

Corporation (the licensee) to withdraw its August 26, 2004, application for proposed amendments to Facility Operating License No. DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55, for the Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, located in Seneca County, SC.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specification 3.3.29 and its associated Bases to accommodate new circuitry that isolates nonsafety portions of the low pressure service water system piping inside containment that supplies the reactor building auxiliary coolers.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on September 28, 2004 (69 FR 57983). However, by letter dated September 29, 2005, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 26, 2004, and the licensee's letter dated September 29, 2005, which withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area 01 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams/html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737 or by e-mail to [pdrc@nrc.gov](mailto:pdrc@nrc.gov).

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of October 2005.

**Leonard N. Olshan,**

*Sr. Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. E5-5798 Filed 10-20-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Fifth International MACCS Users' Group Meeting

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** 5th International MACCS Users' Group Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) will conduct the 5th International MACCS Users' Group (IMUG) Meeting, on March 10, 2006, at a location near the NRC's Headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. The meeting will begin at 8:30 a.m. and will be open to public observation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Jocelyn Mitchell; e-mail: [jam@nrc.gov](mailto:jam@nrc.gov); telephone: (301) 415-5289; Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Mail Stop T-9C34, USNRC, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Additional information and a registration form can be found at the NRC's Web site: [www.nrc.gov/publicinvolve/conferences.html](http://www.nrc.gov/publicinvolve/conferences.html).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The purpose of the meeting is for users of MACCS (MELCOR Accident Consequence Code System) to exchange information about the use of MACCS and about recent code developments. There will be no charge for registration for the conference, but, for planning purposes, registration is required. Anyone wishing to present information relevant to MACCS or its use in consequence estimation should contact Jocelyn Mitchell to be included in the agenda.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of October, 2005.

**William R. Ott,**

*Acting Chief, Radiation Protection, Environmental Risk and Waste Management Branch, Division of Risk Analysis and Applications, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.*

[FR Doc. E5-5797 Filed 10-20-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Solicitation of Public Comments on the Implementation of the Reactor Oversight Process

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** Over 5 years have elapsed since the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) implemented its revised Reactor Oversight Process (ROP). The NRC is currently soliciting comments from members of the public, licensees, and interest groups related to the implementation of the ROP. An electronic version of the survey questions may be obtained from <http://www.nrc.gov/NRR/OVERSIGHT/>

[ASSESS/rop2005survey.pdf](#). This solicitation will provide insights into the self-assessment process and a summary of the feedback will be included in the annual ROP self-assessment report to the Commission.

**DATES:** The comment period expires on December 1, 2005. The NRC will consider comments received after this date if it is practical to do so, but is only able to ensure consideration of comments received on or before this date.

**ADDRESSES:** Completed questionnaires and/or comments may be e-mailed to [nrcprep@nrc.gov](mailto:nrcprep@nrc.gov) or sent to Michael T. Lesar, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration (Mail Stop T-6D59), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Comments may also be hand-delivered to Mr. Lesar at 11554 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays.

Documents created or received at the NRC after November 1, 1999, are available electronically through the NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html>. From this site, the public can access the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of the NRC's public documents. For more information, contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 301-415-4737 or 800-397-4209, or by e-mail at [pdrc@nrc.gov](mailto:pdrc@nrc.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Serita Sanders, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (Mail Stop: OWFN 7A15), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001. Ms. Sanders can also be reached by telephone at 301-415-2956 or by e-mail at [SXS5@nrc.gov](mailto:SXS5@nrc.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Program Overview

The mission of the NRC is to license and regulate the Nation's civilian use of byproduct, source, and special nuclear materials to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, promote the common defense and security, and protect the environment. This mission is accomplished through the following activities:

- License nuclear facilities and the possession, use, and disposal of nuclear materials.
- Develop and implement requirements governing licensed activities.

- Inspect and enforce licensee activities to ensure compliance with these requirements and the law.

While the NRC's responsibility is to monitor and regulate licensees' performance, the primary responsibility for safe operation and handling of nuclear materials rests with each licensee.

As the nuclear industry in the United States has matured, the NRC and its licensees have learned much about how to safely operate nuclear facilities and handle nuclear materials. In April 2000, the NRC began to implement more effective and efficient inspection, assessment, and enforcement approaches, which apply insights from these years of regulatory oversight and nuclear facility operation. Key elements of the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) include NRC inspection procedures, plant performance indicators, a significance determination process, and an assessment program that incorporates various risk-informed thresholds to help determine the level of NRC oversight and enforcement. Since ROP development began in 1998, the NRC has frequently communicated with the public by various initiatives: conducted public meetings in the vicinity of each licensed commercial nuclear power plant, issued FRNs to solicit feedback on the ROP, published press releases about the new process, conducted multiple public workshops, placed pertinent background information in the NRC's Public Document Room, and established an NRC Web site containing easily accessible information about the ROP and licensee performance.

#### NRC Public Stakeholder Comments

The NRC continues to be interested in receiving feedback from members of the public, various public stakeholders, and industry groups on their insights regarding the CY 2005 implementation of the ROP. In particular, the NRC is seeking responses to the questions listed below, which will provide important information that the NRC can use in ongoing program improvement. A summary of the feedback obtained will be provided to the Commission and included in the annual ROP self-assessment report.

This solicitation of public comments has been issued each year since ROP implementation in 2000. In previous years, the questions had been free-form in nature requesting written responses. Although written responses are still encouraged, there are specific choices to best describe your experience to enable us to more objectively determine your level of satisfaction.

#### Questions

In responding to these questions, please consider your experiences using the NRC oversight process.

Shade in the circle that most applies to your experiences as follows: (1) Very much (2) somewhat (3) neutral (4) somewhat less than needed (5) far less than needed.

If there are experiences that are rated as unsatisfactory, or if you have specific thoughts or concerns, please elaborate in the "Comments" section that follows the question and offer your opinion for possible improvements. If there are experiences or opinions that you would like to express that cannot be directly captured by the questions, document that in the last question of the survey.

#### Questions Related to Specific Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) Program Areas

(As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)

(1) Does the Performance Indicator Program provide useful insights to help ensure plant safety?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(2) Does appropriate overlap exist between the Performance Indicator Program and the Inspection Program?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(3) Does NEI 99-02, "Regulatory Assessment Performance Indicator Guideline" provide clear guidance regarding Performance Indicators?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(4) Does the Inspection Program adequately cover areas important to safety and is it effective in identifying and ensuring the prompt correction of performance deficiencies?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(5) Is the information contained in inspection reports relevant, useful, and written in plain English?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(6) Does the Significance Determination Process yield an appropriate and consistent regulatory response across all ROP cornerstones?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(7) Does the NRC take appropriate actions to address performance issues for those plants outside of the Licensee Response Column of the Action Matrix?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(8) Is the information contained in assessment reports relevant, useful, and written in plain English?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

#### Questions Related to the Efficacy of the Overall ROP

(As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)

(9) Are the ROP oversight activities predictable (i.e., controlled by the process) and reasonably objective (i.e., based on supported facts, rather than relying on subjective judgement)?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(10) Is the ROP risk-informed, in that the NRC's actions and outcomes are appropriately graduated on the basis of increased significance?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(11) Is the ROP understandable and are the processes, procedures and products clear and written in plain English?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

(12) Does the ROP provide adequate regulatory assurance when combined with other NRC regulatory processes that plants are being operated and maintained safely?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Comments:

(13) Is the ROP effective, efficient, realistic, and timely?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Comments:

(14) Does the ROP ensure openness in the regulatory process?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Comments:

(15) Has the public been afforded adequate opportunity to participate in the ROP and to provide inputs and comments?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Comments:

(16) Has the NRC been responsive to public inputs and comments on the ROP?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Comments:

(17) Has the NRC implemented the ROP as defined by program documents?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Comments:

(18) Does the ROP minimize unintended consequences?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Comments:

(19) Please provide any additional information or comments related to the Reactor Oversight Process.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of October, 2005.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Stuart A. Richards,**

*Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Division of Inspection Program Management, Inspection Program Branch.*

[FR Doc. E5-5796 Filed 10-20-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

# OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

[OMB No. 3206-0165]

## Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request for Revision of Expiring Information Collections

**AGENCY:** Office of Personnel Management.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13), this notice announces that the Office of Personnel Management intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request for revision of expiring information collections. Depending upon the type of background investigation requested by the Federal agency, the General Request for Investigative Information (INV 40), Investigative Request for Employment Data and Supervisor Information (INV 41) (5/02), the Investigative Request for Personal Information (INV 42) (5/02), the Investigative Request for Educational Registrar and Dean of Students Record Data (INV 43) (5/02), and the Investigative Request for Law Enforcement Data (INV 44) (5/02) are forms used in the processing of background investigations to assist in determining whether an applicant is suitable for Federal employment or should be granted a security clearance. The INV 40, General Request for Investigative Information, is used to accommodate sources for which the collection formats of INV 41-44 are awkward or inappropriate. The INV 41, Investigative Request for Employment Data and Supervisor Information, is sent to past and present employers and supervisors identified on the applicant's investigative questionnaire. The INV 42, Investigative Request for Personal Information, is sent to references listed by the subject of investigation. The INV 43, Investigative Request for Educational Registrar and Dean of Students Record Data, is sent to registrars and dean of students of the educational institutions listed by the subject of an investigation to verify enrollment and degree information, and determine whether there is any relevant adverse information. The INV 44, Investigative Request for Law Enforcement Data, is sent to law enforcement jurisdictions in which the subject has had any significant period of activity during the designated scope of investigation. The INV 44 inquires about any outstanding warrants or record of criminal activity involving the subject of investigation.

The INV 40, INV 41, INV 42, INV 43, and INV 44 ask the recipient to respond to questions concerning the applicant's honesty and integrity, as well as other security-related questions involving general conduct, use of intoxicants, finances and mental health.

Approximately 460,000 INV 40 inquiries are sent to Federal and non-federal agencies annually. The INV 40 takes approximately five minutes to complete. The estimated annual burden is 38,300 hours. Approximately 1,300,000 INV 41 inquiries are sent to past and present employers and supervisors. The INV 41 takes approximately five minutes to complete. The estimated annual burden is 108,300 hours. Approximately 980,000 INV 42 inquiries are sent to individuals annually. The INV 42 takes approximately five minutes to complete. The estimated annual burden is 81,700 hours. Approximately 261,000 INV 43 inquiries are sent to educational institutions annually. The INV 43 takes approximately five minutes to complete. The estimated annual burden is 21,750 hours. Approximately 1,000,000 INV 44 inquiries are sent to law enforcement agencies annually. The INV 44 takes approximately five minutes to complete. The estimated annual burden is 83,300 hours. The total number of respondents for the INV 40, INV 41, INV 42, INV 43, and INV 44 is 4,001,000 and the total estimated burden is 333,350 hours.

For copies of this proposal, contact Mary Beth Smith-Toomey on (202) 606-8358, Fax (202) 418-3251 or e-mail to [mbtoomey@opm.gov](mailto:mbtoomey@opm.gov). Please be sure to include a mailing address with your request.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposal should be received within 30 calendar days from the date of this publication.

**ADDRESSES:** Send or deliver comments to: Kathy Dillaman, Deputy Associate Director, Center for Federal Investigative Services, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E. Street, Room 5416, Washington, DC 20415, and Brenda Aguilar, Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503.

**FOR INFORMATION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION CONTACT:** Sherry Tate, Program Analyst, Standards and Evaluations Group, Center for Federal Investigative Services, Office of Personnel Management. (202) 606-0434.