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 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 1, 1997, NRC staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, R. Maiers of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, 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 December 18, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated February 26, 1997, March 12 and 27, April 3, 9, 16, 18, and 24, 1997, 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 Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stolz,

Director, Project Directorate I–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–11868 Filed 5–5–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 92nd meeting on May 20–22, 1997, in Room T–2B3, at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The schedule for this meeting is as follows:

Tuesday, May 20, 1997—8:30 a.m. until 6 p.m.

Wednesday, May 21, 1997—8:30 a.m. until 6 p.m.

Thursday, May 22, 1997—8:30 a.m. until 4 p.m.

During this meeting, the Committee plans to consider the following:

A. *Planning for and Meeting with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission*—The Committee will prepare for and meet with the Commission to discuss items of mutual interest. Topics will include the ACNW priority list and past Committee reports on the reference biosphere and critical group, flow and transport models for Yucca Mountain, coupled processes in NRC's high-level waste prelicensing program, igneous activity at Yucca Mountain, and risk informed, performance based regulations. The Committee is currently scheduled to meet with the Commission on May 20, 1997 at 2:00 p.m.

B. *Generic Methodology for Decommissioning Performance Assessment (PA)*—The Committee will review the use of PA in the decommissioning of various facilities.

C. *Meeting with NRC's Director, Division of Waste Management, MSS*—The Committee will hold a current events discussion with the Director of NMSS. Topics might include the status of work at the Yucca Mountain site, and high-level waste standards and regulations.

D. *Meeting with Representatives of the DOE and NRC*—The Committee will meet with representatives of the Department of Energy and the NRC staff to discuss DOE's Performance Integrated Safety Assessment (PISA), experience with the use of expert elicitation in the high-level waste repository program, and comments on the defense-in-depth philosophy.

E. *Spent Fuel Dry Storage Facilities*—The Committee will review a draft version of the NRC staff's Standard Review Plan for a spent fuel dry storage facility.

F. *Central Interim Storage Facility*—The Committee will review DOE's non-site-specific Topical Safety Analysis Report (TSAR) for a Central Interim Storage Facility (CISF).

G. *Federal Guidance Report 13*—The Committee will review the Proposed Federal Guidance Report 13, Health Risk for Environmental Exposure to Radionuclides (tentative).

H. *Waste Classification at Hanford, Washington, and Savannah River, South Carolina*—The Committee will discuss the waste classification methodology used by the DOE for wastes resulting from HLW treatment and from bulk HLW removal and cleaning of tanks (tentative).

I. *Preparation of ACNW Reports*—The Committee will discuss potential reports, including igneous activity related to the proposed Yucca Mountain Repository, and other topics discussed during the meeting as the need arises.

J. *Committee Activities/Future Agenda*—The Committee will consider topics proposed for future consideration by the full Committee and Working Groups. The Committee will discuss ACNW-related activities of individual members.

K. *Miscellaneous*—The Committee will discuss miscellaneous matters related to the conduct of Committee activities and organizational activities and complete discussion of matters and specific issues that were not completed during previous meetings, as time and availability of information permit.

Procedures for the conduct of and participation in ACNW meetings were published in the **Federal Register** on October 8, 1996 (61 FR 52814). In accordance with these procedures, oral or written statements may be presented by members of the public, 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 Committee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch, Mr. Richard K. Major, as far in advance as practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made to schedule the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting will be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the ACNW Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be obtained by contacting the Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch, prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACNW meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend

should notify Mr. Major as to their particular needs.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting Mr. Richard K. Major, Chief, Nuclear Waste Branch (telephone 301/415–7366), between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. EDT.

ACNW meeting notices, meeting transcripts, and letter reports are now available on FedWorld from the ''NRC MAIN MENU.'' Direct Dial Access number to FedWorld is (800) 303–9672; the local direct dial number is 703–321–3339.

Dated: April 30, 1997.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Office.

[FR Doc. 97–11717 Filed 5–5–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–245, 50–336, 50–423]

Northeast Utilities; Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2, and 3; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has taken action with regard to a Petition dated October 28, 1994, as supplemented January 15, February 8 and 20, and October 14, 1995, submitted by Mr. Anthony J. Ross. The Petition pertains to Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2, and 3.

In the Petition, the Petitioner raised concerns regarding violations at the Millstone Station involving procedure compliance, work control, and tagging control and requested that ''accelerated'' enforcement action be taken against Northeast Utilities for these violations. As grounds for this request, the Petitioner asserted violations in these areas had increased significantly, that many of these violations had never been assigned a severity level by the NRC, and that when these violations are considered collectively, escalated enforcement action is warranted because of the repetitive nature of the violations.

The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has granted the Petition, in part. In other respects, the Petition is denied. The reasons for this determination are explained in the ''Director's Decision Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206'' (DD–97–11), the complete text of which follows this notice and 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, as well as at the temporary local public document room located at the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

A copy of the Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c) of the Commission's regulations. As provided for by this regulation, the Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after the date of issuance unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Decision in that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of April 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

Director's Decision Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206

I. Introduction

On October 28, 1994, Mr. Anthony J. Ross (Petitioner) filed a Petition with the Executive Director for Operations pursuant to Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR 2.206). By letter dated December 15, 1994, the NRC informed the Petitioner that he had not provided a sufficient factual basis to warrant action under 10 CFR 2.206. The NRC stated that if the Petitioner wished the staff to take action under 10 CFR 2.206, he needed to provide more information describing the specific technical violations that he alleged the NRC had not adequately addressed. By letters dated January 15, February 8, and February 20, 1995, the Petitioner supplemented his Petition by submitting lists of alleged violations. In the Petition, the Petitioner requested that ''accelerated enforcement action'' be taken against Northeast Utilities (NU) for violations at Millstone [1] involving procedure compliance, work control, and tagging control. As a basis for his request, the Petitioner asserted that since August 1993, violations in these areas had increased significantly, that many of these violations had never been assigned a severity level by the NRC, and that when all of the violations are considered collectively, escalated enforcement action is warranted because of the repetitive nature of the violations.

On February 23, 1995, the NRC informed the Petitioner that the Petition had been referred to the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, and that action would be taken within a reasonable time regarding the specific concerns raised in the Petition.

NU responded to the NRC on May 12, 1995, regarding the issues raised in the Petition; the Petitioner submitted a response on July 11, 1995, regarding issues raised in the NU submittal.

On October 14, 1995, the Petitioner submitted a Petition requesting that the NRC take immediate enforcement action consisting of immediate suspension of the licenses to operate the three units at the Millstone Station, and immediate imposition of the maximum daily civil penalty allowed because of the numerous continuing and repetitive violations committed by the licensee since early 1989. The NRC informed the Petitioner by letter dated November 24, 1995, that because his October 14, 1995, Petition did not contain any new information but merely raised again the same issues as in his previous Petition, his October 14, 1995, Petition would be considered as an additional supplement to his January 15, 1995, Petition.[2]

II. Discussion

The Petitioner requested that ''accelerated enforcement action'' be taken against NU for violations at Millstone involving procedure compliance, work control, and tagging control. As a basis for his request, the Petitioner alleged that since August 1993, violations in these areas had increased significantly, that many of these violations had never been assigned a severity level, and that when these violations are considered collectively with violations that had been assigned a severity level, escalated enforcement action is warranted because of the repetitive nature of the violations. In his October 14, 1995, supplement to the Petition, the Petitioner requested that the NRC

[1] Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO/licensee), an electric-power operating subsidiary of NU, holds licenses for the operation of Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Units 1, 2, and 3.

[2] The Petitioner also asserted in his October 14, 1995, Petition that, since many of the violations had been substantiated by the NRC inspectors and/or the licensee, but have not been identified as violations by the NRC, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) should conduct a full investigation of the NRC's neglect. In its November 24, 1995, letter, the NRC informed the Petitioner that this assertion would be referred to the OIG. In addition, in this letter, the Petitioner's request for immediate action was denied. The Petitioner's assertion of neglect by the NRC was referred to the OIG.