One of the sub-areas of concern accepted as an issue in the informal hearing was "[w]hether B&W Management practices as manifested by the management of the Apollo facility threaten offsite releases of radiation from the Park Township facility." LBP-94-12, 39 NRC, 215, 222-23 (1994).

<sup>7</sup> Prior to January 1994, NRC regulations for radioactivity in effluents to unrestricted areas were contained in 10 CFR 20.106. The current requirements are found in 10 CFR 1302. 10 CFR 20.106(a) limited radioactivity in air effluents to unrestricted areas to less than those listed in Appendix B, Table II, except as authorized in 10 CFR 20.106(b). 10 CFR 20.106(b) allowed licensees to propose limits higher than those specified in 10 CFR 20.106(a), if certain conditions were met. 10 CFR 20.106(d) clarified that the limits listed in Appendix B, Table II, apply at the boundary of the restricted area and not at the stack discharge point.

<sup>8</sup> The values set forth in 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B, Table II, are the regulatory limits applicable at the site boundary, not at the stack.

<sup>9</sup> 10 CFR 20.1003 defines "unrestricted area" as "... an area, access to which is neither limited nor controlled by the licensee." Prior to January 1, 1994, an unrestricted area was defined as "... any area access to which is not controlled by the licensee for purposes of protection of individuals from exposure to radiation and radioactive materials, and any area used for residential quarters."

NUMEC was required to meet these same values at the plant roof perimeter.

To evaluate the Intervenor's concern about the alleged contamination in the general vicinity of the Kepple Hill and Riverview areas of Parks Township, the staff estimated the average airborne uranium concentrations using the results from the environmental monitoring program, which was a condition of the License. The NRC staff calculated the average airborne uranium concentrations to be  $3.6 \times 10^{-13}$  uCi/cc.<sup>10</sup> This calculated value is less than one tenth of the maximum permissible concentration in air for insoluble uranium-238 and uranium-235; the requirement for unrestricted air effluent set forth in 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B, Table II. Accordingly, the releases from the facility were within 10 CFR Part 20 requirements for unrestricted release and, therefore, were not a safety concern.

The NRC staff also estimated the potential contamination of soil outside the plant boundary from facility operations.<sup>11</sup> Using conservative assumptions, the Commission staff calculated a maximum concentration of 12 pCi per gram of soil. This is less than the Commission's current release criteria for uranium.<sup>12</sup>

The Commission staff also reviewed environmental radiation monitoring data collected during the facility's period of operation. Environmental radiation monitoring has been conducted at the Apollo site since 1968. Monitoring programs included measurements of radioactive materials in the environment (river water, and sediment, air, soil, and vegetation) and thermoluminescent dosimetry (TLD) measurements of direct radiation in the environment. Radiological monitoring stations have been active in the Apollo facility area for as long as three decades, monitoring the Allegheny and Kiskiminetas Rivers and various tributaries, as well as other surface waters and ground water. These include Commission, State, and B&W stations. Based on its review of this data, the Commission staff concludes that

<sup>10</sup> An estimate of the average airborne uranium concentration can be calculated using a uranium deposition rate of 20 pCi/Ft<sub>2</sub>/week (measured by NUMEC during plant operation) and assuming a gravitational settlement rate of 0.001 meters per second.

<sup>11</sup> An estimate of the soil uranium concentration can be calculated using a uranium deposition rate of 20 pCi/Ft<sub>2</sub>/week (measured by NUMEC during plant operation) and assuming a 1cm depth, a soil density of 1.5g cm<sup>-3</sup>, and a 15-year operating period at Apollo.

<sup>12</sup> The current release criteria for uranium, which is 30 pCi per gram, is set forth in the Commission's "Branch Technical Position" (BTP) published in the **Federal Register**, October 23, 1981.

operation of the Apollo facility did not result in any significant changes to normal background levels outside the immediate site area.

The Commission staff also reviewed the results of an aerial radiological survey to measure gamma radiation<sup>13</sup> levels in the area of the Apollo facility. At the request of the Commission, the survey was conducted by EG&G Energy Measurement Group from June 15-19, 1981. The survey data identified only background levels of radiation.

In summary, the Commission staff calculated the potential airborne uranium concentration and potential contamination of soil, reviewed the environmental monitoring and aerial radiological survey data, and concluded that the radioactive releases from the Apollo facility have been within regulatory limits and have not resulted in concentrations of radioactivity in the soil greater than the NRC release criteria stated in the Branch Technical Position (see footnote 12). In reaching this conclusion, the staff took into account the fact that in 1969, the AEC authorized NUMEC to release at the stack, radioactive materials in concentrations up to 100 times the values (applicable at the site boundary) listed in Appendix B of 10 CFR Part 20. The Intervenor's request that the Commission test for radiological contamination in the general vicinity of Kepple Hill and Riverview in Parks Township is granted to the extent of the review described above. However, the Intervenor has failed to raise any substantial health or safety issues. Therefore, no further action is warranted.

2. Investigate potential radiological contamination on the Farmers Delight Dairy Farm located in the vicinity of the Parks Township facility.

In its request for the Commission to investigate radiological contamination on the Farmers Delight Dairy Farm, the Intervenor asserts that information contained in a U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) report entitled NUMEC-1966 indicates that cattle on the farm are having thyroid problems and that radionuclides are showing up in the cows' milk. The Intervenor indicates that the report was read to them over the telephone by a reference librarian at the USDA Library in Beltsville, Maryland. The Intervenor also asserts that the report "vanished" from that Library.

To evaluate the NUMEC-1966 report, the Commission staff searched its files,

<sup>13</sup> Gamma radiation is electromagnetic photons originating from the nucleus of an atom. Gamma rays are similar to x-rays.

requested both B&W and ARCO to search their files, and requested the USDA to check its files for a copy of the report. No copy was found. However, the USDA did confirm that the only copy in its system was missing from the USDA Beltsville, Maryland, library. It was also determined that NUMEC-1966 was not a USDA report but a NUMEC-published document. The Commission staff again searched its files and requested that B&W and ARCO search their files for a NUMEC report entitled NUMEC-1966. Again, no copy was found.

Since the Commission staff was unable to evaluate the NUMEC-1966 report, the staff reviewed environmental radiation monitoring data collected from the area of the Parks Township facility. Environmental radiation monitoring has been conducted at the Parks Township site since 1969. The monitoring program includes measurements of radioactive materials in the environment (air, soil, and vegetation) and TLD measurements of direct radiation in the environment. These include Commission, State, and B&W monitoring stations. The NRC staff has also taken soil samples from private residences and other locations in the Parks Township area.<sup>14</sup> The NRC staff has reviewed the environmental monitoring data, including the soil samples, and concluded that there has been no significant increase in background levels outside of the immediate site area of the Parks Township facility. The Intervenor's request that the Commission investigate potential radiological contamination on the Farmers Delight Dairy Farm is granted to the extent of the review described above. The Intervenor has, however, failed to raise a substantial health or safety concern; therefore, no further action is warranted.

#### IV. Conclusion

The institution of proceedings pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 is appropriate only where substantial health and safety issues have been raised. See *Consolidated Edison Co. of New York* (Indian Point, Units 1, 2, and 3), CLI-75-8, 2 NRC 173, 175-76 (1975), and *Washington Public Power Supply System* (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2), DD-84-7, 19 NRC 899, 923 (1984). This is the standard that I have applied to determine whether the actions requested by the Intervenor are warranted. Since no substantial health

and safety issues have been raised by the Intervenor and for the reasons discussed above, no basis exists for taking any further action in response to the requests beyond that described above. Accordingly, in this matter, the Commission is taking no further action pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206.

As provided by 10 CFR 2.206(c), a copy of this Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review. The Decision will become the final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Decision.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of June, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Malcolm R. Knapp,**

*Deputy Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 95-16787 Filed 7-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

#### OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

[Form DPRS-2809]

#### Notice of Request for Review of a Currently Approved Information Collection

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (title 44, U.S. Code, chapter 35), this notice announced a request for review of a currently approved information collection. Form DPRS-2809, Request to Change FEHB Enrollment or to Receive Plan Brochures, is used by former spouses who are eligible to elect, cancel, or change health benefits enrollment during open season.

Approximately 28,000 forms are completed annually. This form requires approximately 10 minutes to complete. The annual burden is 4,700 hours.

For copies of this proposal, contact Doris R. Benz on (703) 908-8564.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposals should be received on or before August 9, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Send or deliver comments to—

Robert A. Yuran, Chief, Financial Management Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, N.W., Room 4351, Washington, DC 20415

and  
Joseph Lackey, OPM Desk Officer,  
Office of Information and Regulatory  
Affairs, Office of Management and  
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.

Office of Personnel Management.

**Lorraine A. Green,**

*Deputy Director.*

[FR Doc. 95-16816 Filed 7-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-M

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

#### Agency Forms Submitted for OMB Review

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Railroad Retirement Board has submitted the following proposal(s) for the collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval.

#### SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL(S):

- (1) *Collection title:* Sick Pay and Miscellaneous Payments Report.
- (2) *Form(s) submitted:* BA-10.
- (3) *OMB Number:* 3220-0175.
- (4) *Expiration date of current OMB clearance:* October 31, 1995.
- (5) *Type of request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.
- (6) *Respondents:* Business or other for-profit.
- (7) *Estimated annual number of respondents:* 140
- (8) *Total annual responses:* 140.
- (9) *Total annual reporting hours:* 128.
- (10) *Collection description:* The Railroad Retirement Solvency Act of 1983 added Sec. 1(h)(8) to the RRA expanding the definition of compensation for purposes of computing the Tier 1 portion of an annuity to include sickness payments and certain payments other than sick pay which are considered compensation within the meaning of Sec. 1(h)(8). Collection obtains the sick pay and other types of payments considered compensation within the meaning of Sec. 1(h)(8).

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS:** Copies of the form and supporting documents can be obtained from Chuck Mierzwa, the agency clearance officer (312-751-3363). Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad

<sup>14</sup>The NRC soil sampling results were reported in NRC combined Inspection Reports Nos. 70-135/93-01 and 70-364/93-02; 70-135/93-02 and 70-364/93-03; 70-135/93-03 and 70-364/93-04; 70-135/94-01 and 70-364/94-01; and 70-135/94-02 and 70-364/94-02.