

corrective action program and the results of the Type A test were confirmatory of the Type B and Type C tests rather than providing information that would otherwise not have been available. The licensee has stated that the visual containment inspection will be performed during the September 1995 RFO although it is only required by 10 CFR part 50, appendix J, to be performed in conjunction with Type A tests. The staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued structural integrity of the containment boundary.

The staff has also made use of the information in a draft staff report, NUREG-1493, which provides the technical justification for the present Appendix J rulemaking effort which also includes a 10-year test interval for Type A tests. The ILRT, or Type A test, measures overall containment leakage. However, operating experience with all types of containments used in this country demonstrates that essentially all containment leakage can be detected by LLRT (Type B and Type C). According to results given in NUREG-1493, out of 180 ILRT reports covering 110 individual reactors and approximately 770 years of operating history, only five ILRT failures were found which local leakage rate testing could not detect. This is 3 percent of all failures. This study agrees with previous staff studies which show that Type B and Type C testing detect a very large percentage of containment leaks. The Zion Station, Unit 1, experience has also been consistent with these results.

The Nuclear Management and Resources Council (NUMARC), now the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), collected and provided the staff with summaries of data to assist in the 10 CFR part 50, appendix J, rulemaking effort. The NEI collected results of 144 ILRTs from 33 units of which 23 ILRTs exceeded 1.0L_a. Of these, only nine were not due to Type B or C leakage penalties. The NEI data also added another perspective. The NEI data show that in about one-third of the cases exceeding allowable leakage, the as-found leakage was less than 2L_a; in one case the leakage was found to be approximately 2L_a; in one case the as-found leakage was less than 3L_a; one case approached 10L_a; and in one case the leakage was found to be approximately 21L_a. For about half of the failed ILRTs, the as-found leakage was not qualified. These data show that, for those ILRTs for which the leakage was quantified, the leakage values are small when compared to the leakage value at which the risk to the public starts to increase over the value of risk

corresponding to L_a (approximately 200L_a, as discussed in NUREG-1493). Therefore, based on these considerations, it is unlikely that an extension of 18 months for the performance of the appendix J, type A tests at Zion would result in significant degradation of the overall containment integrity. Thus, the application of the regulation in these particular circumstances is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

Based on generic and plant-specific data, the staff finds the licensee's proposed one-time exemption to permit a schedular extension of one cycle for the performance of the 10 CFR part 50, appendix J, type A test, provided that the visual containment inspection is performed, to be acceptable.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that granting this exemption will not have a significant impact on the human environment (60 FR 34305).

This exemption is effective upon issuance and shall expire at the completion of the Type A test scheduled to be performed during the March 1997 refueling outage.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 12th day of July 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jack W. Roe,

*Director, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-17564 Filed 7-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Updated Statistical Definitions of Metropolitan Areas (MAs)

AGENCY: Statistical Policy Office, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

ACTION: Updated statistical definitions of Metropolitan Areas as of June 30, 1995.

SUMMARY: Under the authority of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3504) and 31 U.S.C. 1104(d) and E.O. No. 10253 (June 11, 1951), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) defines Metropolitan Areas (MAs) for statistical purposes in accordance with a set of standards published in the **Federal Register** (55 FR 12154-12160, March 30, 1990).

On June 30, 1995, OMB updated the MA definitions in OMB Bulletin No. 95-04. Two new Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) were defined

based on the standards and the 1992 and 1994 official population estimates. Flagstaff, Arizona-Utah MSA (FIPS Code 2620) was defined as of June 30, 1995, comprising Coconino County, Arizona and Kane County, Utah. Grand Junction, Colorado MSA (FIPS Code 2995) was defined as of June 30, 1995, comprising Mesa County, Colorado. A new central city was defined in the Hickory-Morganton NC MSA (FIPS Code 3290). Lenoir, North Carolina is the additional central city and the title for the MSA becomes Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir, NC MSA.

The complete announcement presenting all MA definitions can be obtained through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) by calling (703) 487-4650 and ordering Accession Number PB95-208880.

For further information on the statistical uses of MA definitions please call Maria E. Gonzalez (202-395-7313). For information concerning the use of MA definitions in a particular Federal agency program, please contact the sponsoring agency directly.

Sally Katzen,

Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

[FR Doc. 95-17568 Filed 7-18-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3110-01-M

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Identification of Priority Practices; Request for Public Comment

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Request for written submissions from the public on practices that should be considered with respect to the identification of priority practices pursuant to section 310 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (Super 301).

SUMMARY: Section 310 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (Trade Act) (19 U.S.C. 2420), requires the United States Trade Representative (USTR) to review United States trade expansion priorities and to identify priority foreign country practices, the elimination of which is likely to have the most significant potential to increase United States exports, either directly or through the establishment of a beneficial precedent. USTR is requesting written submissions from the public concerning foreign countries' practices that should be considered by the USTR for this purpose.

DATES: Submissions must be received on or before 12:00 noon on Friday, August 4, 1995.