

Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

**John N. Hannon,**

*Director, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-18807 Filed 7-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

### **Intent To Remove the United Technologies Pratt & Whitney Middletown, Conn. Site from the NRC Site Decommissioning Management Plan**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to remove the United Technologies Pratt & Whitney Middletown, Connecticut site from the NRC Site Decommissioning Management Plan.

**SUMMARY:** This is a notice to inform the public that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering removing the United Technologies Pratt & Whitney Middletown, Connecticut site from the NRC Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP). The NRC expects to determine that remediation of residual radioactive contamination in a building on the site has successfully been completed and the facility meets the current NRC criteria for release for unrestricted use.

**DATES:** The NRC hereby provides notice of an opportunity to comment on the proposed NRC action. Comments must be submitted within thirty (30) days of the date of publication of this **Federal Register** notice.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to USNRC, Region I, Attn: Mark Roberts, Senior Health Physicist, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406. Hand deliver comments to 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406 between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark Roberts, Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards, USNRC, Region I, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406, Telephone: (610) 337-5094.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The United Technologies Pratt & Whitney site in Middletown, Connecticut was identified in 1992 by the NRC as a site where residual radioactive contamination might be present above NRC criteria as a result of past operations. Radioactive contamination was identified by Pratt & Whitney in

one of the buildings on the site. In order to ensure that remediation of the building was accomplished in a timely manner, the NRC added this site to its SDMP. Pratt & Whitney has remediated residual contamination in the building, performed radiological surveys in that building and other buildings where radioactive materials may have been used, and requested by letter dated April 27, 1995, that the NRC remove the Middletown, Connecticut site from the SDMP. The request before the NRC at this time is to concur with the view of Pratt & Whitney that the site meets the current criteria for release for unrestricted use and thus can be released for unrestricted use and removed from the SDMP.

The staff of the NRC's Region I Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards has reviewed and approved various remediation activities since 1992. The staff has also reviewed various records of past activities at the site and the radiological surveys performed by Pratt & Whitney's contractor and conducted confirmatory radiological measurements at the site. The NRC staff has not yet completed all of these reviews, but, based on information available at this time, expects to determine that the facility meets the requirements for release for unrestricted use and to remove the site from the SDMP in 1995.

For further details with respect to this action, documents are available for inspection at the NRC's Region I offices located at 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406. Persons desiring to review documents at the Region I Office should call Ms. Cheryl Buracker at (610) 337-5093 several days in advance to assure that the documents will be readily available for review.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Michael F. Weber,**

*Chief, Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 95-18809 Filed 7-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

### **Review of Revised NRC Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) Program**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is reviewing its Systematic Assessment of Licensee

Performance (SALP) program that was last revised on May 19, 1993. Public comments are requested on the revised program and its implementation. The NRC is soliciting comments from interested public interest groups, the regulated industry, States, and concerned citizens. Comments received will be used in the NRC's review of the SALP program.

**DATES:** The comment period expires August 31, 1995. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit written comments to: Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publication Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: T-6D-59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Hand deliver comments to: 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:45 am and 4:15 pm on Federal workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David L. Gamberoni, Mail Stop: O-12E-4, Inspection Program Branch, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone (301) 415-1144.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

The Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) has begun a review of the implementation of the SALP program. The SALP program was revised on May 19, 1993, to improve the focus on significant performance issues, communication with licensees, and licensees' and the public's understanding of SALP results. Specific program changes included reducing the number of functional areas from seven to four, changing the board membership to Senior Executive Service (SES) members, shortening the SALP report, eliminating the draft initial report, changing the nature of the SALP meeting with the licensee from a presentation to more of a discussion, and focusing on the last six months of performance. Implementation of the revised program began for assessment periods ending after July 19, 1993.

This review will attempt to determine if the revisions to the SALP program have been effective in focusing the SALP reports on significant performance issues and have resulted in

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