findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and NRC's regulations. These findings will be documented in a Safety Evaluation Report and an Environmental Assessment. The renewal of the license will be documented in the issuance of a renewed SMB–743 license.

The NRC hereby provides notice that this is a proceeding on an application for renewal of a license falling within the scope of Subpart L. ''Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudication in Materials Licensing Proceedings,'' of NRC's rules and practice for domestic licensing proceedings in 10 CFR part 2. Pursuant to Section 2.1205(a), any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a request for a hearing in accordance with § 2.1205(c). A request for a hearing must be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of publication of the **Federal Register** notice.

The request for a hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary either:

1. By delivery to the Docketing and Services Branch of the Office of the Secretary at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852–2738; or

2. By mail or telegram addressed to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555. Attention: Docketing and Services Branch.

In addition to meeting other applicable requirements of 10 CFR Part 2 of the NRC's regulations, a request for a hearing filed by a person other than an applicant must describe in detail:

1. The interest of the requester in the proceeding;

2. How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requester should be permitted a hearing, with particular reference to the factors set out in § 2.1205 (g);

3. The requester's concerns in the area of licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and

4. The circumstances establishing that the request for a hearing is timely in accordance with § 2.1205 (c).

In accordance with 10 CFR § 2.1205(e), each request for a hearing must also be served, by delivering it personally or by mail to:

1. The applicant, Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation to the attention of Mr. Scott Eves, West Boulevard, P.O. Box 768, Newfield, NJ 08344; and

2. The NRC staff, by delivery to the Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852; or by mail addressed to the Executive Director for Operations, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Any hearing that is requested and granted will be held in accordance with the NRC's Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Material Licensing Proceedings in 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L.

For further details with respect to this action, the licensee's renewal request dated September 15, 1995, and an NRC staff assessment of financial assurance aspects of the renewal (SECY–96–210), dated October 1, 1996, are available for inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20555. Questions should be referred to NRC's project manager for the Shieldalloy, Newfield facility, Heather Astwood, at (301) 415–5819. License No: SMB–743.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of June, 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael F. Weber,

Chief Licensing Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards, NMSS

[FR Doc. 97–17141 Filed 6–30–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–206, 50–361 AND 50–362]

Southern California Edison Company; San Diego Gas and Electric Company; the City of Riverside, CA; the City of Anaheim, CA; San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2 and 3; Consideration of Corporate Restructuring

Notice is hereby given that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an order under 10 CFR 50.80 approving an application concerning the proposed corporate restructuring of Enova Corporation, parent company for San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), one of the co-owners of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3, along with Southern California Edison Company, The City of Riverside, California, and The City of Anaheim, California. By letter dated December 2, 1996, SDGE, through Richard A. Meserve of Covington & Burling, counsel for SDG&E, informed the Commission of a proposed corporate restructuring of SDG&E's parent company, Enova Corporation, whereby Enova would combine with Pacific Enterprises, with each becoming a subsidiary of a newly created holding company, Mineral Energy Company (New Holding Company). SDG&E will remain a subsidiary of Enova. SDG&E will remain co-holder of licenses for San Onofre Units 1, 2 and 3. Under the restructuring, SDG&E's preferred stock and debt will not be affected and will remain securities and obligations of SDG&E. After the restructuring, SDG&E will continue to be a public utility providing the same utility services as it did immediately prior to the reorganization. According to the proposed plan, there will be no significant change in ownership, management, or sources of funds for operation, maintenance, or decommissioning of the San Onofre power stations due to the corporate restructuring.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.80, the Commission may approve the transfer of control of a license after notice to interested persons. Such approval is contingent upon the Commission's determination that the holder of the license following the transfer is qualified to hold the license and that the transfer is otherwise consistent with applicable provisions of law, regulations, and orders of the Commission.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the letter dated December 2, 1996 by Richard A. Meserve of Covington & Burling. This document is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Main Library, University of California, Irvine, California.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of June 1997.

Mel B. Fields,

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

[FR Doc. 97–17142 Filed 6–30–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–206, 50–361, and 50–362]

San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2 and 3; Southern California Edison Company, et al; Environmental Assessment And Finding Of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an order under 10 CFR 50.80 approving an application concerning the corporate restructuring of Enova Corporation, parent company of San Diego Gas and Electric Company (the co-licensee), co-holder of Possession Only License No. DPR–13, and Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–10 and NPF–15, along with Southern California Edison Company,

The City of Riverside, California, and The City of Anaheim, California (the co-licensees) issued for operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), Units 1, 2, and 3, located in San Diego County, California.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would consent to the transfer of control of the licenses to the extent effected by the proposed restructuring of Enova Corporation (Enova), parent company of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), whereby Enova would combine with Pacific Enterprises (Pacific), with each becoming a subsidiary of a newly created holding company, Mineral Energy Company (New Holding Company). SDG&E would continue to be a wholly-owned subsidiary of Enova and would continue to be a co-licensee of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3. The proposed action is in accordance with the request made by SDG&E through its counsel Richard A. Meserve of Covington & Burling in a letter dated December 2, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to enable Enova to restructure as described above. Enova and Pacific have submitted that restructuring will improve their ability to compete in the rapidly evolving energy marketplace.

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 SONGS. The corporate restructuring will not affect the qualifications or organizational affiliation of the personnel who operate the facilities, as SDG&E will continue to be responsible for its portion of the operation of SONGS, Units 1, 2 and 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 San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1, dated October 1973, and the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3, dated April 1981, and its Errata dated June 5, 1981.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 29, 1997, 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 letter dated December 2, 1996, by Richard A. Meserve of Covington & Burling (Counsel for SDG&E), 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 Main Library, University of California, Irvine, California.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of June 1997.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mel B. Fields,

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

[FR Doc. 97–17144 Filed 6–30–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–482]

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit 1); Exemption

I

On June 4, 1985, the Commission issued Facility Operating License No. NPF–42 to Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (the licensee) for the Wolf Creek Generating Station, Unit 1 (WCGS). The license provides, among other things, that the licensee is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect.

II

Subsection (a) of 10 CFR 70.24, ''Criticality Accident Requirements,'' requires that each licensee authorized to possess special nuclear material (SNM) shall maintain in each area where such material is handled, used, or stored, an appropriate criticality monitoring system. In accordance with Subsection (a)(1) of 10 CFR 70.24, coverage of all such areas at WCGS shall be provided by two criticality detectors. However, exemptions may be requested pursuant to 10 CFR 70.24(d), provided that the licensee believes that good cause exists for the exemption. In particular, Regulatory Guide 8.12, Revision 2, ''Criticality Accident Alarm System,'' states that it is appropriate to request an exemption from 10 CFR 70.24 if an evaluation determines that a potential for criticality does not exist, as for example where geometric spacing is used to preclude criticality.

By letter dated September 19, 1995, and supplement dated March 21, 1997, the licensee requested an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24. A previous exemption from the provisions of 10 CFR Part 70.24 for the storage of SNM, including reactor fuel assemblies [maximum amount of 2,400 kg of U–235 in uranium enriched to no more than 3.50 weight percent (w/o)], was granted to Wolf Creek Nuclear