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 nonradiological environmental impacts. The proposed exemption involves 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 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 Oconee Nuclear Station Units 1, 2, and 3'' dated March 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 17, 1997, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Mr. Henry Porter of the Bureau of Radiological Health, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed exemption. 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 February 4, 1997, and supplement dated March 19, 1997, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at local public document room located at the Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of July 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herbert N. Berkow,

Director, Project Directorate II–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–19635 Filed 7–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–461]

Illinois Power Company; Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating License No. NPF–62, issued to Illinois Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1, located in DeWitt County, Illinois.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated July 22, 1997, for a temporary, partial exemption from the requirements contained in General Design Criterion (GDC) 17, ''Electric Power Systems,'' of Appendix A to 10 CFR 50. The requested exemption would only be effective through and including October 15, 1997, and would permit plant operation with one fully qualified offsite circuit and one circuit that does not strictly conform to the capacity and capability requirements of GDC 17.

The Need for the Proposed Action

GDC 17 requires that an onsite and an offsite electric power system be provided to permit functioning of structures, systems, and components important to safety. The safety function for each of these two systems (assuming the other system is not functioning) is to provide sufficient capacity and capability to assure that (1) specified acceptable fuel design limits and design conditions of the reactor coolant pressure boundary are not exceeded as a result of anticipated operational occurrences, and (2) the core is cooled and containment integrity and other vital functions are maintained in the event of postulated accidents.

The Clinton Power Station (CPS) licensing basis assumes two independent offsite electric power sources that are capable of supplying power to emergency buses. These consist of 138–kV and 345–kV offsite circuits. During the current refueling outage at CPS, the licensee has determined that, for short and intermittent periods of time, voltage on the 345–kV offsite source has not consistently remained above the minimum required value conservatively established for CPS. This is primarily due to the fact that unusually low voltages are occurring as a result of the current lack of operating generators in Illinois, coupled with high load demands during peak hours. The licensee has determined that all practical measures taken to boost voltage, short of interrupting service to customers, are not sufficient to maintain required voltage. Further action to restore voltage would necessitate power interruptions.

Conformance to GDC 17 requires that both offsite sources have sufficient capacity and capability such that voltage is continuously maintained above the minimum values conservatively established for the facility. Due to the intermittent voltage conditions for the 345–kV system described above, the licensee cannot demonstrate that this offsite circuit has sufficient capacity and capability at all times. With this offsite source experiencing intermittent periods of lower than expected voltage, it would have to be declared inoperable. Plant startup or continued plant operation is not permitted with one offsite source inoperable.

The licensee has proposed a temporary, partial exemption to the requirements of GDC 17 that would only be effective through and including October 15, 1997. The exemption would temporarily allow plant operation with one fully qualified offsite circuit and one circuit that does not strictly conform to the capacity and capability requirements of GDC 17. Strict compliance with GDC 17 is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule and would impose undue hardship to the licensee. The licensee has implemented measures to assess when the 345-kV system voltage would be inadequate in the event of a plant trip, performed an analysis to assess the risk associated with continued plant operation for the period of time within which the intermittent condition is likely to occur (i.e., through the end of hot, summer weather), and established procedures that will restore

bus voltage within 10 minutes in the event that it is needed.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents.

Granting the exemption would not significantly increase the probability of unavailable offsite power in the event of an accident and, therefore, would not significantly increase the probability of a radiological release from CPS. The availability and reliability of the onsite power sources would not be affected by the exemption. The availability and reliability of the offsite source having adequate voltage (i.e., the 138-kV circuit) would also not be affected. Although there is a slight increase in the probability of having the low-voltage offsite source unavailable following a plant trip, or both sources unavailable in the event of a loss of the other offsite source, this increase is small based on the factors identified, and actions available to restore offsite voltage.

Electric power would still be available for safety-related equipment required to mitigate an accident. The proposed change does not involve an increase in the consequences of an accident, 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 involves 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. The principal alternative to the proposed action would be to deny the requested action. Denial of the requested action would effectively preclude operation of the facility until the intermittent voltage condition is resolved (i.e., until the end of hot, summer weather).

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Final Environmental Statement dated May 1982, related to the operation of the Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 22, 1997, the NRC staff consulted with the Illinois State representative regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the foregoing 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 letter dated July 22, 1997, 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 Vespasian Warner Public Library, 310 N. Quincy Street, Clinton, IL 61727.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of July 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gail H. Marcus,

Director, Project Directorate III–3, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–19805 Filed 7–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

[RI 30–10]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request for the Revised Information Collection

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 intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for a revised information collection. RI 30–10, Disabled Dependent Questionnaire, is used to collect sufficient information about the medical condition and earning capacity for OPM to be able to determine whether a disabled adult child is eligible for health benefits coverage and/or survivor annuity payments under the Civil Service Retirement System or the Federal Employees Retirement System.

Approximately 2,500 RI 30–10 forms are completed annually. Each form takes approximately 30 minutes to complete. The annual estimated burden is 1,250 hours.

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

DATES: Comments on this proposal should be received on or before September 23, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send or deliver comments to—Lorraine E. Dettman, Chief, Operations Support Division, Retirement and Insurance Service, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW, Room 3349, Washington, DC 20415–0001.

For Information Regarding Administrative Coordination—Contact: Mary Beth Smith-Toomey, Management Services Division, (202) 606–0623.

Office of Personnel Management.

James B. King,

Director.

[FR Doc. 97–19638 Filed 7–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325–01–M

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Excepted Service

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This gives notice of positions placed or revoked under Schedules A and B, and placed under Schedule C in the excepted service, as required by Civil Service Rule VI, Exceptions from the Competitive Service.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia H. Paige, Staffing Reinvention Office, Employment Service (202) 606–0830.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office of Personnel Management published its last monthly notice updating appointing authorities established or revoked under the Excepted Service provisions of 5