

between different voltage levels; (2) to prevent exceeding the vendor-specified thermal limits on motors, containment electrical penetrations and cable insulation systems; (3) to allow starting of electrical equipment under degraded voltage conditions; and (4) to provide adequate pre-trip alarms, when applicable.

- The adequacy of setpoints and time delays for other protective relays for attributes such as undervoltage, underfrequency, reverse power, ground faults, differential current, thermal overload and phase synchronization to assure functionality of the EDS.

- That mechanical loads, such as pump horsepower, correspond to actual system operating points during normal and accident conditions and have been correctly translated to electrical loads and incorporated in the electrical load list as appropriate.

- That surveillance and test procedures are adequate to demonstrate the functionality of the equipment or system being tested or the design assumptions being verified.

NRC inspectors (including NRC contractors) assigned to the EDSFI teams attended a week-long course (held in September and December 1990) to enhance their knowledge of EDSs, the TI and related requirements. Using the guidance provided by the TI and the EDSFI training course, the EDSFI teams then conducted inspections of the EDSs through early 1994 at most operating nuclear power plants. As a result, numerous deficiencies were identified and documented in plant-specific EDSFI inspection reports, and corrective actions were taken. Those corrective actions were subsequently evaluated, found acceptable by the staff and documented in follow-up inspection reports. Many of these deficiencies and corrective actions were listed in IN 93-99 and include incorrect UVR relay and thermal overload setpoints caused by design errors, as well as other points raised by the Petitioner.

In summary, as stated in my April 17, 1996, letter, I believe the NRC staff recognized the existence of repeated errors and widespread EDS design deficiencies, including those associated with UVR SPs, took appropriate actions (conducted EDSFIs, identified deficiencies, required corrective actions) based on those observations, and made all licenses aware of typical design deficiencies encountered during EDSFIs and licensees' self-initiated efforts by issuing INs such as IN 91-29, "Deficiencies Identified During Electrical Distribution System Functional Inspections," its supplements, and IN 93-99.

Additionally, the staff has continued to inform power reactor licensees of other design deficiencies when they are encountered (e.g., IN 95-37 which discusses UVR setpoints in relationship to inadequate offsite power system voltages during design-basis events) and will continue to do so in the future when necessary. Such action by the staff is appropriate to address repeated errors in UVR setpoints and EDS designs and to provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection of public health and safety.

III. Conclusion

The institution of proceedings pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 is appropriate only if substantial health and safety issues have been raised. See *Consolidated Edison Co. of New York* (Indian Point Units 1, 2, and 3) CLI-75-8, 2 NRC 173, 175 (1975) and *Washington Public Power Supply System* (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2) DD-84-7, 19 NRC 899, 924 (1984). This is the standard that has been applied to the concerns raised by the Petitioner to determine whether the action requested by the Petitioner, or enforcement action, is warranted.

On the basis of the preceding assessment, I have concluded that no substantial health and safety issues have been raised by the Petitioner that would warrant the action requested by the Petitioner. I further conclude that the Petitioner's concerns have been adequately addressed by the staff and that there is no need for a third party review. Additionally, with regard to plants with UVRs that cannot be properly set, the staff has shown in plant-specific evaluations, such as described above, that other alternative designs are acceptable.

The Petitioner's request for action pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 is denied. As provided for in 10 CFR 2.206(c), a copy of the decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review. The decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes review of the decision in that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26 day of September, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-29459 Filed 11-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Budget Analysis Branch; Sequestration Update Report

AGENCY: Office of Management and Budget—Budget Analysis Branch.

ACTION: Notice of transmittal of final sequestration report to the President and Congress.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 254(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Control Act of 1985, as amended, the Office of Management and Budget hereby reports that it has submitted its Final Sequestration Report to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Balis, Budget Analysis Branch—202/395-4574.

Dated: November 13, 1996.

John B. Arthur,

Associate Director for Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-29599 Filed 11-14-96; 2:30 pm]

BILLING CODE 3110-01-P

POSTAL SERVICE

Board of Governors; Amendment to Closed Sunshine Act Meeting Agenda

“FEDERAL REGISTER” CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: 61 FR 54245, October 17, 1996, and 61 FR 56576, November 1, 1996.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED DATE OF MEETING: November 4, 1996.

CHANGE: Addition of the following item to the closed meeting agenda:

1. Consideration of Exercising the Board's Reserved Approval Authority With Respect to Performance of a Prototype for the Tray Management Systems.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Thomas J. Koerber, (202) 268-4800.

At its meeting on November 4, 1996, the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service voted unanimously to add to the agenda, “consideration of exercising the Board's reserved approval authority with respect to performance of a prototype for the tray management systems,” and that discussion on the item was closed to the public pursuant to section 552b(c)(9)(B) of title 5, United States Code; and § 7.3(i) of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, and that no earlier announcement was possible.

In accordance with section 552b(f)(1) of title 5, United States Code, and § 7.6(a) of title 39, Code of Federal