

concentration limits for radium, uranium, and sulfate to be disposed by deep well injection will not cause significant environmental impacts.

#### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the NRC staff has concluded that there are no significant environmental impacts 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 action. Since the environmental impacts of the proposed action and this no-action alternative are similar, there is no need to further evaluate alternatives to the proposed action.

#### Agencies and Persons Consulted

The NRC staff consulted with the State of Nebraska, Department of Environmental Quality (NDEQ), in the development of the Environmental Assessment. A facsimile copy of the final Environmental Assessment was transmitted to Mr. Frank Mills of the NDEQ on June 11, 1996. In a telephone conversation on June 11, 1996, Mr. Mills indicated that the NDEQ had no comments on the Environmental Assessment.

#### Finding of No Significant Impact

The NRC staff has prepared an Environmental Assessment for the proposed amendment of NRC Source Material License SUA-1534. On the basis of this assessment, the NRC staff has concluded that the environmental impacts that may result from the proposed action would not be significant, and therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not warranted.

The Environmental Assessment and other documents related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at the NRC Public Document Room, in the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, MD., this 25th day of June 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
Joseph J. Holonich,  
*Chief, Uranium Recovery Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 96-16876 Filed 7-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362]

#### **Southern California Edison Co.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15 issued to Southern California Edison Company (the licensee) for operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3 located in San Diego County, California.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications 3.3.11, "Post Accident Monitoring Instrumentation (PAMI)," and 5.5.2.13, "Diesel Fuel Oil Testing Program." Specifically, the number of instruments required to measure reactor coolant inlet temperature ( $T_{cold}$ ), and reactor coolant outlet temperature ( $T_{hot}$ ), will be revised from two per loop to two (with one per steam generator). The proposed change would also revise criteria for diesel fuel oil testing. The changes described above would reinstate provisions of the current San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Unit Nos. 2 and 3 technical specifications that were revised as part of Amendment Nos. 127 and 116. These amendments adopted the recommendations of NUREG-1432, "Standard Technical Specifications Combustion Engineering Plants."

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or

consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Proposed Technical Specification Change Number NPF-10/15-466 (PCN-466), Supplement 1 addresses modifications to the Technical Specifications for San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) Units 2 and 3 approved by NRC Amendment Nos. 127 and 116. NRC Amendment Nos. 127 and 116 approved changes to adopt the recommendations of NUREG-1432, "Standard Technical Specifications Combustion Engineering Plants," requested through Proposed Technical Specification Change Number NPF-10/15-299 (PCN-299). The proposed changes were identified during drafting of the procedure changes required to implement NRC Amendment Nos. 127 and 116.

PCN-466 Supplement 1 is required to restore certain provisions of the current Technical Specifications that were not properly incorporated in Amendment Nos. 127 and 116. Changes are proposed that would revise Technical Specification (TS) TS 3.3.11, "Post Accident Monitoring Instrumentation (PAMI)," and TS 5.5.2.13, "Diesel Fuel Oil Testing Program."

Specifically, the proposed change corrects the number of instruments required to measure  $T_{cold}$  and  $T_{hot}$  from two per loop to two (with one cold leg RDT [RTD] and one hot leg RTD per steam generator) in TS 3.3.11. Also, the proposed change revises diesel fuel oil testing requirements specified in TS 5.5.2.13. In particular, the viscosity limit specified in the Administrative Controls is revised to the correct range per ASTM-D975-81, which is consistent with the Bases to SR 3.8.3.3. Also, a typographical error in paragraph b is corrected. The ASTM standard for sampling fuel oil is restored to ASTM-D4057-81.

These provisions are contained in the current Technical Specifications, TS 3/4.3.3.6, "Accident Monitoring Instrumentation," and in SR 4.8.1.1.2.c of TS 3/4.8.1.1, "A.C. Sources."

Operation of the facility would remain unchanged as a result of the proposed changes. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change will restore provisions of the current Technical Specifications for SONGS Units 2 and 3. The proposed change would correct the number of instruments required to be operable to measure  $T_{cold}$  and  $T_{hot}$  from two per loop to two (with one cold leg RDT [RTD] and one hot leg RTD per steam generator), and revise diesel fuel oil testing requirements.

Operation of the facility would remain unchanged as a result of the proposed change. Therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change will restore provisions of the current Technical

Specifications for SONGS Units 2 and 3 and make certain changes for clarity. Operation of the facility would remain unchanged as a result of the proposed change. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By August 1, 1996, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and

any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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 Main Library, University of California, P.O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or

controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union

operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to William H. Bateman, Director, Project Directorate IV-2: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to T. E. Oubre, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, P. O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated June 3, 1996, as superseded by application dated June 25, 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 Main Library, University of California, P. O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of June 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
Mel B. Fields,  
*Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2,  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of  
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 96-16877 Filed 7-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

### Sunshine Act Meeting

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Weeks of July 1, 8, 15, and 22, 1996.

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

**STATUS:** Public and Closed.

### MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of July 1

Tuesday, July 2

10:00 a.m.

Briefing on Alternatives for Regulating Fuel Cycle Facilities (Public Meeting)  
(Contact: Ted Sherr, 301-415-7218)

Wednesday, July 3

10:00 a.m.

Briefing on BPR Project on Redesigning Material Licensing Process (Public Meeting)

(Contact: Pat Rathbun, 301-415-7178)

11:30 a.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

Week of July 8—Tentative

Wednesday, July 10

11:30 a.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed)

Week of July 15—Tentative

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.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** By a vote of 3-0 on June 26, the Commission determined pursuant to U.S.C. 552b(e) and § 9.107(a) of the Commission's rules that "Affirmation of Innovative Weaponry, Inc.—Request for a Hearing" (Public Meeting) be held on June 26, and on less than one week's notice to the public.

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](mailto:alb@nrc.gov) or [dkw@nrc.gov](mailto:dkw@nrc.gov).

Dated: June 28, 1996.

William M. Hill, Jr.,

*SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96-17011 Filed 6-28-96; 2:29 pm]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

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

**Arizona Public Service Company; Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR § 2.206**

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has acted on a Petition for

action under 10 CFR § 2.206 received from Mr. Thomas J. Saporito, Jr., on behalf of Florida Energy Consultants, Inc., dated May 27, 1994, as supplemented on July 8, 1994, for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

In a letter dated May 27, 1994, the Petitioner requested that the NRC (1) institute a show-cause proceeding pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.202 to modify, suspend, or revoke the operating licenses for Palo Verde; (2) issue a notice of violation against the licensee for continuing to employ The Atlantic Group (TAG) as a labor contractor at Palo Verde; (3) investigate alleged material false statements made by William F. Conway, Executive Vice President at Palo Verde, during his testimony at a Department of Labor hearing (ERA Case No. 92-ERA-030) and, in the interim, require that he be relieved of any authority over operations at Palo Verde; (4) investigate the licensee's statements in a letter of August 10, 1993, from Mr. Conway to the former NRC regional administrator, Mr. Bobby H. Faulkenberry, that Mr. Saporito gave materially false, inaccurate, and incomplete information on his application for unescorted access to Palo Verde and that, as a result, he lacks trustworthiness and reliability for access to Palo Verde; (5) investigate the circumstances surrounding the February 1994 termination of licensee employee Joseph Straub, a former radiation protection technician at Palo Verde, to determine if his employment was illegally terminated by the licensee because he engaged in "protected activity" during the course of his employment; (6) require the licensee to respond to a "chilling effect" letter regarding the circumstances surrounding Mr. Straub's termination from Palo Verde and to specify whether any measures were taken to ensure that his termination did not have a chilling effect at Palo Verde; and (7) initiate appropriate actions to require the licensee to immediately conduct eddy current testing on all steam generators at Palo Verde because the steam generator tubes were recently found to be subject to cracking.

In a letter dated July 8, 1994, the Petitioner raised six additional issues. This supplemental Petition asked the NRC to (1) institute a show-cause proceeding pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.202 for the modification, suspension, or revocation of the Palo Verde operating licenses for Units 1, 2, and 3; (2) modify the Palo Verde operating licenses to require operation at 86-percent power or less; (3) require the licensee to submit a No Significant Hazards safety analysis