

the "continuance of existing controls and advisories regarding LWBR activities" and the "Monitoring Plan." The DOE report (page 2-9) also notes that "The state of Tennessee and other federal agencies are already implementing the main components of the preferred alternative." With respect to the removal of radioactive sediments, the DOE report (page 2-9) states that "The cost of the preferred alternative is much lower and a more effective use of funds when compared to active remediation of sediments." In other words, a remedy has been developed for the contamination in the LWBR and the purpose of the DOE report is to present that remedy.

Notwithstanding the conclusion that operation of WBNP will not disturb the sediment in the upstream LWBR, the WBNP Technical Specifications (TS) and the associated Offsite Dose Calculation Manual require programs and controls for the control of radioactive effluents from the plant itself. Such controls include limitations on the concentrations of radioactive material released in liquid effluents from the plant. The staff evaluated control of radioactive effluents by WBNP in Section 11 of NUREG-0847, "Safety Evaluation Report related to the operation of Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2." The staff concluded therein that WBNP meets applicable regulations (10 CFR 20.1302; 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criteria 60, 63, and 64) and other guidance documents and is therefore acceptable for operation.

The NRC staff's review did not substantiate the Petitioner's assertions. The Petitioner did not offer information that indicated any need to revisit the staff's previous evaluations.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons given above, Petitioner's request to rescind the operating license of the WBNP is denied. As explained above, the NRC staff concludes that the Petitioner has not raised any substantial health and safety issues as the staff believes that there is no appreciable threat to the public health and safety presented by WBNP's effluent water. Accordingly, the Petitioner's request for action pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206, as specifically stated in the letter of February 14, 1996, is denied.

A copy of this Final Director's Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c). This Decision will become the final action of the Commission 25 days after issuance unless the Commission,

on its own motion, institutes review of the Decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of July 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-18004 Filed 7-15-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATE: Weeks of July 15, 22, 29, and August 5, 1996.

PLACE: Commissioner's Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of July 15

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of July 15.

Week of July 22—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of July 22.

Week of July 29—Tentative

Monday, July 29

10:00 a.m.

Briefing on Uranium Recovery Program (Public Meeting)
(Contact: Joe Holonich, 301-415-6643)

Tuesday, July 30

10:00 a.m.

Briefing by Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (Public Meeting)

2:00 p.m.

Briefing on Status of Staff Actions on Industry Restructuring and Deregulation (Public Meeting)
(Contact: Dave Mathews, 301-415-1282)

Wednesday, July 31

2:00 p.m.

Briefing on EEO Program (Public Meeting)
(Contact: Ed Tucker, 301-415-7382)

Thursday, August 1

10:00 a.m.

Briefing on Spent Fuel Pool Cooling Issues (Public Meeting)
(Contact: George Hubbard, 301-415-2870)

11:30 a.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

Week of August 5—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of August 5.

The schedule for Commission meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings call (Recording)-301 415-1292.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Bill Hill (301) 415-1661.

* * * * *

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm>.

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, D.C. 20555 (301-415-1963).

In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to alb@nrc.gov or dkw@nrc.gov.

* * * * *

Dated: July 12, 1996.

William M. Hill, Jr.,

SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-18149 Filed 7-12-96; 2:24 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-390]

Tennessee Valley Authority, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), has taken action on a Petition of February 14, 1996 (Petition), for action under Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS (10 CFR 2.206) filed by Ms. Faith Young (Petitioner) of Dixon Springs, Tennessee. The Petitioner asks that the NRC rescind Watts Bar's license to operate until the alleged issue of increased radioactive contamination of the plant's emission is resolved.

Petitioner believes that the lake containing the water used to cool Watts Bar's core contains sediment previously contaminated by radioactive material.

Over the lifetime of Watts Bar's operation, according to Petitioner, uncontrolled access to the lake will disturb this sediment, which will in turn contaminate water drawn into the plant's cooling system. Petitioner believes that the issue of heightened radioactive contamination of nuclear power plant emissions has not been previously addressed. The Notice of Receipt of Petition Under 10 CFR 2.206 was published in the Federal Register on April 4, 1996 (61 FR 15151).

The Director of NRR determined that the Petition should be denied for the reasons explained in the "Director's

Decision under 10 CFR 2.206" (DD-96-10), the complete text of which follows this notice and is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D. C., and at the Local Public Document Room for the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant at the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

A copy of this Director' Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's 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 the date of issuance, unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of July 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
William T. Russell,
Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
[FR Doc. 96-18003 Filed 7-15-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Review of an Information Collection

AGENCY: Office of Personnel
Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-13, May 22, 1995), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a final request for clearance of an information collection, the voluntary commercial garnishment application form. The Application For Federal Employee Commercial Garnishment is intended to be completed by creditors in order to facilitate the Federal Government's compliance with commercial garnishment orders as mandated by section 9 of the Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993, Public Law 103-94, by providing information about each commercial garnishment order in a uniform manner that would otherwise not be available due to the wide variety of commercial garnishment orders issued by various state and local jurisdictions.

We estimate that approximately 100 forms will be completed annually for OPM employees, each requiring an

estimated ten minutes to complete, for a total public burden of approximately 17 hours. OPM anticipates, of course, that many other federal agencies will also be suggesting that creditors complete the form. OPM is unable to predict the total annual public burden as a result of the completion of this form.

On September 18, 1995, an initial notice of OPM's clearance request was published in the Federal Register (60 FR 48176). In response to the initial notice, OPM received written comments from four federal agencies, the National Association of Retail Collection Attorneys, the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, the Commercial Law League of America, and one individual. A fifth federal agency provided oral comments and a fourth organization, Nationwide Credit Corporation, did not comment directly, but forwarded comments from two law firms.

While not in response to any suggestion, OPM renumbered the items on the form and replaced the word "Applicant" with "Authorized Payee" in Parts C and D.

Two federal agencies recommended that the form be mandatory. OPM disagrees with making the use of this form mandatory since it would be unnecessary interference with the operation of state courts. Further, regardless of whether or not use of the form is mandatory, it is expected that the form will be in widespread use.

One organization noted that in the collection industry the word "commercial" is interchangeable with the word "business" and that it would be better to simply delete the word "commercial" from the form. However, OPM has opted not to delete the word "commercial" from the form, lest the form be associated by some as being intended to be completed in conjunction with the garnishment of child support indebtednesses which has no "commercial" implication. OPM has been advised that the Department of Health and Human Services is currently conducting a pilot program that utilizes a wholly different form in connection with child support garnishment. It is OPM's intent to avoid any inconsistency or confusion with the child support form.

One agency suggested that number 3 of the "Instructions" on the form be rewritten to explain that agencies are not required to respond until 30 days after receipt by the designated agent. OPM has, however, retained the proposed instruction that more closely follows the language of the statute

which provides for agency responses "within thirty days."

Another agency suggested that the use of certified mail be encouraged. In order to make the form as clear and concise as possible, OPM has opted to have the form include only the statutory mailing provisions.

While one agency suggested that specific identifying information concerning the employee-obligor be made mandatory when completing Part A of the form, such a requirement would conflict with the statutory authority for commercial garnishment which only requires that sufficient identifying information be provided so as to enable the employing agency to identify the employee-obligor. See the Hatch Act Reform Amendments of 1993, Public Law 103-94, section 9, codified at 5 U.S.C. 5520a.

One of the creditor associations expressed concern that incomplete forms might be rejected and noted that creditors typically do not obtain an employee-obligor's date of birth or social security number. The instructions in Part A of the proposed form reflect the statutory identification requirements. It should be emphasized that where sufficient information has been provided for the employing agency to identify the employee-obligor, a garnishment order must not be rejected as being incomplete.

One agency recommended that the form ask the creditor to identify the employee-obligor's payroll office. OPM has not adopted this suggestion. It is doubtful that many creditors would know or could easily obtain the employee-obligor's payroll office. However, individual agencies could include such a request in the "For Agency Use" block at A.6 of the form.

A second agency suggested that block B.7 (now block B.1) identify the court as well as the case number. OPM has adopted this suggestion.

Two creditor organizations suggested that block B.8 (now block B.2) be revised to request the garnishment amount rather than the judgment amount. OPM has adopted this suggestion in order to clarify that the amount to be garnished is the amount listed on the garnishment order, i.e., what is not referred to in block B.2 as the "Garnishment Amount," rather than what might have been mistaken as being the amount of the underlying judgment.

One federal agency also suggested that block B.10 (now B.4) be revised. The agency opined that as written, the block could be misinterpreted to mean that there were instances when the Consumer Credit Protection Act was inapplicable. As rewritten, the form