better communication with the licensees and the public, leading to a better understanding of SALP results.

The NRC SALP program objectives are:

(1) To conduct an integrated assessment of licensee safety performance that focuses on the safety significance of the NRC findings and conclusions during an assessment period;

(2) To provide a vehicle for meaningful dialogue with the licensee regarding its safety performance based on the insights gained from synthesis of NRC observations;

(3) To assist NRC management in making sound decisions regarding allocation of NRC resources used to oversee, inspect, and assess licensee performance; and

(4) To provide a method for informing the public of the NRC's assessment of licensee performance.

The SALP program guidance is located in NRC Management Directive 8.6, ''Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP),'' approved July 14, 1993.

Scope of the Review

This review will focus primarily on the effectiveness of the May 19, 1993, changes. General feedback on the SALP program is also invited. Additional detail on the scope of the review is given in the questions below. Commenters are not obligated to and need not address every issue.

In providing comments, please key your response to the number of the applicable question (e.g., ''Response to A.1''). Comments should be as specific as possible. The use of examples is encouraged.

Comments are requested on the following issues:

A. Functional Areas

1. Are the current four functional areas (operations, maintenance, engineering, and plant support) an improvement compared to the previous seven functional areas?

2. Are the plant support functional area messages clear in characterizing individual elements (radiological controls, emergency preparedness, security, fire protection, chemistry, and housekeeping)?

3. Are additional improvements needed for the designation of functional areas? What types of improvements?

B. Management Involvement

1. Did increased NRC management involvement in the SALP program result in program improvements and improved communication with licensee management?

2. Did the SALP program changes result in better licensee and public understanding of the SALP results?

3. Did increased involvement of the regional administrator or deputy at the SALP meeting result in improved communication with licensee management?

4. Was the change in SALP presentation meeting format—from a presentation to more of a discussion—effective in improving communication with licensee management?

5. Are additional improvements needed in the areas of communications with licensee management and licensee and public understanding of SALP results? What types of improvements?

C. Assessment Period

1. What bases should be considered when determining SALP period length and how should they be applied?

2. SALP assessments currently range from 12 to 24 months (nominally 18 month average). Is this variation in practice appropriate?

3. How long should the SALP assessment period be for good, average, and poor performing plants?

D. SALP Report

1. Are the new, shorter SALP reports more effective in communicating the results of the NRC's assessment of safety performance than the previous, more lengthy reports?

2. Are SALP reports appropriately focused on safety issues and do they deliver a clear message?

3. Do SALP reports provide a balanced assessment of licensee safety performance (and are positive aspects of licensee safety performance appropriately considered)?

4. Do SALP reports consistently focus on the last six months of performance? Is this practice appropriate?

5. Is the level of detail in the SALP report appropriate?

6. Are SALP report conclusions well-supported by documented facts?

7. Are SALP report cover letter messages consistent with the associated SALP report messages?

8. Are licensee self-assessment efforts adequately recognized in the SALP report and cover letter?

9. Are additional improvements needed in the SALP reports? What types of improvements?

E. Additional Comments

In addition to the above issues, commenters are invited to provide any other views on the NRC SALP program that could assist the NRC in improving its effectiveness.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 26th day of July 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard W. Borchardt,

Chief, Inspection Program Branch, Directorate for Inspection and Support Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–18808 Filed 7–31–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Privacy Act of 1974; Add a Record System

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

ACTION: Notice to add a record system.

SUMMARY: OPM proposes to add one system of records to its inventory of record systems subject to the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended. This action is necessary to meet the requirements of the Privacy Act to publish in the **Federal Register** notice of the existence and character of record systems maintained by the agency.

DATES: The proposed system of records will be effective without further notice on August 31, 1995, unless comments are received that would result in a contrary determination.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Office of Personnel Management, ATTN: Leslie Crawford (Freedom of Information/Privacy Act Coordinator), Office of Information Technology, 1900 E Street NW., CHP 500, Washington, DC 20415–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Leslie Crawford at (703)908–8565.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The system notice is published under the requirements of the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4)). This notice covers records that may contain individually identifiable information about health care providers (physicians, hospitals and other individuals or entities which furnish health care services or supplies) and other participants excluded from participation in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program (FEHBP), and other federally authorized financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under programs and activities (nonprocurement) administered by OPM. Exclusion may be based on debarment or suspension, ineligibility, or for other reasons.

OPM's Internal and Central system notices were previously published in the **Federal Register** in full on April 12, 1993 (58 FR 19154). OPM's Governmentwide system notices were last published in full on August 10, 1992 (57 FR 35698), with a correction

published on November 30, 1992 (57 FR 56733).

Office of Personnel Management.

Lorraine A. Green,

Deputy Director.

OPM/CENTRAL–14

SYSTEM NAME:

Debarment or Suspension Records for Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHPB).

SYSTEM LOCATION:

Administrative Sanctions Branch, Office of the Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW., Room CHP 1314, Washington, DC 20415–0001.

CATEGORIES OF INDIVIDUALS COVERED BY THE SYSTEM:

Health care providers (physicians, hospitals and other individuals or entities which furnish health care services or supplies) and other participants who have been or are in the process of being debarred, suspended, determined to be ineligible, or otherwise excluded from participating in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program (FEHBP), and other federally authorized financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under programs and activities (nonprocurement) administered by OPM.

CATEGORIES OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

This system contains a listing of health care providers and other participants, debarred, suspended, determined to be ineligible, or otherwise excluded from participation in the FEHBP and other federally authorized financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under programs and activities (non-procurement) administered by OPM. It includes records such as general correspondence, statements of cause, case files, and other related documents.

AUTHORITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING WITH ANY REVISIONS OR AMENDMENTS:

5 U.S.C. Appendix 3, Executive Orders 12549 and 12689, and 5 CFR part 970.

PURPOSE:

Executive Orders 12549 and 12689 provide that Executive departments and agencies participate in a governmentwide system for nonprocurement debarment and suspension. This system of records documents OPM's participation in the program to reduce fraud and abuse in Federal nonprocurement programs and decisions regarding actions taken to exclude participants in Federally authorized nonprocurement programs administered by OPM.

ROUTINE USES OF RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE SYSTEM, INCLUDING CATEGORIES OF USERS AND THE PURPOSES OF SUCH USES:

a. To disclose pertinent information to the appropriate Federal, State, or local agency responsible for investigating, prosecuting, enforcing, or implementing a statute, rule, regulation, or order, where OPM becomes aware of an indication of a violation or potential violation of civil or criminal law or regulation.

b. To disclose information to a Federal agency, in response to its request in connection with the hiring or retention of an employee, the issuance of a security clearance, the conducting of a suitability or security investigation of an individual, the classifying of jobs, the letting of a contract, or the issuance of a license, grant, or other benefit by the requesting agency, to the extent that the information is relevant and necessary to the requesting agency's decision on the matter.

c. To provide information to a congressional office from the record of an individual in response to an inquiry from that congressional office made at the request of that individual.

d. To disclose information to another Federal agency, to a court, or a party in litigation before a court or in an administrative proceeding being conducted by a Federal agency, when the Government is a party to the judicial or administrative proceeding. In those cases where the Government is not a party to the proceeding, records may be disclosed if a subpoena has been signed by a judge.

e. To disclose information to the National Archives and Records Administration for use in records management inspections.

f. By OPM in the production of summary descriptive statistics and analytical studies in support of the function for which the records are collected and maintained, or for related workforce studies. While published studies do not contain individual identifiers, in some instances the selection of elements of data included in the study may be structured in such a way as to make the data individually identifiable by inference.

g. To disclose information to the Department of Justice, or in a proceeding before a court, adjudicative body, or other administrative body before which OPM is authorized to appear, when:

(1) OPM, or any component thereof; or

(2) Any employee of OPM in his or her official capacity; or

(3) Any employee of OPM in his or her individual capacity where the Department of Justice or OPM has agreed to represent the employee; or

(4) The United States, when OPM determines that litigation is likely to affect OPM or any of its components;

is a party to litigation or has an interest in such litigation, and the use of such records by the Department of Justice or OPM is deemed by OPM to be relevant and necessary to the litigation provided, however, that the disclosure is compatible with the purpose for which records were collected.

h. To disclose information to officials of the Merit Systems Protection Board or the Office of the Special Counsel, when requested in connection with appeals, special studies of the civil service and other merit systems, review of OPM rules and regulations, investigations of alleged or possible prohibited personnel practices, and such other functions, e.g., as promulgated in 5 U.S.C. 1205 and 1206, or as may be authorized by law.

i. To disclose information to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission when requested in connection with investigations into alleged or possible discrimination practices in the Federal sector, compliance by Federal agencies with the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures or other functions vested in the Commission and to otherwise ensure compliance with the provisions of 5 U.S. 7201.

j. To disclose information to the Federal Labor Relations Authority or its General Counsel when requested in connection with investigations of allegations of unfair labor practices or matters before the Federal Service Impasses Panel.

k. To disclose information to contractors, grantees, or volunteers performing or working on a contract, service, grant, cooperative agreement, or job for the Federal Government.

1. To disclose records to appropriate Federal, State and local agencies if necessary and relevant to administering Federal financial or nonfinancial assistance programs or benefits.

m. To disclose records for performance of a Federal duty to a State or local agency, or financial institution.

n. To disclose information on excluded health care providers to other persons involved in or affected by the action.

o. To disclose information to agencies or organizations that license, certify, regulate, investigate, or prosecute persons or organizations that provide health-related services or items to

determine possible disqualifying actions, practices, or conditions.

POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR STORING, RETRIEVING, SAFEGUARDING, RETAINING AND DISPOSING OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM: STORAGE:

These records are maintained in paper copy and automated form.

RETRIEVABILITY:

These records are retrieved by name, address, occupation, Social Security Number, and case number.

SAFEGUARDS:

Paper records are stored in lockable filing cabinets or secured rooms. Automated records are protected by ID/ password security system. Records are available only to those persons whose official duties require access.

RETENTION AND DISPOSAL:

Records are placed in inactive files (cut at the end of each fiscal year) when the case is closed. Inactive records are destroyed after 10 years.

SYSTEM MANAGER AND ADDRESS:

Chief, Administrative Sanctions Branch, Office of the Inspector General Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW., Room CHP 1314, Washington, DC 20415–0001.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE:

Individuals wishing to determine whether this system of records contains information on them should contact the system manager indicated above. Individuals must furnish the following for their records to be located and identified:

a. Full name.
b. Case number, if applicable.
c. Address.
d. Date of Birth.
e. Social Security Number and Tax Identification Number.
f. Health Insurance related Identification Number.

RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURE:

Individuals wishing to request access to records should contact the system manager indicated above. Individuals must provide the following information for their records to be located and identified:

a. Full name.
b. Case number, if applicable.
c. Address.
d. Date of Birth.
e. Social Security Number and Tax Identification Number.
f. Health Insurance related Identification Number.

Individuals requesting access must also follow the OPM's Privacy Act regulations regarding verification of identity and access to records (5 CFR part 297).

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURE:

Individuals wishing to request amendment of records should contact the system manager indicated above. Individuals must furnish the following information for their records to be located and identified:

a. Full name.
b. Case number, if applicable.
c. Address.
d. Date of Birth.
e. Social Security Number and Tax Identification Number.
f. Health Insurance related Identification Number.

Individuals requesting amendment must also follow the OPM's Privacy Act regulations regarding verification of identity and amendment of records (5 CFR 297).

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Information in this system of records is obtained from:

a. The individual(s) to whom the record pertain(s).
b. Federal agencies.
c. State and local law enforcement officials.
d. Private agencies and organizations.

[FR Doc. 95–18708 Filed 7–31–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6325–01–M

POSTAL SERVICE

Verification Procedures for Second-Class Publications

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Notice of revised procedures.

SUMMARY: On January 20, 1995, the Postal Service published a notice for public comment in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 4207–4208) concerning revised procedures for conducting verifications of publications authorized for mailing at second-class postage rates. Under the revised procedures, the Postal Service will separate the verification process into two reviews, one for validating correct postage payment and one for determining continued eligibility for second-class authorizations. A postage payment review will be conducted at least once a year for each authorized second-class publication. An eligibility review will be conducted as determined by the Postal Service from circulation data provided by the publisher of an authorized second-class publication.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 31, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward J. Mayhew, (212) 613–8747.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with its statutory responsibilities, the Postal Service must ensure that authorized second-class publications meet all applicable second-class eligibility requirements and that the proper amount of postage is paid on mailings of those second-class publications. See 39 U.S.C. 404, 3685.

The physical inspection of mailings of second-class publications and the examination of records and documentation related to those mailings have been the principal means used by the Postal Service to carry out its statutory responsibilities. A long-standing goal of the Postal Service has been to review all publications on an annual basis. An annual review of every publication, however, has not always been possible at all post offices, particularly those offices where large numbers of different publications are entered at second-class rates.

1. Background

Currently, the Postal Service schedules a second-class publication for review every 1 to 3 years, depending on the number of second-class publications authorized original entry at the post office conducting the review. For the issue of the publication to be examined, the review centers on these two activities:

a. Substantiating that the publication meets second-class eligibility requirements, particularly circulation requirements.

b. Verifying that the mailing statement submitted with the mailing of the publication is complete and the postage payment correct.

After a careful analysis of its review procedures for second-class publications, the Postal Service determined that the current procedures no longer promote the most efficient use of postal resources. On one hand, the Postal Service believes that, for some publications, eligibility reviews do not serve a significant purpose. Where other evidence provides assurance that a publication remains eligible for second-class mailing privileges, an on-site review simply confirms a fact already known. On the other hand, the Postal Service believes that annual postage payment reviews for all publications not only confirm the accuracy of postage payment but also prevent a potential for long-term accumulations of any revenue deficiency that might be discovered during the reviews.

Accordingly, the Postal Service proposed revising its review procedures for second-class publications by separating the procedures along the lines of the two review activities, each