

Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, CT 06457.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of March, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Phillip F. McKee,
Director, Northeast Utilities Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
[FR Doc. 96-6520 Filed 3-18-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-146]

Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corporation; Notice of Transfer of Control of License

Notice is hereby given that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval under 10 CFR 50.80 of the transfer of control of the license for the Saxton Nuclear Experimental Facility (SNEF) to GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPUN) for all maintenance, characterization, decontamination, dismantlement, decommissioning, and other management related responsibilities. The current licensee, the Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corporation (SNEC), will remain as owner and joint holder of Amended Facility License No. DRP-4. Prior notice of consideration of a license amendment that would be required to reflect this proposed transfer and notice of an opportunity for a hearing in connection with the amendment was given on January 31, 1996 (61 FR 3502) in the Federal Register. SNEC, with the concurrence of GPUN, applied for approval of the transfer, as well as a license amendment, by letter dated November 21, 1995.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.80, the Commission may approve the transfer of control of a license, after notice to interested persons, upon the Commission's determination that the proposed transferee is qualified to be a holder of the license and the transfer of the control is otherwise consistent with applicable provisions of law, regulations and orders of the Commission.

For further details with respect to the subject transfer, see the application from SNEC dated November 21, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555, and at the local public document room located at the Saxton Community Library, 911 Church Street, Saxton, Pennsylvania 16678.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Seymour H. Weiss,
Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning, Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
[FR Doc. 96-6518 Filed 3-18-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. STN 50-528, 50-529, and 50-530]

Arizona Public Service Company Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-41, NPF-51, and NPF-74 issued to Arizona Public Service Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, respectively, located in Maricopa County, Arizona.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The Environmental Assessment is written in connection with the proposed core uprate for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station in response to the licensee's application dated January 5, 1996. The proposed action would increase the rated thermal power (RTP) for Palo Verde from the current level of 3800 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 3876 MWt, an increase of 2 percent over the current RTP. To support the increased power operation, the licensee has also proposed amendment changes that would lower the allowable reactor coolant system cold-leg temperature limits for all three PVNGS Units and lower the pressurizer safety valve setpoints for Units 1 and 3. The PVNGS Unit 2 safety valve setpoints were revised by Amendment 78, approved March 28, 1995, to the same values being requested for Units 1 and 3. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated January 5, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to increase the electrical output by up to approximately 26 megawatts electric (MWe) and thus provide additional electrical power to the grids which service the commercial and residential areas of the owner utilities (the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement

and Power District, Southern California Edison Company, El Paso Electric Company, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and Southern California Public Power Authority).

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

A 2-percent increase in rated thermal power (RTP) is not a significant increase in power level. The Final Environmental Statement (FES) (NUREG-0841) recognized in the Summary and Conclusions Section that the maximum design thermal output for each unit is 4100 MWt. The proposed increase is less than maximum design thermal output evaluated during the FES construction permit stage (FES-CP). Thus the environmental effects previously evaluated for land and water usage are bounded by those previously evaluated. The increase in RTP does not change any of the conclusions of NUREG-0841.

The 2-percent RTP increase does not change the method of operation or modify the plant configuration, apart from minor changes in equipment setpoints. Thus no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident is created by the proposed amendment. System and programmatic reviews have been done of the nuclear steam supply system (NSSS) controls, the reactor coolant system, the steam generators, balance-of-plant systems, and the fire protection, equipment qualification, and probability risk assessment programs. The reviews concluded that operation in accordance with the changes proposed in this amendment was acceptable and posed no significant risk to the health and safety of the public. The analysis supporting this amendment demonstrates that the consequences of events under the increased-RTP conditions are within the criteria of the current licensing basis for the PVNGS units. Therefore the amendment, as proposed, does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The increase in RTP does not authorize construction, change the processes, plant equipment, or type of effluents, or significantly affect operation of the units. The proposed amendment will not significantly change the types or amount of radiological effluents from the facility. The changes are within the design basis of the balance-of-plant systems, and reviews of the NSSS have demonstrated the acceptability of operation at the increased-RTP conditions. Safety

analyses of design basis events affected by the increase have been reviewed or reanalyzed and the consequences found to be bounded by current updated final safety analysis report (UFSAR) consequences or within regulatory requirements. In addition, no significant increases in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure would result from the proposed changes in operating conditions. Also, the proposed increase in the NSSS power involves no significant change in the amount of any nonradiological impacts associated with operation of the facility, i.e., those previously evaluated and approved in the FES. The Final Environmental Assessment evaluated the environmental impact, assuming the maximum design thermal output of the PVNGS units to be 4100 MWt. Thus, the proposed increase in power level is within the scope of the previous reviews performed for the environmental impact of operation of the units. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant 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 impacts need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the proposed action would be to deny the requested amendment. Denial would not significantly reduce the environmental impact of plant operation and would restrict operation of the PVNGS units to the currently licensed power level, thereby reducing operational flexibility.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with NRC policy, on February 28, 1996, the staff consulted with the Arizona State official, Mr. William Wright of the Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency, 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 January 5, 1996, 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 Phoenix Public Library, 1221 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Charles R. Thomas,
*Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2,
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 96-6521 Filed 3-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Planning and Procedures; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Planning and Procedures will hold a meeting on April 10, 1996, Room T-2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of a portion that may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (2) and (6) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of ACRS, and matters the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, April 10, 1996—1:30 p.m. until 4:00 p.m.

The Subcommittee will discuss proposed ACRS activities and related matters. It will also discuss the qualifications of candidates nominated for appointment to the ACRS. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring

to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff person named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions open to the public, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements, and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff person, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone: 301/415-7360) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EST). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: March 11, 1996.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 96-6522 Filed 3-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATE: Weeks of March 18, 25, April 1, and 8, 1996.

PLACE: Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of March 18

Tuesday, March 19

10:30 a.m.

Briefing on U.S. Enrichment Corporation Certification (Public Meeting)
(Contact: John Hickey, 301-415-7192)

Week of March 25—Tentative

Wednesday, March 27

10:30 a.m.

Meeting with Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee (NSRRC) (Public Meeting)
(Contact: Jose Cortez, 301-415-6596)

Week of April 1—Tentative

Thursday, April 4

10:00 a.m.

Briefing on PRA Implementation Plan (Public Meeting)

(Contact: Ashok Thadani, 301-415-1274)

11:30 a.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

2:00 p.m.

Briefing on Status of Activities with CNWRA and HLW Program (Public Meeting)