NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–133, 50–275, AND 50–323]

Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 and Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit 3 Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval under 10 CFR 50.80(a) of the transfer of control of the licenses that would be effected by the corporate restructuring of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (the licensee), holder of Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–80, DPR–82, and DPR–7, issued for operation of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (DCPP), Units 1 and 2, located in San Luis Obispo County, California, and the Humboldt Bay Power Plant (HBPP), Unit 3, located in Humboldt County, California.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would consent to the transfer of control of the licenses that would result from the restructuring of Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) by establishment of a holding company under the temporary name ''PG&E Parent Co., Inc.'' PG&E would become a wholly owned subsidiary and would continue to be the licensee of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, and Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit 3. The proposed action is in accordance with PG&E's application dated November 1, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to enable PG&E to restructure as described above. PG&E has submitted that restructuring will enable it to better prepare to implement changes resulting from electric industry restructuring, and will enhance the insulation of PG&E's California utility business, including the DCPP and HBPP units, from any business risks associated with non-utility enterprises.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed corporate restructuring and concludes that there will be no physical or operational changes to Diablo Canyon and Humboldt Bay. The corporate restructuring will not affect the qualifications or organizational affiliation of the personnel who operate the facilities, as PG&E will continue to be responsible for the operation of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 and Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit 3.

The Commission has evaluated the environmental impact of the proposed action and has determined that the probability or consequences of accidents would not be increased by the restructuring, and that post-accident radiological releases would not be greater than previously determined. Further, the Commission has determined that the corporate restructuring would not affect routine radiological plant effluents and would not increase occupational radiological 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 restructuring would not affect nonradiological plant effluents and would have no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternative with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested 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 identical.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, dated May 1973, and the Humboldt Bay Power Plant, dated April 1987.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 17, 1996, the staff consulted with the California State official, Mr. Steve Hsu of the Radiologic Health Branch of the State Department of Health Services, 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 November 1, 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 rooms located at the Humboldt County Library, 1313 3rd Street, Eureka, California 95501, and at the California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of June 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Steven D. Bloom,

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

[FR Doc. 96–15399 Filed 6–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of change of meeting.

As previously announced, the Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee (NSRRC) will hold its next meeting on June 27–28, 1996. The purpose of the present notice is to provide a revised schedule, reflecting a change in meeting location and a change in the list of meeting topics. The location of the meeting will now be in Room T–10A1, Two White Flint North (TWFN) Building, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD. The meeting will still be held from 9am to 5pm on both days.

The revised list of topics is as follows:

(1) To discuss the March 27, 1996 NSRRC briefing with the Commission;

(2) To receive a presentation by the Nuclear Energy Institute on their views on nuclear safety research needs; and

(3) To review and discuss the reports and recommendations of the Subcommittees on Research in Support of Risk-Based Regulation (PRA), including discussions on risk informed performance-based regulation; Instrumentation and Control (I&C) and

Human Factors; and Subcommittee on Accident Analysis.

Any inquiries regarding this notice or any subsequent changes in the status and schedule of the meeting, may be made to the Designated Federal Officer, Dr. Jose Luis M. Cortez (telephone: 301–415–6596), between 8:15 am and 5:00 pm.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 12th day of June, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Andrew L. Bates,

Federal Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–15396 Filed 6–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee (NSRRC); Meeting of the Materials and Engineering Subcommittee

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

The Materials and Engineering Subcommittee will hold a meeting on June 26, 1996. The meeting will take place, starting at 9:00 a.m., in room T–2B1, Two White Flint North (TWFN) Building, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD and will be open to public attendance.

The Materials and Engineering Subcommittee will review the general nuclear safety research activities of the Division of Engineering Technology, including:

- Recent research activities in the area of reactor pressure vessel integrity including developments in the vessel thermal annealing demonstration program,
- Progress in the research program on the equipment qualification of electric cables,
- Steam generator tube integrity activities,
- Assessment of degraded structures and components,
- Generic Safety Issues, and
- Other items of interest to the Subcommittee.

A detailed agenda will be made available at the meeting. Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the presiding Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Subcommittee. Questions may be asked only by members of the NSRRC Subcommittee and the staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff member named below as far in advance as is practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portions of the meetings, the Subcommittee may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting. The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding the topics to be discussed.

Further information regarding topics to be covered, the rescheduling and/or cancellation of meeting sessions, and the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted for discussion can be obtained by a telephone call to Dr. Jose Luis M. Cortez (telephone 301/415–6596) between 9:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (EST). Persons planning to attend these meetings are urged to contact the above named individual one or two business days before the scheduled meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: June 10, 1996.

Jose Luis M. Cortez,

Senior Research Program Coordinator, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 96–15401 Filed 6–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–528, 50–529, 50–530]

Arizona Public Service Company (Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station) (License Nos. NPF–41, NPF–51, NPF–74); Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

A Petition was filed by Thomas J. Saporito, Jr. (Petitioner), in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206 on May 12, 1993. The Petition requested that the NRC: (1) Institute a show cause proceeding pursuant to 10 CFR 2.202 to modify, suspend, or revoke Arizona Public Service (APS) Company's operating licenses for Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (Palo Verde); (2) initiate actions to shut down Palo Verde; (3) take escalated enforcement action against APS, including the issuance of civil penalties against APS and/or licensee management personnel at Palo Verde; and (4) survey Palo Verde employees to gauge the chilling effect that may exist and whether the licensee's actions were effective in limiting the chilling effect. On May 28, 1993, Petitioner forwarded a New Times article to the NRC as a supplement to this petition. On October 26, 1993, Petitioner supplemented the May 12, 1993 Petition to include a copy of an October 23, 1993 discrimination complaint filed by the Petitioner with the Department of Labor against APS and The Atlantic Group (TAG). In the October 26, 1993 supplement, Petitioner reiterated his earlier request for action and additionally requested escalated enforcement action against TAG and against any of its employees who are found to have engaged in wrongdoing.

Another Petition was filed by Petitioner on January 15, 1994. This Petition, which has been treated as a supplement to the May 12, 1993 Petition: (1) Reiterated the requests for escalated enforcement action against APS that were made in the May 12, 1993 Petition; (2) requested that APS be required to provide a make-whole remedy for Petitioner for terminating Petitioner and failing to rehire him as a result of Petitioner's engaging in protected activities; and (3) requested that APS be required to abate and obviate the chilling effect at APS arising from the failure to provide the Petitioner with employee protections afforded under 10 CFR 50.7.

As the bases for the May 12, 1993 request, Petitioner asserted that: (1) A Department of Labor (DOL) Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled that APS discriminated against Petitioner; (2) the DOL case is evidence that ''the licensee appears to have violated numerous NRC requirements regarding operation of the Palo Verde nuclear station; and (3) licensee managers have made questionable if not false statements to the NRC regarding the emergency lighting at Palo Verde. Petitioner's October 26, 1993 supplement to the original Petition bases the request for action on Petitioner's October 23, 1993 complaint filed with DOL and the ruling in favor of Ms. Sarah C. Thomas against APS. Petitioner's January 15, 1994 supplement to the original Petition bases the request for action on the admission by one of the witnesses at the Petitioner's DOL hearing that the witness lied under oath, as evidence of APS' intent to discriminate against Petitioner and that the discriminatory treatment of Petitioner has caused a chilling effect on other employees at Palo Verde.

Another Petition was filed by Petitioner and Florida Energy Consultants (Petitioners) on May 27, 1994. This Petition: (1) Reiterated the request for a show cause proceeding, and further requested that the NRC: (2) issue a notice of violation against the Licensee for continuing to employ 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,