depleted uranium is received or transferred under general license. NRC Form 484 is submitted biannually to report groundwater data necessary to implement EPA groundwater standards.

5. *Who will be required or asked to report:* 10 CFR part 40: Applicants for and holders of NRC licenses authorizing the receipt, possession, use, or transfer of radioactive source and byproduct material.

NRC Form 244: Persons receiving, possessing, using, or transferring depleted uranium under the general license established in 10 CFR 40.25(a).

NRC Form 484: Uranium recovery facility licensees reporting groundwater monitoring data pursuant to 10 CFR 40.65.

6. *An estimate of the number of responses:* 10 CFR part 40: 447 for NRC licensees and 311 for Agreement State licensees.

NRC Form 244: 20 for NRC licensees and 40 for Agreement State licensees.

NRC Form 484: Included in 10 CFR Part 40, above.

7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 10 CFR part 40: 156 for NRC licensees and 172 for Agreement State licensees.

NRC Form 244: 20 for NRC licensees and 40 for Agreement State licensees.

NRC Form 484: Included in 10 CFR Part 40, above.

8. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 10 CFR part 40: 26,049 hours for reporting requirements and 9,019 hours for recordkeeping requirements, or a total of 35,068 hours for NRC licensees; 28,083 hours for reporting requirements and 9,398 hours for recordkeeping requirements, or a total of 37,481 hours for Agreement State licensees.

NRC Form 244: 20 hours for NRC licensees and 40 hours for Agreement State licensees for reporting requirements.

NRC Form 484: Included in 10 CFR Part 40, above.

9. *An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Public Law 104–13 applies:* Not applicable.

10. *Abstract:* 10 CFR part 40 establishes requirements for licenses for the receipt, possession, use, and transfer of radioactive source and byproduct material. NRC Form 244 is used to report receipt and transfer of depleted uranium under general license, as required by 10 CFR part 40. NRC Form 484 is used to report certain groundwater monitoring data required by 10 CFR part 40 for uranium recovery licensees. The application, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements are necessary to permit the NRC to make a determination on whether the possession, use, and transfer of source and byproduct material is in conformance with the Commission's regulations for protection of public health and safety.

A copy of the submittal may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access the submittal via modem on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advanced Copy Document Library) NRC subsystem at FedWorld, 703–321–3339. Members of the public who are located outside of the Washington, DC, area can dial FedWorld, 1–800–303–9672, or use the FedWorld Internet address: fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document will be available on the bulletin board for 30 days after the signature date of this notice. If assistance is needed in accessing the document, please contact the FedWorld help desk at 703–487–4608. Additional assistance in locating the document is available from the NRC Public Document Room, nationally at 1–800–397–4209, or within the Washington, DC, area at 202–634–3273.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by June 26, 1997. Edward Michlovich, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0020 and 3150–0031), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395–3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Arnold E. Levin,

Acting Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 97–13780 Filed 5–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50–528, STN–529, and STN–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 exemption from certain requirements of its regulations for Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–41, NPF–51, and NPF–74, issued to Arizona Public Service Company (the licensee), for operation of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, located in Maricopa County, Arizona.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt Arizona Public Service Company from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24, which requires a monitoring system that will energize clear audible alarms if accidental criticality occurs in each area in which special nuclear material is handled, used, or stored. The proposed action would also exempt the licensee from the requirements to maintain emergency procedures for each area in which this licensed special nuclear material is handled, used, or stored to ensure that all personnel withdraw to an area of safety upon the sounding of the alarm, to familiarize personnel with the evacuation plan, and to designate responsible individuals for determining the cause of the alarm, and to place radiation survey instruments in accessible locations for use in such an emergency.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated March 28, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Power reactor license applicants are evaluated for the safe handling, use, and storage of special nuclear material. The proposed exemption from criticality accident requirements is based on the original design for radiation monitoring at Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3 (PVNGS) as discussed in the NUREG–0857, ''Safety Evaluation Report Related to the Operation of Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3.'' The exemption was granted with the original Part 70 license, for the PVNGS units, but it expired with the issuance of the Part 50 licenses when the exemption was inadvertently not included in those licenses. Therefore, the exemption is needed to clearly define the design of the plant as evaluated and approved for licensing.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there is no significant environmental impact if the exemption is granted. Inadvertent or accidental criticality will be precluded through compliance with the Palo Verde Technical Specifications, the design of

the fuel storage racks providing geometric spacing of fuel assemblies in their storage locations, and administrative controls imposed on fuel handling procedures. Technical Specifications requirements specify reactivity limits for the fuel storage racks and minimum spacing between the fuel assemblies in the storage racks.

Appendix A of 10 CFR Part 50,—General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants, Criterion 62, requires the criticality in the fuel storage and handling system shall be prevented by physical systems or processes, preferably by use of geometrically-safe configurations. This is met at PVNGS, as identified in the Technical Specifications and the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). PVNGS Technical Specifications Section 5.3.1.3, states that the new fuel storage racks are designed and shall be maintained with Keff less than or equal to 0.95, if fully flooded with unborated water, and less than or equal to 0.98, if moderated by aqueous foam, and a nominal 17-inch center to center distance between fuel assemblies placed in the storage racks. UFSAR Section 9.1.1.1, New Fuel Storage Design Bases, states that accidental criticality shall be prevented for the most reactive arrangement of new fuel stored, with optimum moderation, by assuring that Keff is less than 0.98, under normal and accident conditions. UFSAR Section 9.1.1.3, Safety Evaluation, states that the new fuel rack design and location ensures that the design bases of Section 9.1.1.1 are met.

The proposed exemption would not result in any significant radiological impacts. The proposed exemption would not affect radiological plant effluent nor cause any significant occupational exposures since the Technical Specifications, design controls (including geometric spacing of fuel assembly storage spaces) and administrative controls preclude inadvertent criticality. The amount of radioactive waste would not be changed by the proposed exemption.

The proposed exemption does not result in any significant non-radiological environmental impacts. The proposed exemption involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological 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 impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed exemption, the staff considered denial of the requested exemption. Denial of the request 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 Operation of Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3,'' dated February 1982, (NUREG–0841).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 3, 1997, 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 March 28, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, which is located at The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C., 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 16th day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James Clifford,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–13781 Filed 5–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Save Wills Creek Water Resources Committee Receipt of Petition and Issuance of a Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated July 22, 1996, Sherwood Bauman, on behalf of the Save Wills Creek Water Resources Committee, requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) take action with regard to Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation and Foote Mineral Company (now Cyprus Foote Mineral Company). Specifically, the Petitioner requested NRC to take the following actions:

(1) NRC should reinstate Foote Mineral's original license so that Shieldalloy and Cyprus Foote become co-responsible licensees concerning the proper remediation and decommissioning of the Shieldalloy site;

(2) Any and all parties involved in any wrongdoing, as alleged in the Petitioner's letter, should be terminated from employment, and where appropriate, criminal charges pursued;

(3) NRC should terminate the development of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Shieldalloy site;

(4) In place of the EIS, Shieldalloy and Cyprus Foote should be jointly ordered to submit a decommissioning plan for licensed material that includes only a plan to remediate licensed material, including grading and evaluation of all various assorted options. One option considered should be offsite disposal at a licensed disposal facility; and

(5) The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) and Ohio Department of Health should evaluate all unlicensed slag found at the Shieldalloy site.

As a basis for the request, the Petitioner asserts that there has been collusion among agencies and responsible parties to remediate offsite slag, that NRC failed to properly police Foote Mineral for a period of 12 years, and that NRC then allowed Foote Mineral to retire its license without investigating the licensee's claims that no licensable materials remained onsite. The Petitioner also asserts that NRC illegally allowed Foote Mineral to return slag to a site owned by Shieldalloy, in the process conspiring with State of Ohio agencies.

The Petitioner further argues that Shieldalloy has a decommissioning plan that would wrongfully mix licensed and unlicensed waste. In support of this claim, he states his belief that the material at the Shieldalloy site is made up of 150,000 tons of licensed material and 350,000 tons of nonlicensed material. The Petitioner believes that Shieldalloy's decommissioning plan illegally combined both licensed and