Advisory Council at the above address. Papers will be accepted and included in the record of the meeting if received on or before October 3, 1996.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 18th day of September, 1996.

Olena Berg,

Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–24450 Filed 9–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–29–M

Working Group on Guidance for Selecting and Monitoring Service Providers Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans; Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to the authority contained in Section 512 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), 29 U.S.C. 1142, a public meeting of the Working Group on Guidance for Selecting and Monitoring Service Providers of the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans will be held on October 9, 1996, in Room S3215 A&B, U.S. Department of Labor Building, Second and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

The purpose of the meeting, which will run from 9:30 a.m. to approximately noon, is for Working Group members to review testimony taken thus far in the year on how to guide plans in selecting investment consultants and advisers and for them to begin formulating their recommendations to ultimately be presented at the full Council's meeting on November 13.

There will be no full council meeting in October.

Members of the public are encouraged to file a written statement pertaining to any topic concerning ERISA by submitting 20 copies on or before September 27, 1996, to Sharon Morrissey, Acting Executive Secretary, ERISA Advisory Council, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–5677, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210. Individuals or representatives of organizations wishing to address the Working Group on Guidance for Selecting and Monitoring Service Providers should forward their request to the Acting Executive Secretary or telephone (202) 219–8753. Oral presentations will be limited to 10 minutes, but an extended statement may be submitted for the record. Individuals with disabilities, who need special accommodations, should contact Sharon Morrissey by October 3, 1996, at the address indicated in this notice.

Organizations or individuals may also submit statements for the record without testifying. Twenty copies of such statements should be sent to the Acting Executive Secretary of the Advisory Council at the above address. Papers will be accepted and included in the record of the meeting if received on or before October 3.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 18th day of September, 1996.

Olena Berg,

Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–24451 Filed 9–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–29–M

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

TIME AND DATE: 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 1, 1996.

PLACE: The Board Room, 5th Floor, 490 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20594.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

6744 Recommendations to FAA: Boeing 737 Directional Control System Improvements and Unusual Attitude Recovery Training.

6745 Recommendations to FAA: American Airlines Accident near Buga, Colombia, December 20, 1995.

NEWS MEDIA CONTACT: Telephone: (202) 382–0660.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: Bea Hardesty, (202) 382–6525.

Dated: September 20, 1996.

Bea Hardesty,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–24554 Filed 9–20–96; 10:05 am]

BILLING CODE 7533–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–255]

Consumers Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–20 issued to Consumers Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the Palisades Plant located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

The proposed amendment would revise the Palisades Technical Specifications (TS) to extend the surveillance interval frequency for the primary coolant pump (PCP) flywheels by one operating cycle. By letter dated January 18, 1996, the licensee previously submitted a request to amend the TS to delete the requirement to perform PCP flywheel inspections. NRC review of the original request will not be completed in time for the upcoming refueling outage scheduled for November 1996; therefore, the licensee has submitted this separate request to extend the surveillance frequency by one operating cycle. The licensee's August 14, 1996, submittal to extend the surveillance frequency stated that the no significant hazards consideration determination presented in its January 18, 1996, submittal remains bounding.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The following evaluation supports the finding that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change to the Technical Specifications would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to the Technical Specifications would delete the requirement to perform non-destructive examination of the upper flywheel on the PCPs. The fracture mechanics analyses conducted to support the change show that a preexisting crack sized just below detection level will not grow to the flaw size necessary to result in flywheel failure within the life of the plant. This analysis conservatively assumes minimum material properties, maximum flywheel accident speed, location of the flaw in the highest stress area and a number of startup/

shutdown cycles eight times greater than expected. Since an existing flaw in the flywheel will not grow to the allowable flaw size under normal operating conditions or to the critical flaw size under LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident] conditions over the life of the plant, elimination of inservice inspection for such cracks during the plant's life will not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously considered.

The proposed changes do not increase the amount of radioactive material available for release or modify any systems used for mitigation of such releases during accident conditions. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change to the Technical Specifications would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed change to the Technical Specifications would not change the design, configuration, or method of operation of the plant and therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change to the Technical Specifications would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change to the Technical Specifications would not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety. Significant conservatisms have been used for calculating the allowable flaw size, critical flaw size and crack growth rate in the PCP flywheels. These include minimum material properties, maximum flywheel accident speed, location of the postulated flaw in highest stress area and a number of startup/shutdown cycles eight times greater than expected. Since an existing flaw in the flywheel will not grow to the maximum allowable flaw size under normal operating conditions or to the critical flaw size under LOCA conditions over the life of the plant, elimination of inservice inspections for such cracks during the plant's life will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By October 24, 1996, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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 Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one

contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1–(800) 248–5100 (in Missouri 1–(800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to John Hannon: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1) (i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 14, 1996, and the related application dated January 18, 1996, 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 Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of September 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert G. Schaaf,

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

[FR Doc. 96–24410 Filed 9–23–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–397]

Washington Public Power Supply System; WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to the technical specifications (TSs) for Facility Operating License No. NPF–21, issued to Washington Public Power Supply System (the Supply System or the licensee) for operation of the WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2 (WNP–2), located in Benton County, Washington.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed amendment will revise the existing Technical Specifications (TS) in its entirety and incorporate the guidance provided in NUREG–1434, ''Improved BWR/6 Technical Specifications,'' Revision 1, April 1995. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated December 8, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated July 9, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all plants would benefit from improvement and standardization of TS. The ''NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' 52 FR 3788) contained proposed criteria for defining the scope of technical specifications. Later, the ''NRC Final Policy Statement on TS Improvement for Nuclear Power Reactors,'' (58 FR 39132) incorporated lessons learned since publication of the interim policy statement and formed the basis for recent revisions to 10 CFR 50.36. The ''Final Rule'' (60 FR 36953) codified criteria for determining the content of technical specifications. To facilitate the development of standard TS, each reactor vendor owners' group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS. For WNP–2, the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) are NUREG–1434, ''Improved BWR/6 Technical Specifications,'' Revision 1. This document formed the basis for the WNP–2 Improved TS (ITS) conversion. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the STS, made note of its safety merits, and indicated its support of conversion by operating plants to the STS.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed revision to the TS is based on NUREG–1434 and on guidance provided in the Final Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the existing TS. Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding. The Bases section has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG–1434, portions of the existing TS were also used as the basis for the development of the WNP–2 ITS. Plant specific issues (unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed at length with the licensee and generic matters with General Electric Company and other OGs.

The proposed changes from the existing TS can be grouped into four general categories. These groupings 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 existing WNP–2 TS, 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 TS. Relocation of requirements to documents with an established control program 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