sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If the amendment is issued before the expiration of the 30-day hearing period, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. If a hearing is requested, the final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248–5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to John N. Hannon: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street NW., Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 4, 1995, which 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 Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of August 1995.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Tae Kim,

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

[FR Doc. 95–20112 Filed 8–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Office of Management and Budget Review

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of the Office of Management and Budget review of information collection.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has recently submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

1. Type of submission, new, revised, or extension: Revision.

2. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR Parts 60, 72, 73, and 75—Safeguards for Spent Nuclear Fuel of High-Level Radioactive Waste, Proposed Rule.

3. The form number if applicable: Not applicable.

4. How often the collection is required: On occasion.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: As safeguards events occur: Independent spent fuel storage installations, power reactors that have permanently ceased operations, DOE's monitored retrievable storage installations, and DOE's geologic repository operations area.

6. An estimate of the total number of respondents: none required.

7. An estimate of the total number of hours needed to complete the requirement or request: reporting—none; recordkeeping—none; total—none.

8. An indication whether Section 3504(h), Pub. L. 95–511 applies: Applicable.

9. Abstract: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is proposing to amend its regulations for the safeguards of spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste. This action is necessary to clarify the safeguards requirements for spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste stored at independent spent fuel storage installations, power reactors that have permanently ceased operations, monitored retrievable storage installations, and a geological repository operations area.

Copies of the submittal may be inspected or obtained for a fee from the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

Comments and questions can be directed by mail to the OMB reviewer: Troy Hillier, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, (3150–0002,–0127,–0132), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3084. The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda J. Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 95–20028 Filed 8–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–298]

Nebraska Public Power District; Cooper Nuclear Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the revocation of an

exemption from the requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50 previously issued to the Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD or the licensee) for the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS), located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revoke an exemption from the requirements of Section III.G of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50, previously issued to the licensee on September 21, 1983.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's request for withdrawal of the exemption dated December 16, 1994.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to eliminate unnecessary commitment by the licensee to upgrade certain fire barriers, which was made in connection with the exemption in question regarding the Critical Switchgear Rooms 1F and 1G on the 932 foot elevation of the reactor building.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed revocation of exemption is appropriate. The revocation of the exemption would allow the licensee to change a previous commitment to upgrade the fire barriers for the electrical bus duct penetrations in Critical Switchgear Rooms 1F and 1G. This commitment formed part of the basis upon which the staff granted the previous exemption.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological 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 action, the staff considered denial of the requested withdrawal of the exemption. Denial of the requested action 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 for the Cooper Nuclear Station, dated February 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 21, 1995, the staff consulted with the Nebraska State official, Ms. Julia Schmidt, Division of Radiological Health, Nebraska Department of Health, 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 this action, see the licensee's request for withdrawal of exemption dated December 16, 1994, and the exemption dated September 21, 1983, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the Commission's Local Public Document Room at the Auburn Public Library, 118 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68305.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James R. Hall,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–20026 Filed 8–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Notice

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44907 D(1), on May 4, 1995, I notified the government of the Philippines that I had determined the Ninoy Aquino International Airport, Manila, Philippines, did not administer and maintain effective security measures. On August 2, 1995, 90 days elapsed since my determination, and I have found that Ninoy Aquino International Airport still does not administer and maintain effective security measures. My determination is based on Federal Aviation Administration assessments which reveal that security measures used at the airport do not meet the standards established by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44907 D(1), I have directed that a copy of this notice be published in the **Federal Register,** that my determination be displayed prominently in all U.S. airports regularly being served by scheduled air carrier operations, and that the news media be notified of my determination. In addition, as a result of this determination, all U.S. air carriers and foreign air carriers (and their agents) providing service between the United States and Ninoy Aquino International Airport must provide notice of my determination to any passenger purchasing a ticket for transportation between the United States and Ninoy Aquino International Airport, with such notice to be made by written material included on or with such ticket.

Dated: August 8, 1995.

Federico Peña,

Secretary of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 95–20016 Filed 8–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–62–P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95–70; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban Multi-Purpose Passenger Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban multi-purpose passenger