gaming ordinances and resolutions adopted after the effective date of the regulation; (2) a description of procedures the tribe will employ in conducting background investigations on key employees or primary management officials; (3) a description of procedures the tribe will use to issue licenses to primary management officials and key employees; (4) copies of all gaming regulations; (5) copies of tribal-state compacts; (6) a description of dispute resolution procedures for disputes arising between the gaming public and the tribe or management contractor; (7) an independent audit; and (8) a request for approval of the ordinance or resolution. Under 25 C.F.R. § 522.3 tribes must submit an amendment to the ordinance or resolution.

Estimated Burden: The reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to be 89 hours per response.

Respondents: Tribal gaming owners and operators.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 220.

Estimated Annual Responses: 525.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 46,705 hours.

Copies of the information collections can be obtained from Linda Hutchinson 1441 L Street NW, Suite 9100, Washington, DC 20005.

Harold A. Monteau,

Chairman, National Indian Gaming Commission.

[FR Doc. 96–6510 Filed 3–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7565–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

1. Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: Revision/Extension.

2. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR Part 26, ''Fitness for Duty Program''.

3. The form number if applicable: Not applicable.

4. How often the collection is required: On occasion.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: All licensees authorized to construct or operate a nuclear power reactor and all licensees authorized to possess, use, or transport unirradiated Category 1 nuclear material.

6. An estimate of the number of responses:

a. 148 semi-annual reports (an average of 40 hours per response).

b. 74 telephonic event reports (an average of 15 minutes per response).

c. 44,000 written statements from applicants for unescorted access authorization to protected areas (an average of 30 seconds per response).

7. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 63,960 (7,210 hours of reporting burden, and 56,750 hours of recordkeeping burden).

8. An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104–13 applies: Not applicable.

9. Abstract: 10 CFR Part 26, ''Fitness for Duty Program,'' requires licensees of nuclear power plants and licensees authorized to possess, use, or transport unirradiated Category 1 nuclear material to implement fitness-for-duty programs to assure that personnel are not under the influence of any substance or mentally or physically impaired, to retain certain records associated with the management of these programs, and to provide reports concerning significant events. Compliance with these requirements is mandatory for licensees subject to 10 CFR Part 26.

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 April 18, 1996. Peter Francis, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0146), 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 14th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 96–6519 Filed 3–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–213]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–61, issued to Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the Haddam Neck Plant located in Middlesex County, Connecticut.

The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TS) and associated Bases based on Dose Consequence Reanalysis and Containment Pressure and Temperature Reanalysis as follows:

TS 3.4.6.2—Extend the 2 liter per hour pump seal leakage criteria to be applicable to an individual charging or high pressure safety injection (HPSI) pump. Change allowable combined leakage from 3 liters per hour to 5 liters per hour for recirculation systems outside of containment.

TS 3/4.6.2—Revise required containment air recirculation (CAR) system flow from 52,000 plus or minus 2,500 cfm per unit to 40,000 cfm to 55,000 cfm per unit. Revise the heat removal rate for each CAR unit from 26.5×10^{6} BTU/hr to 24.0×10^{6} BTU/hr.

TS Table 3.7–6—Revise the maximum isolation time for the feedwater motor operated valves from 70 seconds to 40 seconds.

TS 3/4.7.11—Delete the APPLICABILITY and ACTION statement for modes 1,2,3, and 4. The Primary Auxiliary Building (PAB) Air

Cleanup System is only explicitly credited by the Haddam Neck Plant in a fuel assembly handling accident. This section will be moved to Section 3/4.9 (Refueling Operations) since this proposed change will require the PAB Air Cleanup System be operable during refueling activities only.

B3/4.4.6.2—The change provides a discussion of the 2 liter per hour limitation on leakage from an individual residual heat removal, charging, or HPSI pump mechanical seal. It also provides a discussion on the new limitation on combined leakage for recirculation systems outside of containment.

B3/4.6.2—Provides the basis for the 40,000 cfm lower air flow limit, the revised heat removal rate, and a discussion on the existence of higher than normal air flows for the CAR system during a loss of coolant accident.

B3/4.7.11—This discussion on the PAB Air Cleanup System will be renumbered 3/4.9.15 as part of the Refueling Operations bases. This section will specify that air cleanup is accomplished by one exhaust fan, one prefilter, the HEPA/HECA filter, and interconnecting ductwork (i.e., one train of the PAB Air Cleanup System).

The appropriate Index pages from the Haddam Neck Plant Technical Specifications will also be revised to reflect the changes discussed above.

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.

By April 18, 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 Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, CT 06457. 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 a 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.

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, 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 Phillip F. McKee: 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, and to Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq., Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141–0270, 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).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated December 19, 1995, 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 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 oppotunity 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