DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before September 12, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments are to be submitted to the Docket Office, Docket No. ICR–97–32, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. Telephone: (202) 219–7894. Written comments limited to 10 pages or less in length may also be transmitted by facsimile to (202) 219-5046.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Sauger, Directorate of Safety Standards Programs, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–3605, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. Telephone: (202) 219-7202, Ext. 137. Copies of the referenced information collection request are available for inspection and copying in the Docket Office and will be mailed to persons who request copies by telephoning Theda Kennedy at (202) 219-8061, ext. 100, or Barbara Bielaski at (202) 219–8076, ext. 142. For electronic copies of the Information Collection Request on the certification provision of Servicing Multi-piece and Single Piece Rim Wheels, contact OSHA's WebPage on the Internet at http://www.osha.gov/and click on ''standards.''

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act) authorizes the promulgation of such health and safety standards as are necessary or appropriate to provide safe or healthful employment and places of employment. The statute specifically authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidents.

The inspection certification records required in 29 CFR 1910.177(d)(3)(iv) are necessary to assure compliance with the requirement for multi-piece and single piece rim wheels. Included in that standard is a requirement for the employer to ensure that restraining devices and barriers (restraining devices or restraints) are used when large vehicle tires are inflated. Each device is required to be inspected prior to each day's use and after any accident. Any restraining device that is damaged must be immediately removed from service. Any damaged restraining device that has been removed from service. Any damaged restraining device that has been removed from service cannot be reused until it is repaired and reinspected. When the repairs require component replacement or rewelding, the repaired device must be certified by the manufacturer or a registered professional engineer as meeting the strength requirements of 29 CFR 1910.177(d)(3)(iv).

II. Current Actions

This notice requests an extension of the current Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of the inspection certification requirement contained in 29 CFR 1910.177(d)(3)(iv)—Servicing Multi-piece and Single Piece Rim Wheels (currently approved under OMB Control No. 1218–0210).

Type of Review: Extension.

Agency: U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Title: Servicing Multi-piece and Single Piece Rim Wheels.

OMB Number: 1218.

Agency Number: ICR–37–32.

Frequency: Varies.

Affected Public: State of local governments; Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 80.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 6 hours.

Total Annualized Capital/Startup Costs: $0.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 7th day of July 1997.

John F. Martonik,

Acting Director, Directorate of Safety Standards Programs.

[FR Doc. 97–18401 Filed 7–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 97–095]

Agency Information Collection: Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

SUMMARY: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before August 13, 1997.

ADDRESSES: All comments should be addressed to Ms. Lois Ryno, Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Greenbelt Road, Greenbelt, MD 20771–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Carmela Simonson, NASA Reports Officer, (202) 358–1223.

Reports

Title: Locator and Information Services Tracking System (LISTS).

OMB Number: 2700–0064.

Type of Review: Reinstatement.

Need and Uses: The LIST System is used primarily to support services on the Center dependent upon accurate locator-type information.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 13,111.

Responses Per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Annual Responses: 13,111.

Estimated Hours Per Request: .083.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 1088.21.

Frequency of Report: As required.

Donald J. Andreotta,

Deputy Chief Information Officer (Operations), Office of the Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–18433 Filed 7–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–3 and 50–247]

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc; Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 1 and 2

Notice is hereby given that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an Order approving, under 10 CFR 50.80, an application regarding the proposed corporate restructuring of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Con Edison), the licensee for Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 1 and 2. By letter dated December 24, 1996, Con Edison informed the Commission that it is proposing to become a wholly owned subsidiary of a newly created holding company, which will be named at a later date. Con Edison will remain the holder of its licenses for Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 1 and 2. Under the restructuring, the holders of Con Edison common stock will become the holders of common stock of the holding company on a share-for-share basis. After the restructuring, Con Edison will continue to be a public utility providing the same utility services as it did immediately prior to the restructuring.

According to the application, there will be no effect on the management, or sources of funds for operation, maintenance, or decommissioning, of Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 1 and 2 due to the corporate restructuring.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.80, the Commission may approve the transfer of control of a license after notice to interested persons. Such approval is contingent upon the Commission's determination that the holder of the license following the transfer is qualified to hold the license and that the transfer is otherwise consistent with applicable provisions of law, regulations, and orders of the Commission.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated December 24, 1996. This document is 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 White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10610.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 7th day of July 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jefferey F. Harold,

Project Manager, Project Directorate I–1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–18363 Filed 7–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–413 and 50–414]

Duke Power Company, et al.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–35 and NPF–52 issued to the Duke Power Company, et al. (DPC or the licensee) for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina.

The proposed amendments, requested by the licensee in a letter dated May 27, 1997, would represent a full conversion from the current Technical Specifications (TS) to a set of TS based on NUREG–1431, Revision 1, ''Standard Technical Specifications—Westinghouse Plants,'' dated April 1995. NUREG–1431 has been developed through working groups composed of both NRC staff members and industry representatives and has been endorsed by the staff as part of an industry-wide initiative to standardize and improve TS. As part of this submittal, the licensee has applied the criteria contained in the Commission's ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors (Final Policy Statement),'' published in the **Federal Register** on July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132), to the current Catawba TS, and, using NUREG–1431 as a basis, developed a proposed set of improved TS for Catawba. The criteria in the Final Policy Statement were subsequently added to 10 CFR 50.36, ''Technical Specifications,'' in a rule change, which was published in the **Federal Register** on July 19, 1995 (60 FR 36953) and became effective on August 18, 1995.

The licensee has categorized the proposed changes to the existing TS into five general groupings. These groupings are characterized as administrative changes, relocated changes, more restrictive changes, less restrictive changes, and removed detail changes.

Administrative changes are those that involve restructuring, renumbering, rewording, interpretation, and complex rearranging of requirements and other changes not affecting technical content or substantially revising an operational requirement. The reformatting, renumbering, and rewording processes reflect the attributes of NUREG–1431 and do not involve technical changes to the existing TS. The proposed changes include: (a) providing the appropriate numbers, etc., for NUREG–1431 bracketed information (information which must be supplied on a plant-specific basis, and which may change from plant to plant), (b) identifying plant-specific wording for system names, etc., and (c) changing NUREG–1431 section wording to conform to existing licensee practices. Such changes are administrative in nature and do not impact initiators of analyzed events or assumed mitigation of accident or transient events.

More restrictive changes are those involving more stringent requirements for operation of the facility or eliminate existing flexibility. These more stringent requirements do not result in operation that will alter assumptions relative to mitigation of an accident or transient event. The more restrictive requirements will not alter the operation of process variables, structures, systems and components described in the safety analyses. For each requirement in the current Catawba TS that is more restrictive than the corresponding requirement in NUREG–1431, which the licensee proposes to retain in the improved Technical Specifications (ITS), the licensee has provided an explanation of why it has concluded that retaining the more restrictive requirement is desirable to ensure safe operation of the facilities because of specific design features of the plant.

Less restrictive changes are those where current requirements are relaxed or eliminated, or new flexibility is provided. The more significant ''less restrictive'' requirements are justified on a case-by-case basis. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit, their removal from the TS may be appropriate. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of (a) generic NRC actions, (b) new NRC staff positions that have evolved from technological advancements and operating experience, or (c) resolution of the Owners Groups' comments on the ITS. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG–1431 were reviewed by the staff and found to be acceptable because they are consistent with current licensing practices and NRC regulations. The licensee's design will be reviewed to determine if the specific design basis and licensing basis are consistent with the technical basis for the model requirements in NUREG–1431 and, thus, provides a basis for these revised TS or if relaxation of the requirements in the current TS is warranted based on the justification provided by the licensee.

Removed detail changes move details from the current TS to a licensee-controlled document. The details being removed from the current TS are considered not to be initiators of any analyzed events nor required to mitigate accidents or transients. Therefore, such removals do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Moving some details to licensee-controlled documents will not involve a significant change in design or operation of the plant and no hardware is being added to the plant as part of the proposed changes to the current TS. The changes will not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis and licensing basis. Therefore, the changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The changes do not reduce the margin of safety since they have no impact on any safety analysis assumptions. In addition, the details to be moved from the current