

907, Arlington, VA 22230, Telephone: 306-1696.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to the NATO Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (NATO).

Agenda: Review and Evaluate NATO proposals.

Reasons 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 within exemptions 4 and 6 of 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Reasons for Late Notice: Complications with meeting logistics.

Dated: April 5, 1995.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-8817 Filed 4-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Two Public Forums for Alaskan Air Safety Study

As part of a special study of aviation safety in Alaska, the National Transportation Safety Board will convene two public forums. The forums will be held in Juneau, Alaska, on May 22, 1995, at the Westmark Baranof Hotel, 127 North Franklin St., and in Anchorage, Alaska, on May 24 and 25, at the Sheraton Anchorage Hotel, 401 East Sixth Avenue. For more information, contact Mike Benson, Office of Public Affairs, Washington, D.C. 20594, telephone (202) 382-0660.

Dated: April 5, 1995.

Bea Hardesty,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-8771 Filed 4-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7533-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Announcement of the NRC's Intent To Reduce the Scope of Work to States Under Contract to the NRC To Perform Environmental Monitoring in the Environs of Selected NRC Licensed Facilities

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Opportunity for Public Comment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulation Commission (NRC) is issuing an

announcement of its intent to reduce the scope of work for contracts with States which perform environmental monitoring in the environs of selected NRC licensed facilities. The NRC is seeking comment from interested parties regarding the proposed contract action discussed in the announcement presented in the appendix to this document. The NRC will consider comments received from interested parties in the final evaluation of the proposed contract action.

DATES: Comment period expires May 26, 1995. Comments submitted after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Written comments may also be delivered to 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 am to 4:15 pm, Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Klementowicz, (301) 415-1084.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Announcement of the NRC's intent to reduce the scope of work to States under contract to the NRC to perform environmental monitoring in the environs of selected NRC licensed facilities appears in the appendix to this document.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Charles L. Miller,

Chief, Emergency Preparedness and Radiation Protection Branch, Division of Technical Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

Appendix—Announcement of the NRC's Intent to Reduce the Scope of Work to States Under Contract to the NRC To Perform Environmental Monitoring in the Environs of Selected NRC Licensed Facilities

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is soliciting comments on its plan to reduce the scope of work for the Cooperative Agreement program under which States are paid to conduct radiological environmental monitoring in the environs of selected nuclear facilities. The NRC plans to eliminate the scope of work in 1996 for the part of the program under which States obtain and analyze environmental samples. However, the NRC plans to continue the part of the program under which States participate in the NRC's direct radiation monitoring network. This reduction in the scope of work of the program directly affects 27 States. The

elimination of the environmental monitoring portion of the program will not have an impact on public health and safety and does not represent a reduction in plant safety.

The State Cooperative Agreement Program was established in the 1970s to provide NRC assistance to State radiological health programs, through the use of NRC-funded contracts, to perform measurements of radioactive material released into the environment from NRC-licensed facilities. The States issue an annual report to the NRC of all analyses they perform with comparisons of similar analyses performed by the respective nuclear facility. The NRC uses this data as a supplemental tool in assessing the performance of environmental monitoring programs conducted by nuclear power plants. The contracts for environmental monitoring were intended as a means to assist States with nuclear facilities to develop their own environmental monitoring programs, but not to fully fund them.

NRC-licensed facilities are under strict NRC requirements to monitor and control the release of radioactive materials to the air, water and ground around their facilities. The NRC inspects and reviews licensee conformance with the requirements on a routine basis.

In addition to the environmental monitoring portion of the program, which will cost \$1 million for 1995, the NRC has a provision in the contract, which will continue to remain, for the States to participate in the NRC's direct radiation monitoring network. The network provides continuous measurement of the ambient radiation levels around selected nuclear facilities by using small devices called thermoluminescent dosimeters (TLDs). The cost of this program for 1995 is \$195,000.

The environmental monitoring portion of the program was specifically chosen for elimination because of the excellent record maintained by NRC-licensed facilities in controlling the release of radiological effluents into the environment within regulatory limits. In addition, the elimination of the data supplied by the States will not adversely affect NRC's ability to effectively monitor and regulate NRC licensees in this area.

The NRC recognizes the excellent service and cooperation the States have provided under this program. However, the need to constantly examine and adjust programs to ensure that public health and safety is protected in the most cost-effective manner has necessitated the reduction in this program.

[FR Doc. 95-8871 Filed 4-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-306]

Northern States Power Company; Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is

considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License No. DPR-60, issued to Northern States Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 2, located in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of February 23 and March 3, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to the extent that a one-time interval extension for the Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) by approximately 24 months from the May 1995 refueling outage to the May 1997 refueling outage would be granted.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to defer the Type A test from the May 1995 refueling outage to the May 1997 refueling outage, thereby saving the cost of performing the test and eliminating the test period from the critical path time of the outage.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed one-time exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the results of previous Type A tests performed at Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit No. 2, to show good containment performance and will continue to be required to conduct the Type B and C local leak rate tests which historically have been shown to be the principal means of detecting containment leakage paths with the Type A tests confirming the Type B and C test results. It is also noted that the licensee, as a condition of the proposed exemption, would perform the visual containment inspection although it is only required by Appendix J to be conducted in conjunction with Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary. The NRC staff also notes that the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit No. 2,

containment penetration and weld channel pressurization system provides a means for continuously monitoring potential containment leakage paths during power operation. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types or amounts 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 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 action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action. The NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant dated May 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the NRC staff consulted with the Minnesota State official 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 letters dated February 23 and March 3, 1995, 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 Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Cynthia Carpenter,

Acting Director, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Reactor Projects-III/IV Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-8844 Filed 4-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323]

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82, issued to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in San Luis Obispo, California.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant scheduler relief from the Section IV.F.3 of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E requirement for a biennial, full-scale emergency preparedness exercise. The action would allow the licensee to postpone its 1995 full-scale exercise until 1996 and subsequently conduct these exercises in even-numbered years.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated October 17, 1994.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to support the State of California's request to reschedule the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCPP) offsite biennial exercise because currently both nuclear utilities (Pacific Gas and Electric Company and Southern California Edison) conduct their biennial, full-scale exercises in odd-numbered years, which creates a hardship for the State in terms of manpower and finances. The change would allow the State to participate in one exercise each year instead of two exercises every other year.