

Date and Time: October 16–17, 1997; 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Room 1175 Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person(s): Tatsuya Suda, Program Director, CISE/NCRI, Room 1175, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, (703) 306–1950.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review & evaluate proposals submitted for the Networking and Communications Program.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b.(c)(4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: September 22, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–25459 Filed 9–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Advisory Panel for Neuroscience; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Advisory Panel for Neuroscience (1158).

Date and Time: October 16 & 17, 1997; 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Place: Room 340, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA.

Type of Meeting: Part-Open.

Contact Persons: Dr. Emmeline Edwards, Program Director, Behavioral Neuroscience; Dr. Daniel Hartline, Program Director, Computational Neuroscience; Division of Integrative Biology and Neuroscience; room 685, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230; Telephone: (703) 306–1416.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Minutes: May be obtained from the contact persons listed above.

Agenda: Open Session: October 17, 1997; 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., To discuss research trends and opportunities in Behavioral and Computational Neuroscience. Closed Session: October 16, 1997; 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.; October 17, 1997; 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.; 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. To review and evaluate Behavioral and Computational Neuroscience proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

Reason For Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a

proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: September 22, 1997.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–25458 Filed 9–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–261]

Carolina Power & Light Company; H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

1.0 Introduction

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–23 issued to the Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L or the licensee) for operation of the H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2 (Robinson) located at the licensee's site in Darlington County, South Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application dated August 27, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated January 17, February 18, March 27, April 4, April 25, April 29, May 30, June 2, June 13, June 18, August 4, August 8, and September 10, 1997. The proposed amendment will replace the current Robinson Technical Specifications (CTS) in their entirety with Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) based on Revision 1 to NUREG–1431, "Standard Technical Specifications Westinghouse Plants" dated April 1995, and the CTS for Robinson.

In the application of August 27, 1996, the licensee also requested an amendment to the Appendix B TS to relocate certain radiological and environmental reporting requirements to a licensee-controlled document. Appendix B TS contain environmental reporting requirements which were relocated to Appendix B as an interim action in 1976 pending reissuance of comprehensive Appendix B Environmental TS. These requirements are comparable to portions of other Radiological Environmental Monitoring

TS that are also being separately relocated because they do not relate to mitigating a design basis accident or transient.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all plants would benefit from improvement and standardization of TS. The Commission's "NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," (52 FR 3788, February 6, 1987), and later the Commission's "Final Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," 58 FR 39132 (July 22, 1993), formalized this need. To facilitate the development of individual improved TS, each reactor vendor owners group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS (STS). For Westinghouse plants, the STS are published as NUREG–1431, and this document was the basis for the new Robinson TS. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the STS and made note of the safety merits of the STS and indicated its support of conversion to the STS by operating plants.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed revision to the TS is based on NUREG–1431 and on guidance provided in the Final Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the existing TS. Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding. The Bases section has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG–1431, portions of the existing TS were also used as the basis for the ITS. Plant-specific issues (unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed at length with the licensee, and generic matters with the OG.

The proposed changes from the existing TS can be grouped into four general categories, as follows:

1. Non-technical (administrative) changes, which were intended to make the ITS easier to use for plant operations personnel. They are purely editorial in nature or involve the movement or reformatting of requirements without affecting technical content. Every section of the Robinson TS has undergone these types of changes. In order to ensure consistency, the NRC staff and the licensee have used NUREG–1431 as guidance to reformat and make other administrative changes.
2. Relocation of requirements, which includes items that were in the existing

Robinson TS. The TS that are being relocated to licensee-controlled documents are not required to be in the TS under 10 CFR 50.36 and do not meet any of the four criteria in the Commission's Final Policy Statement for inclusion in the TS. They are not needed to obviate the possibility that an abnormal situation or event will give rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety. The NRC staff has concluded that appropriate controls have been established for all of the current specifications, information, and requirements that are being moved to licensee-controlled documents. In general, the proposed relocation of items in the Robinson TS to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), appropriate plant-specific programs, procedures and ITS Bases follows the guidance of the Westinghouse STS (NUREG-1431). Once these items have been relocated by removing them from the TS to licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC staff-approved control mechanisms, which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes.

3. More restrictive requirements, which consist of proposed Robinson ITS items that are either more conservative than corresponding requirements in the existing Robinson TS, or are additional restrictions that are not in the existing Robinson TS but are contained in NUREG-1431. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition of Operation (LCO) on plant equipment that is not required by the present TS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

4. Less restrictive requirements, which are relaxations of corresponding requirements in the existing Robinson TS that provide little or no safety benefit and place unnecessary burdens on the licensee. These relaxations were the result of generic NRC actions or other analyses. They have been justified on a case-by-case basis for Robinson as will be described in the staff's Safety Evaluation to be issued with the license amendment, which will be noticed in the **Federal Register**.

In addition to the changes described above, the licensee proposed certain changes to the existing TS that deviated from the STS in NUREG-1431. These additional proposed changes are described in the licensee's application and in the staff's Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing

(61 FR 55830). Where these changes represent a change to the current licensing basis for Robinson, they have been justified on a case-by-case basis and will be described in the staff's Safety Evaluation to be issued with the license amendment.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed TS conversion would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents.

Changes that are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TS, and are acceptable. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operator's control of the plant in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements to licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which ensures continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found to be in conformance with the guidelines of NUREG-1431 and the Final Policy Statement, and, therefore, are acceptable.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to be acceptable and are likely to enhance the safety of plant operations.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit or to place unnecessary burdens on the licensee, their removal from the TS was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic NRC action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG and found to be acceptable for Robinson. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1431 as well as proposed deviations from NUREG-1431 have also been reviewed by the NRC staff and have been found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revision to the TS was found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided so that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

These TS changes will not increase the probability or consequences of

accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The revisions to the Appendix B TS relocate reporting requirements on radioactive effluent releases, solid waste shipments and results of the environmental monitoring programs. The relocation of the reporting requirements to a licensee-controlled document is comparable to portions of other radiological environmental monitoring TS which are also being separately relocated. Programmatic aspects of these specifications are retained in the ITS Administrative Controls. The relocation of the reporting requirements will not change or affect the possible releases or monitoring programs. Therefore, 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 involves 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 amendments, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to this action would be to deny the request for the amendment. Such action would not reduce the environmental impacts of plant operations.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to the operation of the Robinson Electric Generating Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 11, 1997, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Max Batavia, Chief, South Carolina Department of Health, Bureau of Radiological Health and Environmental Control. The State official had no comments.

Findings 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 amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated August 27, 1996, and supplemental letters dated January 17, February 18, March 27, April 4, April 25, April 29, May 30, June 2, June 13, June 18, August 4, August 8, and September 10, 1997, which are 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 Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College, Hartsville, South Carolina 29550.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 22nd day of September, 1997.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gordon E. Edison,

*Acting Director, Project Directorate II-I,
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-25630 Filed 9-24-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412]

**Duquesne Light Company, et al.;
Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos.
1 and 2; Environmental Assessment
and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval, by issuance of an order under 10 CFR 50.80, of the indirect transfer of Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73, to the extent they are held by the Duquesne Light Company (DLC) for Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (BVPS-1 and BVPS-2), located in Shippingport, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment**Identification of the Proposed Action**

The proposed action would consent to the indirect transfer of the licenses with respect to a proposed merger between DQE, Inc., and Allegheny Power Systems, Inc. DQE, Inc. is the parent holding company of DLC, which holds

licenses to possess interests in and operate BVPS-1 and BVPS-2. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, The Toledo Edison Company, and Ohio Edison Company, and its subsidiary Pennsylvania Power Company, also hold licenses to possess interests in BVPS-1 and BVPS-2, but are not involved in the proposed merger. In the proposed merger, DQE, Inc. will become a wholly owned subsidiary of Allegheny Power. Allegheny Power will be renamed Allegheny Energy, Inc.

According to the application, the merger will have no effect on the operation of Beaver Valley Power Station or the provisions of its operating licenses. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, The Toledo Edison Company, Ohio Edison Company, and Pennsylvania Power Company will remain licensees responsible for their possessory interests and related obligations. Duquesne Light Company will continue to operate the Beaver Valley Power Station after the merger, as required by the operating licenses. No direct transfer of the licenses will result from the merger.

The proposed action is in accordance with DLC's request for approval dated August 1, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to obtain the necessary consent to the indirect transfer of the licenses discussed above. According to the application, the underlying transaction is needed to create a stronger, more competitive enterprise that is expected to save over \$1 billion in net savings over the first 10 years, thereby enhancing DLC's financial resources to possess its interests in BVPS-1 and BVPS-2.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has reviewed the proposed action and concludes that there will be no changes to the facility or its operation as a result of the proposed action. Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes that there are no

significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

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 Related to the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 1," dated July 1973, and the "Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 2," dated September 1986 in NUREG-1094.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 5, 1997, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. Michael P. Murphy of the Bureau of Radiation Protection, Department of Environmental Protection, 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 DLC's submittal dated August 1, 1997, 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 B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 15001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of September 1997.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stolz,

*Director, Project Directorate I-2, Division of
Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear
Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-25445 Filed 9-24-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P