

[Docket Nos. 50-313 and 50-368]

Entergy Operations, Inc., Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2; 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 Nos. DPR-51 and NPF-6, issued to Entergy Operations, Inc., (the licensee), for operation of the Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2, located in Pope County, Arkansas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-51 and NPR-6 to reflect the name change from Arkansas Power & Light Company to Entergy Arkansas, Inc.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated May 9, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to correct the name in the license to reflect the change which occurred on April 22, 1996. The name change was made by the licensee to improve customer identification by establishing the name Entergy in the region that it serves.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and changes to the license. We agree with the licensee that the name change will not impact the existing ownership of Arkansas Nuclear One (ANO) or the existing entitlement to power and will not alter the existing antitrust license conditions applicable to Arkansas Power & Light Company (AP&L) or AP&L's ability to comply with these conditions or with any of its other obligations or responsibilities. As stated by the licensee, "The corporate existence continues uninterrupted and all legal characteristics remain the same. Thus, there is no change in the state of incorporation, registered agent, registered office, directors, officers, rights or liabilities of the company, nor is there a change in the function of the Company or the way in which it does business. AP&L's financial responsibility for ANO and its sources of funds to support the facility will remain the same." Therefore, the change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types 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 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 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 for the Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 4, 1996, the staff consulted with Mr. Bernie Bevell, Acting Director, Division of Radiation Control and Emergency Management, 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 May 9, 1996, 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 Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of October, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Thomas W. Alexion,
Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-25900 Filed 10-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Joint Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittees on Materials and Metallurgy and on Severe Accidents; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittees on Materials and Metallurgy and on Severe Accidents will hold a joint meeting on October 22, 1996, Room T-2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows: *Tuesday, October 22, 1996—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business.*

The Subcommittees will review the validity of the technical approach used in developing the proposed risk-informed, performance-based rule, regulatory guide, and industry guidance document associated with steam generator tube integrity. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittees, their consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittees, along with any of their consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittees will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and the Nuclear Energy Institute, and other interested persons regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting