design safety factor of 10 and was subjected to a 200-percent overload test followed by magnetic particle inspection prior to initial operation. Protection against wire rope wear and fatigue damage are ensured by scheduled inspection and maintenance. The special lifting device used for cask movement is designed to support 6 times the weight of the fully loaded cask and was subjected to a 300-percent overload test by the manufacturer. The lifting device undergoes dimensional testing, visual inspection, and nondestructive testing every 12 months (plus or minus 25 percent).

A single-failure-proof crane, such as the crane at Prairie Island, that has become immobilized by failure of components while holding a load, is able to hold the load or set the load down while adjustments or repairs are made. Safety features and emergency devices permit manual operation to accomplish this task. Two separate magnetic brakes are provided as well as an emergency drum band brake. Each magnetic brake provides a braking force of at least 150 percent of rated load. The emergency drum brake assures that the load can be safely lowered even if power is lost to the crane. Because of the large design margins and the ability to withstand a failure of any single component, the NRC staff does not postulate a load drop from a single-failure-proof crane.

After the incident on May 13, 1995, the Licensee temporarily removed the crane from service for testing. The Licensee and the crane vendor performed testing on the crane to analyze the event and assure the crane was operable. The Licensee's analysis of the May 13, 1995, incident found the problem to be an improperly calibrated load cell (a load cell is a device that measures the load being lifted by the crane and provides input to an overload-sensing device). It was determined that the actual load was less than what was being sensed by the overload-sensing device. The function of the overload-sensing device is to stop the operation of the crane when the load reaches a predetermined value. This prevents loading the crane beyond its rated load by maintaining loads within the design working limit, thereby maintaining safety and the physical integrity of the crane system.

Since the design-rated load of the crane was not exceeded during the incident, there is no reason to assume that the crane cannot continue to operate safely. Even if the rated load had been exceeded, an analysis would be needed to determine how much the rated load was exceeded and if that amount is significant. When cranes are built, manufacturers conduct proof tests at a load above rated load. The proof test for this crane was 25 percent higher than the 125-ton design-rated load for the main hoist (i.e., the proof test was 156.25 tons).

With regard to the Petitioners' comment about metal fatigue, metal fatigue is a condition that results from cyclic stress. Cyclic stress is produced by repeated loading and unloading. The crane is designed to handle all loading and unloading cycles during the life of the plant, including construction and operating periods. A single static (constant) load such as the load in question, does not produce the cyclic stress that causes metal fatigue. The Petitioners' contention that it was never contemplated that the Prairie Island polar crane hold a load of 123.75 tons inches above the surface of the reactor pool for 16 hours is incorrect. The contemplated failure mechanism of a single-failure proof crane is to hold the load safely at any location until the load can be safely moved. Because of the large design margins, the length of time that a design-rated load (or a load less than design rated) is on the hook of a single-failure-proof crane is inconsequential.

With regard to cable and cable mechanisms (also known as the reeving system and lifting devices), the crane is provided with a balanced dual reeving system with each wire rope capable of supporting the maximum critical load (if a load being held by a crane can be a direct or indirect cause of release of radioactivity, the load is called a critical load). The hydraulic load equalizing system allows transfer of the load to the remaining rope, without overstressing it, in the event of a failure of one rope. Protection against wire rope wear and fatigue damage are ensured by scheduled inspection and maintenance.

In conclusion, NRC agrees with the Licensee in its determination that the cause of the incident was an incorrectly calibrated load cell. This cause was documented in NRC Inspection Report 95–006, issued June 27, 1995. NRC has determined that the Licensee met the design and testing requirements established in industry standards for the control of heavy loads such as a dry storage cask, that the overload-sensing device worked as designed, and that no safety issue was involved in the Licensee's use of the auxiliary building crane and associated cask handling equipment to move the cask. Therefore, the Petitioners' requests for suspension of NSP's licenses for the Prairie Island units until physical testing and safety analyses can be performed on the crane are denied.

IV. Conclusion

Petitioners requested an immediate suspension of NSP's licenses for Prairie Island Units 1 and 2 until corrective actions of potentially hazardous conditions would be taken by NSP and NRC with regard to issues identified in the Petition. The institution of a proceeding in response to a request for action under 10 CFR 2.206 is appropriate only when 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, 176 (1975), and *Washington Public Power Supply System* (WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2), DD–84–7, 19 NRC 899, 923 (1984). I have applied this standard to determine if any action is warranted in response to the matters raised by the Petitioners. Each of the claims by the Petitioners has been reviewed. The available information is sufficient to conclude that no substantial safety issue has been raised regarding the operation of Prairie Island Units 1 and 2. Therefore, I conclude that, for the reasons discussed above, no adequate basis exists for granting Petitioners' requests for immediate suspension of NSP's licenses for Prairie Island Units 1 and 2.

A copy of this decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission to review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c).

As provided by this regulation, this decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance, unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the decision with that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of November, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank J. Miraglia,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–30949 Filed 12–04–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

1997 Railroad Experience Rating Proclamations

AGENCY: Railroad Retirement Board.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Railroad Retirement Board is required by paragraph (1) of section 8(c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (Act) (45 U.S.C. 358(c)(1)), as amended by Public Law 100–647, to proclaim by October 15

of each year certain system-wide factors used in calculating experience-based employer contribution rates for the following year. The Railroad Retirement Board is further required by section 8(c)(2) of the Act to publish the amounts so determined and proclaimed. Pursuant to section 8(c)(2), the Railroad Retirement Board gives notice of the following system-wide factors used in the computation of individual employer contribution rates for 1997:

(1) The balance to the credit of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance (RUI) Account, as of June 30, 1996, is $136,017,033.90;

(2) The balance of any new loans to the Account, including accrued interest, is zero;

(3) The system compensation base is $2,724,133,182.21;

(4) The system unallocated charge balance is −$185,148,121.98;

(5) The pooled credit ratio is zero;

(6) The pooled charge ratio is zero;

(7) The surcharge rate is zero.

DATES: The balance in notice (1) and the determinations made in notices (3) through (7) are based on data as of June 30, 1996. The balance in notice (2) is based on data as of September 30, 1996. The determinations made in notices (5) through (7) apply to the calculation, under section 8(a)(1)(C) of the Act, of employer contribution rates for 1997.

ADDRESSES: Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gerald E. Helmling, Chief of Experience Rating, Office of Programs—Policy and Systems, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611–2092, telephone (312) 751–4567.

Dated: November 26, 1996.

By authority of the Board.

Beatrice Ezerski,

Secretary to the Board.

[FR Doc. 96–30977 Filed 12–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7905–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

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

Extensions:

Form T–1, SEC File No. 270–121, OMB Control No. 3235–0110

Form T–2, SEC File No. 270–122, OMB Control No. 3235–0111

Form T–3, SEC File No. 270–123, OMB Control No. 3235–0105

Form T–4, SEC File No. 270–124, OMB Control No. 3235–0107

Form T–6, SEC File No. 270–344, OMB Control No. 3235–0391

Form 11–K, SEC File No. 270–101, OMB Control No. 3235–0082

Rule 14f–1, SEC File No. 270–127, OMB Control No. 3235–0108

Rule 12d1–3, SEC File No. 270–116, OMB Control No. 3235–0109

Form SR, SEC File No. 270–120, OMB Control No. 3235–0124

Rules 7a–15 through 7a–37, SEC File No. 270–115, OMB Control No. 3235–0132

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'') is publishing the following summaries of collections for public comment.

Form T–1 is a statement of eligibility under the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (''TIA'') of a corporation designated to act as a trustee. It is filed by an estimated 500 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 7,500 hours.

Form T–2 is a statement of eligibility under the TIA of an individual designated to act as a trustee. It is filed by an estimated 36 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 324 hours.

Form T–3 is used for applications for the qualification of trust indentures. It is filed by an estimated 55 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 2,365 hours.

Form T–4 is used to apply for exemption pursuant to Section 304(c) of the TIA. It is filed by an estimated 3 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 15 hours.

Form T–6 is used to apply under Section 310(a)(1) of the TIA for determination of eligibility of a foreign person to act as institutional trustee. It is filed by an estimated 15 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 255 hours.

TIA Rules 7a–15 through j7a–37 set forth general requirements as to the form and content of applications, statements and reports required to be made under the TIA. The burden hours resulting from these requirements are reflected in the FIA forms and Rules 7a–15 through 7a–37 therefore are collectively assigned only one burden hour for administrative convenience.

Form SR is used to report sales of securities and use of proceeds therefrom. The Commission has proposed that this form be eliminated. Form SR is filed by an estimated 2,566 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 14,113 hours.

Form 11–K is an annual report of certain types of employee benefit plans. It is filed by an estimated 774 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 23,220 hours.

Rule 14f–1 requires issuers to file information in connection with a change in the majority of their directors. Rule 14f–1 submissions are filed by an estimated 44 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 792 hours.

Rule 12d1–3 sets forth requirements concerning certification that a security has been approved by an exchange for listing and registration pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Rule 12d1–3 submissions are filed by an estimated 688 respondents for a total estimated annual burden of 344 hours.

The information provided by the above forms and submissions is needed to ensure compliance with the requirements of the TIA, Securities Act of 1933 and Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Trustees and corporate issuers are the likely respondents.

Written comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted in writing within 60 days of this publication.

Direct your written comments to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20549.

Dated: November 22, 1996.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–30942 Filed 12–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M