SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: If you are not on the Commission mailing list and wish to receive an agenda, please call 202/653–7220 after April 3, 1998.

Murray N. Ross,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 98–7727 Filed 3–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–BW–M

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: National Labor Relations Board.

TIME AND DATE: 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 28, 1998.

PLACE: Board Conference Room, Eleventh Floor, 1099 Fourteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20570.

STATUS: Closed to public observation pursuant to 5 U.S.C. Section 552b(c)(2) (internal personnel rules and practices); and (c)(6) (personal information where disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy).

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Personnel matters.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: John J. Toner, Executive Secretary, Washington, D.C. 20570, Telephone: (202) 273–1940.

Dated: Washington, D.C., March 16, 1998.

By direction of the Board.

John J. Toner,

Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board..

[FR Doc. 98–7958 Filed 3–23–98; 12:47 pm]

BILLING CODE 7545–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information collection request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR Part 11—Criteria and Procedures for Determining Eligibility for Access to or Control Over Special Nuclear Material.

2. Current OMB approval number: 3150–0062.

3. How often the collection is required: New applications, certifications, and amendments may be submitted at any time. Applications for renewal are submitted every 5 years.

4. Who is required or asked to report: Employees (including applicants for employment), contractors and consultants of NRC licensees and contractors whose activities involve access to or control over special nuclear material at either fixed sites or in transportation activities.

5. The number of annual responses: The majority of responses required under Part 11 are submitted using Standard Form 86, Personnel Security Packet, OMB Clearance No. 3206–0007, and NRC Form 237, Request for Access Authorization, OMB Clearance No. 3150–0050. The response and burden information for those forms is reported separately under those clearances. The remaining number of responses under Part 11 is estimated to be 5.

6. The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: Approximately 0.25 hours annually per response, for an industry total of 1.25 hours annually.

7. Abstract: NRC regulations in 10 CFR part 11 establish requirements for access to special nuclear material, and the criteria and procedures for resolving questions concerning the eligibility of individuals to receive special nuclear material access authorization. Personal history information which is submitted on applicants for relevant jobs is provided to OPM, which conducts investigations. NRC reviews the results of these investigations and makes determinations of the eligibility of the applicants for access authorization.

Submit, by May 26, 1998, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide web site (http://www.nrc.gov) under the FedWorld collection link on the home page tool bar. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions about the information collection requirements may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T–6 F33, Washington, DC 20555–0001, or by telephone at 301–415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–7810 Filed 3–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NOS. STN 50–528, STN 50–529, AND STN 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 the issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–41, NPF–51, and NPF–74, issued to Arizona Public Service Company (the licensee), for operation of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, (PVNGS), located in Maricopa County, Arizona.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed amendments will revise the existing, or current Technical Specifications (CTS) in their entirety for PVNGS and incorporate the guidance provided in NUREG–1432, ''Standard Technical Specifications, Combustion Engineering Plants,'' Revision 1, dated April 1995. The licensee proposed this action in an amendment request dated October 4, 1996, as supplemented by (1) the following 19 letters submitted in 1997 and dated January 31, March 16, May 30 (2 letters), June 6, July 18 (5 letters), August 31, September 18 (2 letters), September 19 (2 letters), November 7, November 14, November 26, and December 16; and (2) the letter dated February 12, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all nuclear power plants would benefit from an improvement and standardization of the plant Technical Specifications (TS). The ''NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Plants,'' (52 FR 3788) contained proposed criteria for defining the scope of TS. Later, the Commission's ''Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' published on July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132), incorporated lessons learned since publication of the interim policy statement and formed the basis for revisions to 10 CFR 50.36. The ''Final Rule'' (60 FR 36953) codified criteria for determining the content of TS. To facilitate the development of standard TS for nuclear power reactors, each power reactor vendor owners' group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS. For PVNGS, the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) are in NUREG–1432. This document formed the basis for the PVNGS Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) conversion. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the STS, made note of its safety merits, and indicated its support of the conversion by operating plants to the STS.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed revision to the CTS is based on NUREG–1432 and on guidance provided by the Commission in its Final Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the CTS. Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding of the TS. The Bases section of the TS has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG–1432, portions of the CTS were also used as the basis for the development of the PVNGS ITS. Plant-specific issues (e.g., unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed with the licensee, and generic matters with Combustion Engineering and other OGs.

The proposed changes from the CTS can be grouped into four general categories. These categories are characterized as relocated requirements, administrative changes, less restrictive changes involving deletion of requirements, and more restrictive changes, and are as follows:

1. Relocated requirements are items which are in the CTS but do not meet the criteria set forth in the Final Policy Statement. The Final Policy Statement establishes a specific set of objective criteria for determining which regulatory requirements and operating restrictions should be included in the TS. Relocation of requirements to documents with an established control program, controlled by the regulations or the TS, allows the TS to be reserved only for those conditions or limitations upon reactor operation which are necessary to obviate the possibility of an abnormal situation or event giving rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety, thereby focusing the scope of the TS. In general, the proposed relocation of items from the CTS to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), appropriate plant-specific programs, plant procedures, or ITS Bases follows the guidance of NUREG–1432. Once these items have been relocated to other licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes by the licensee.

2. Administrative changes involve the reformatting and rewording of requirements, consistent with the style of the STS in NUREG–1432, to make the TS more readily understandable to plant operators and other users. These changes are purely editorial in nature, or involve the movement or reformatting of requirements without affecting the technical content. Application of a standardized format and style will also help ensure consistency is achieved among specifications in the TS. During this reformatting and rewording process, no technical changes (either actual or interpretational) to the TS will be made unless they are identified and justified.

3. Less restrictive changes and the deletion of requirements involve portions of the CTS which (1) provide information that is descriptive in nature regarding the equipment, systems, actions, or surveillances, (2) provide little or no safety benefit, and (3) place an unnecessary burden on the licensee. This information is proposed to be deleted from the CTS and, in some instances, moved to the proposed Bases, UFSAR, or procedures. The removal of descriptive information to the Bases of the TS, UFSAR, or procedures is permissible because these documents will be controlled through a process that utilizes 10 CFR 50.59 and other NRC-approved control mechanisms. The relaxations of requirements were the result of generic NRC actions or other analyses. They will be justified on a case-by-case basis for PVNGS and described in the safety evaluation to be issued with the license amendments.

4. More restrictive requirements are proposed to be implemented in some areas to impose more stringent requirements than are in the CTS. These more restrictive requirements are being imposed to be consistent with the STS. Such changes have been made after ensuring the previously evaluated safety analysis for PVNGS was not affected. Also, other more restrictive technical changes have been made to achieve consistency, correct discrepancies, and remove ambiguities from the TS. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) on plant equipment which is not required by the CTS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

There are seven other proposed changes to the CTS that will be included in the proposed amendments to convert the CTS to the ITS for PVNGS. These other changes have, or will be, the subject of **Federal Register** Notices of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment. These proposed changes are changes to the CTS or deviations to the ISTS and are the following:

1. LCO 3.6.1.5, containment air temperature, the maximum air temperature would be decreased from ≤ 120 °F to ≤ 117 °F, to incorporate instrument uncertainties.

2. LCO 3.6.2.1, containment spray system (CSS) applicability, the LCO would be revised to eliminate the need to enter an emergency shutdown action requirement during a routine shutdown when the CSS is intentionally made inoperable.

3. Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.6.2.1.c, containment spray header piping water level, the minimum water level would be reduced from 115 feet to 113 feet to include instrument uncertainty.

4. SR 4.6.4.3.d.1, allowable pressure drop across the hydrogen purge filtration unit, the allowable pressure drop across the hydrogen purge exhaust air filtration unit for the hydrogen purge cleanup system would be reduced from 8.4 inches of water gauge to 2.26 inches of water gauge as a result of a revised analysis.

5. SR 4.3.2.1, frequency of testing the engineered safety feature actuation system (ESFAS) subgroup relays, would be extended from 62 days to 9 months on a staggered test basis in accordance with an NRC-approved topical report.

6. Applicability Note for LCO 3.5.1, safety injection tank minimum nitrogen

pressure, would increase the minimum required nitrogen cover pressure for the safety injection tanks (SITs) from 254 psig to 260 psig to include instrument uncertainties.

7. Action 3.1.5.d, misalignment distance for movable control assemblies, the criterion to enter the Action statement for the LCO for misalignment of control assemblies would be reduced from 19 inches to 9.9 inches based on a revised analysis.

These seven changes result in more restrictive conditions on safe plant operation, are based on new safety analyses for PVNGS, prevent unnecessary shutdowns when equipment is intentionally made inoperable, or do not affect existing safety analyses for PVNGS.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the CTS for PVNGS. Changes which are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TS. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operators control of PVNGS in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements from the CTS to other licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may then be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 and other NRC-approved control mechanisms which will ensure continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found consistent with the guidelines of NUREG–1432 and the Commission's Final Policy Statement.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to enhance plant safety.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit, or to place an unnecessary burden on the licensee, their removal from the TS was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG and found to be acceptable for the plant. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG–1432 have been reviewed by the NRC staff and found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revisions to the TS were found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

These TS changes will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made to the types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational exposure. Also, these changes do not affect the effect the design or operation of the plant, do not involve any modifications to the plant or any increase in the licensed power for the plant, and will not create any new or unreviewed environmental impacts that were not considered in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) related to the operation of PVNGS dated February 1982. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological impacts associated with the proposed TS amendments.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed amendments involve features located entirely within the restricted area defined in 10 CFR Part 20. They do not affect non-radiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed TS amendments.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed amendments, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the proposed amendments would be to deny the amendments. Denial of the licensee's application would not reduce the environmental impacts of PVNGS operations. 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 FES for PVNGS dated February 1982.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 9, 1998, the staff consulted with the Arizona State official, Mr. William Wright of the Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency, 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 application dated October 4, 1996, as supplemented by (1) 19 letters submitted in 1997 dated January 31, March 16, May 30 (2 letters), June 6, July 18 (5 letters), August 31, September 18 (2 letters), September 19 (2 letters), November 7, November 14, November 26, and December 16, and (2) the letter dated February 12, 1998, 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 Phoenix Public Library, 1221 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jack N. Donohew,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–7809 Filed 3–24–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–327 and 50–328]

Tennessee Valley Authority Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–77 and DPR–79, issued to The Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee), for operation of the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Hamilton County, Tennessee.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24, which requires in each area in which special nuclear material (SNM) is handled, used, or stored, a monitoring system that will energize clear audible alarms if accidental criticality occurs.