

lower bound of static, dynamic, and crack arrest fracture toughness tests on material similar to the ANO-2 reactor vessel material.

In determining the relief valve setpoint for LTOP events, the licensee proposed the use of safety margins based on an alternate methodology consistent with the proposed ASME Code Case N-514 guidelines. ASME Code Case N-514 allows determination of the setpoint for LTOP events such that the maximum pressure in the vessel will not exceed 110% of the P/T limits of the existing ASME Appendix G. This results in a safety factor of 1.8 on the principal membrane stresses. All other factors, including assumed flaw size and fracture toughness, remain the same. Although this methodology would reduce the safety factor on the principal membrane stresses, use of the proposed criteria will provide adequate margins of safety to the reactor vessel during LTOP transients.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, 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 does involve 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 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 action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application 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 for ANO-2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 13, 1996, the staff consulted with the Arkansas State official, Mr. Bernard Bevell Director of Radiation Control and Emergency Management, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. 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 April 11, 1996, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of July, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
George Kalman,
Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate VI-1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-18373 Filed 7-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Notice of Meeting

SUMMARY: The NRC will hold a public meeting in Rockville, Maryland to receive comments from licensees and the public on its initiative to perform research on electric cables to resolve technical issues related to the Environmental Qualification (EQ) process. All interested licensees, and members of the public are invited to attend this meeting. Interested parties, unable to attend the meeting, are encouraged to provide written comments pertinent to the proposed EQ research by August 2, 1996.

DATES: The meeting will be held on August 6-7, 1996, beginning at 8:30 a.m.

ADDRESSES: The public meeting will be held at the DoubleTree Hotel at 1750 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. Visitor parking is also available at the hotel, however, the hotel is located adjacent to the Twinbrook Station on the Metro Red Line.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information, contact Satish K. Aggarwal, Office of Nuclear Regulatory

Research, Mail Stop T 10 E-10, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone 301-415-6005; fax: 301-415-5074; INTERNET: SKA@NRC.GOV

Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, August 6, 1996

8:30 am—Welcome and Introductions

8:45 am—Overview of EQ Research

9:30 am—Overview of EQ Task Action Plan

10:15 am—Overview of Issues to be Resolved and Planned Research

11:00 am—Discussion of Issue 1

12:00 noon—Lunch Break

1:00 pm—Discussion of Issue 2

1:30 pm—Discussion of Issue 3

2:00 pm—Discussion of Issues 4 and 5

3:00 pm—Discussion of Issues 6 to 9

5:00 pm—Adjourn

Wednesday, August 7, 1996

8:30 am—Discussion of Issues 10 to 13

10:00 am—Discussion of Issues 14 and 15

12:00 noon—Lunch Break

1:00 pm—Discussion of Issues 16 to 19

4:00 pm—Adjourn

Unresolved Issues

The following issues have been identified for further research. Information that may help fully or partially resolve these issues may be presented at this meeting.

Issues 1 & 2: Thermal Preaging Process

—Arrhenius application

—Activation energies

Issue 3: Other Aging Factors

—The effects on humidity

Issues 4 & 5: Cable Construction

—Multiple vs. single conductor cables

—Bonded jacket cables

Issues 6, 7, 8 & 9: Installed Environment

—Hot spots

—Vibration

—Water/steam impingement

—Maintenance activities

Issues 10, 11, 12 & 13: Installed Configuration

—Bends, vertical runs, overhangs

—Cable trays, conduits

—Fire protection coatings

—Installation damage

Issues 14 & 15: Condition Monitoring

—Effectiveness

—LOCA survivability

Issues 16, 17, 18 & 19: Life Extension

—Requalification options

—Definition of qualified life

—Use of operating experience

—Extension of qualified life

Further information on these issues can be obtained from NUREG/CR-6384, Volumes 1 and 2, which are available from the Government Printing Office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: When the latest regulation for environmental qualification (EQ) of electric equipment, 10 CFR 50.49, was issued, it contained provisions that allowed licensees to meet different standards for qualification. In general, one standard required testing of electric equipment by exposing it to a harsh environment. The second standard required similar testing in addition to artificial radiation and thermal aging of equipment prior to LOCA testing. Although the first standard does not include consideration of the effects of aging, both standards include margin for operating temperature, radiation levels, and some physical damage mechanisms. It is believed that this margin compensates for any damage mechanisms which are not modelled precisely in the accelerated testing.

As a result of the staff's activities related to license renewal in the early 1990s, EQ was identified as an area that required further review. As discussed in SECY-93-049, a major concern related to EQ was whether the EQ requirements for older plants were adequate to support license renewal. Subsequently, the NRC staff concluded that differences in EQ requirements between older and newer plants constituted a potential generic issue which should be evaluated for backfit, independent of license renewal activities. Furthermore, recent test results raise questions with respect to the environmental qualification and accident performance capability of certain types of cables, and there have been some instances of cable failures as a result of exposure to high temperature and/or radiation during normal plant operation.

The NRC staff developed a task action plan (TAP) which has been designed to identify, evaluate and resolve EQ concerns. One item of the TAP was for the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research to develop and implement a research program which will focus on (1) data collection and analysis, and (2) technical issues. Since most of the electrical equipment in operating nuclear power plants can be replaced with relative ease except for cables, the research program was subsequently developed to focus on low-voltage I&C cables within the scope of 10 CFR 50.49.

For the data collection and analysis, Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) was designated the lead laboratory to perform a literature review and establish an extensive database. The assessment of the literature has been completed and includes an analysis of available data, both domestic and foreign, to determine which EQ related technical issues can be resolved with existing information

and which will require further research. For those issues identified which require further research, testing of both naturally aged and artificially aged cable samples will be performed.

The primary objective of this research program is to answer EQ questions related to electrical cables based upon actual testing. The testing phase of the program will provide information to assess the effectiveness of condition monitoring (CM) methods to determine the extent of degradation, if any, of qualified low voltage instrumentation and control (I&C) cables within the scope of 10 CFR 50.49, and evaluate the adequacy of accelerated aging techniques in the environmental qualification process.

This meeting will provide an opportunity for licensees and the public to provide input on the issues identified for further research, and the research to be performed. A transcript of this meeting will be available for inspection, and copying for a fee at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Lower Level, Washington, DC 20555, on or about September 2, 1996.

The meeting will be open to the public, and the public will be provided opportunities throughout the workshop to comment on the issues under discussion.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland on this 15th day of July, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Lawrence C. Shao,
*Director, Division of Engineering Technology,
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.*

[FR Doc. 96-18371 Filed 7-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

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

Extension: Rule 15g-2; SEC File No. 270-381; OMB Control No. 3235-0434

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") has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget requests for approval of extension on the following rule:

Rule 15g-2 requires broker-dealers to provide their customers with a risk disclosure document, as set forth in

Schedule 15G,¹ prior to their first non-exempt transaction in a "penny stock." The rule requires broker-dealers to obtain written acknowledgement from the customer that he or she has received the required risk disclosure document. The rule also requires broker-dealers to maintain a copy of the customer's written acknowledgment for at least three years following the date on which the risk disclosure document was provided to the customer, the first two years in an accessible place.

Approximately 270 broker-dealers are subject to Rule 15g-2, and each one of these firms will process an average of approximately 156 risk disclosure documents per year. The total ongoing respondent burden is approximately 4 minutes per response, or an aggregate total of 624 minutes per respondent. Since there are 270 respondents, the annual burden 2808 hours.

In addition, 270 broker-dealers will incur a recordkeeping burden of approximately one minute per response. Thus, respondents as a group will incur an aggregate annual recordkeeping burden of 702 hours. The total annual hour burden is 3510 hours.

The total cost of ongoing compliance for the respondents and recordkeepers is \$70,200.

General comments regarding the estimated burden hours should be directed to the Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission at the address below. Any comments concerning the accuracy of the estimated average burden hours for compliance with Commission rules and forms should be directed to Michael E. Bartell, Associate Executive Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549 and Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Room 3208, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dated: July 10, 1996.
Margaret H. McFarland,
Deputy Secretary.
[FR Doc. 96-18298 Filed 7-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

¹ Schedule 15G explains the risks of investing in penny stocks; important concepts associated with the penny stock market; the broker-dealer's duties to customers; a toll-free telephone number through which a customer may inquire about the disciplinary history of a broker-dealer; the customer's rights and remedies in cases of fraud or abuse in connection with transactions in penny stocks; and certain other significant information.