the fuel storage racks providing geometric spacing of fuel assemblies in their storage locations, and administrative controls imposed on fuel handling procedures. Technical Specifications requirements specify reactivity limits for the fuel storage racks and minimum spacing between the fuel assemblies in the storage racks.

Appendix A of 10 CFR Part 50,—General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants, Criterion 62, requires the criticality in the fuel storage and handling system shall be prevented by physical systems or processes, preferably by use of geometrically-safe configurations. This is met at PVNGS, as identified in the Technical Specifications and the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). PVNGS Technical Specifications Section 5.3.1.3, states that the new fuel storage racks are designed and shall be maintained with Keff less than or equal to 0.95, if fully flooded with unborated water, and less than or equal to 0.98, if moderated by aqueous foam, and a nominal 17-inch center to center distance between fuel assemblies placed in the storage racks. UFSAR Section 9.1.1.1, New Fuel Storage Design Bases, states that accidental criticality shall be prevented for the most reactive arrangement of new fuel stored, with optimum moderation, by assuring that Keff is less than 0.98, under normal and accident conditions. UFSAR Section 9.1.1.3, Safety Evaluation, states that the new fuel rack design and location ensures that the design bases of Section 9.1.1.1 are met.

The proposed exemption would not result in any significant radiological impacts. The proposed exemption would not affect radiological plant effluent nor cause any significant occupational exposures since the Technical Specifications, design controls (including geometric spacing of fuel assembly storage spaces) and administrative controls preclude inadvertent criticality. The amount of radioactive waste would not be changed by the proposed exemption.

The proposed exemption does not result in any significant non-radiological environmental impacts. The proposed exemption involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed exemption, the staff considered denial of the requested exemption. Denial of the request 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 does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the ''Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3,'' dated February 1982, (NUREG–0841).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 3, 1997, the staff consulted with the Arizona State official, Mr. William Wright of the Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the 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 action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated March 28, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, which is located at The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document room located at the Phoenix Public Library, 1221 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James Clifford,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–13781 Filed 5–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Save Wills Creek Water Resources Committee Receipt of Petition and Issuance of a Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated July 22, 1996, Sherwood Bauman, on behalf of the Save Wills Creek Water Resources Committee, requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) take action with regard to Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation and Foote Mineral Company (now Cyprus Foote Mineral Company). Specifically, the Petitioner requested NRC to take the following actions:

(1) NRC should reinstate Foote Mineral's original license so that Shieldalloy and Cyprus Foote become co-responsible licensees concerning the proper remediation and decommissioning of the Shieldalloy site;

(2) Any and all parties involved in any wrongdoing, as alleged in the Petitioner's letter, should be terminated from employment, and where appropriate, criminal charges pursued;

(3) NRC should terminate the development of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Shieldalloy site;

(4) In place of the EIS, Shieldalloy and Cyprus Foote should be jointly ordered to submit a decommissioning plan for licensed material that includes only a plan to remediate licensed material, including grading and evaluation of all various assorted options. One option considered should be offsite disposal at a licensed disposal facility; and

(5) The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) and Ohio Department of Health should evaluate all unlicensed slag found at the Shieldalloy site.

As a basis for the request, the Petitioner asserts that there has been collusion among agencies and responsible parties to remediate offsite slag, that NRC failed to properly police Foote Mineral for a period of 12 years, and that NRC then allowed Foote Mineral to retire its license without investigating the licensee's claims that no licensable materials remained onsite. The Petitioner also asserts that NRC illegally allowed Foote Mineral to return slag to a site owned by Shieldalloy, in the process conspiring with State of Ohio agencies.

The Petitioner further argues that Shieldalloy has a decommissioning plan that would wrongfully mix licensed and unlicensed waste. In support of this claim, he states his belief that the material at the Shieldalloy site is made up of 150,000 tons of licensed material and 350,000 tons of nonlicensed material. The Petitioner believes that Shieldalloy's decommissioning plan illegally combined both licensed and

unlicensed materials, thus greatly reducing the real risk factors from exposure to licensed material and wrongfully enhancing the company's own preferred plan for in-situ disposal, which would require the NRC to waive enforcement rules and regulations. The Petitioner also alleges an NRC-Ohio conspiracy to allow in-situ disposal to proceed.

The NRC response to the Petitioner's requests have been evaluated by the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. After review of the Petition, the Director has denied the Petitioner's requests.

The Director's Decision concluded that no health and safety issues have been raised regarding Shieldalloy or Cyprus Foote that would require the actions requested by the Petitioner. The Petitioner has not provided any information in support of his requests of which the NRC was not already aware. The complete ''Director's Decision under 10 C.F.R. 2.206'' (DD–97–12) is available for public inspection in the Commission's Public Document Room located at 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20555. The Director's Decision is also available on the NRC Electronic Bulletin Board at 1–(800)–952–9676.

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 14th day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Malcolm R. Knapp,

Deputy Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97–13778 Filed 5–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Submission for OMB Emergency Clearance of the Revised Information Collection RI 10–72

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for emergency clearance of the following revised information collection. RI 10–72, Client Satisfaction Survey, is used to determine how well the U.S. Office of Personnel Management has served Federal civil service annuitants and survivor annuitants.

The questionnaire will be sent to approximately 1500 annuitants and will require approximately 25 minutes to complete. The annual estimated burden is 625 hours.

For copies of this proposal, contact Jim Farron on (202) 418–3208, or E-mail to jmfarron@mail.opm.gov.

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before June 2, 1997. OMB will have 5 calendar days to act after the close of this **Federal Register** Notice.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to Chris Brown, Chief, Management Information Branch, Quality Assurance Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW, Room 4316, Washington, DC 20415–0001.

FOR INFORMATION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION CONTACT: Mary Beth Smith-Toomey, Management Services Division, (202) 606–0623.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

James B. King,

Director.

[FR Doc. 97–13628 Filed 5–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–01–M′

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

Extension:

Rule 12b–1, SEC File No. 270–188, OMB Control No. 3235–0212
Rule 17f–1, SEC File No. 270–236, OMB Control No. 3235–0222
Form N–SAR, SEC File No. 270–292, OMB Control No. 3235–0330
Form N–17f–1, SEC File No. 270–316, OMB Control No. 3235–0359
N–17f–2, SEC File No. 270–317, OMB Control No. 3235–0360
Form ADV–E, SEC File No. 270–318, OMB Control No. 3235–0361
30b2–1, SEC File No. 270–213, OMB Control No. 3235–0220

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, DC 20549.

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget requests for extension of the previously approved collections of information discussed below.

Rule 12b–1 under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (''1940 Act'') permits a registered open-end management investment company (''mutual fund'') to distribute its own shares and pay expenses of distribution provided, among other things, the mutual fund adopts a written plan, and has in writing any agreements relating to the implementation of the plan. The rule requires the plan to be approved by the mutual fund's directors and shareholders; provides for quarterly reports to the board regarding amounts spent under the plan; requires the board to review the plan at least annually; requires board and shareholder approval for certain changes to the plan; and imposes certain recordkeeping requirements.

It is estimated that approximately 4,165 mutual funds rely on the rule each year, and the average annual burden per fund is estimated to be 40 hours. The total annual burden for all mutual funds relying on the rule is estimated to be 166,600 hours.

Rule 17f–1 under the 1940 Act provides that any registered management investment company (''fund'') that wishes to place its assets in the custody of a national securities exchange may do so only pursuant to a written contract that must ratified initially and approved annually by a majority of the fund's board of directors and that contains certain specified provisions. The rule also requires that the fund's assets in such custody be examined by an independent public account at least three times during the fund's fiscal year. The rule requires the written contract and the certificate of each examination to be transmitted to the Commission. The annual burden of the rule's requirements is estimated to be about 2½ hours for each of approximately 31 funds that maintain their assets with a national securities exchange, for an estimated total of 77.5 burden hours annually.

Form N–SAR under the 1940 Act is used by registered investment companies for annual or semi-annual reports required to be filed with the Commission. The annual burden is approximately to 31.5 hours.

Form N–17f–1 is the cover sheet for accountant examination certificates filed pursuant to rule 17f–1 under the 1940 Act by management investment companies maintaining securities or other investments with companies that