Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Timothy G. Colburn,

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

[FR Doc. 97–14015 Filed 5–28–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Meeting Between the American Society for Quality Control and NRC to Discuss Quality Assurance Principles

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of a meeting between the American Society for Quality Control, Energy and Environmental Division, Power Production Committee (ASQC EED) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) on quality assurance principles of mutual interest.

SUMMARY: The ASQC EED and the NRC have met periodically to discuss technical matters of mutual interest. Topics at this meeting will cover codes and standards, graded QA, and more detailed QA features found in QA standards.

DATES: The meeting will be held on June 5, 1997, from 8:00 am–5:00 pm, and on June 6, 1997, from 8:00 am–12:00 noon.

ADDRESSES: Conference Room O–1 F7/9, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Owen P. Gormley (301) 415–6793 Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The ASQC EED and NRC meet periodically to discuss topics of mutual interest concerning problems in achieving quality and means to correct the problems, or interpretations or problems in implementing activities found in QA standards and in most QA programs. Topics at this session will include codes and standards, graded QA, and more detailed QA features found in QA standards. The format of the meeting will consist of discussion between the ASQC EED and NRC on the topics noted above. Seating for the public will be on a first come, first-served basis.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Lawrence C. Shao,

Director, Division of Engineering Technology Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 97–14017 Filed 5–28–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Revised

The agenda for the 442nd meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards scheduled to be held on June 11–13, 1997, in Conference Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, has been revised to include Committee discussion of the NRC staff's position on the need for a containment spray system for the AP600 design for severe accident management. This discussion is scheduled between 8:30 a.m. and 10:30 a.m. on Friday, June 13, 1997. Following the discussion of this item, the items previously scheduled for Friday, June 13, 1997 will be discussed. If necessary, the meeting will be extended to Saturday, June 14, 1997 to complete the Committee business.

The agenda for June 11 and 12, 1997 remains the same as published in the **Federal Register** on Tuesday, May 20, 1997 (62 FR 27632).

Further information regarding this meeting can be obtained by contacting Mr. Sam Duraiswamy, Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch (telephone 301/415–7364), between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. EDT.

Dated: May 22, 1997.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–14009 Filed 5–28–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Notice of Correction to Biweekly Notice Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

On May 21, 1997, the **Federal Register** published the Biweekly Notice of Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations. On page 27802, under Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–266 and 50–301, Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, the date of amendment request should have been April 14, 1997 (TSCR 197).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Kevin A. Connaughton,

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

[FR Doc. 97–14011 Filed 5–28–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–219]

In the Matter of GPU Nuclear Corporation; Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated April 1, 1997, Berkeley Township Environmental Commission (Petitioner) has passed a resolution opposing transfer of spent nuclear fuel from wet to dry storage during operation of Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station (OCNGS). Petitioner requests that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) direct GPU Nuclear (GPU) to shut down the nuclear reactor at OCNGS during the aforementioned fuel transfer.

As the bases for its request, Petitioner asserts that (1) the load transfer path for the 100-ton fuel transfer cask passes over the reactor's containment mechanism and other safety-related equipment; (2) NRC Bulletin 96–02, dated April 11, 1996, states that a dropped cask could damage the isolation condensers and the torus, creating the possibility of an unisolable leak, which in industry jargon describes a situation perilously close to a nuclear meltdown; (3) the operating record of GPU demonstrates it is capable of human error, including dropping heavy loads; (4) Berkeley Township could not be successfully evacuated in the event of a serious nuclear accident at OCNGS; and (5) the safer simpler alternative of turning off the reactor while lifting 100-ton loads over the containment can be easily implemented.

This request is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The request has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. A copy of the Petition is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 20th day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–14014 Filed 5–28–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Availability of Draft Branch Technical Position on a Performance Assessment Methodology for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Availability of Draft Branch Technical Position.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is announcing the availability of the ''Draft Branch Technical Position on a Performance Assessment Methodology for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities.''

DATES: The comment period expires August 27, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11545 Rockville Pike, Mail Stop T–6–D59, Rockville, Maryland 20852–2738. Comments may be delivered to the same address between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m., on Federal workdays.

A copy of the draft Branch Technical Position (BTP) is available for public inspection and/or copying at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street (Lower Level), NW, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Copies of the draft BTP may also be obtained by contacting Karen S. Vandervort, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. Telephone: (301) 415–7252.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anne E. Garcia, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. Telephone: (301) 415–6631.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC's) regulation regarding the licensing requirements for the land disposal of low-level radioactive waste (LLW) can be found at 10 CFR part 61. Part 61 requires that technical analyses be performed to demonstrate protection of the general population from releases of radioactivity to the general environment in certain environmental pathways such as ground water, surface water, air, soil, and biota (plants). A LLW performance assessment is a technical analysis that can be used to demonstrate compliance with NRC's performance objective for radiological protection of the general public—10 CFR 61.41. NRC's Performance Assessment Working Group has prepared a draft BTP, designated NUREG–1573, as a step toward providing detailed LLW performance assessment guidance to potential applicants for a NRC license. When finalized, the BTP may contain information that may be useful to Agreement States and disposal site developers on LLW performance assessment. In this regard, the draft BTP includes the staff's technical positions on: (a) An acceptable approach for systematically integrating site characterization, facility design, and performance modeling into a single performance assessment process; (b) five principal regulatory issues regarding interpreting and implementing Part 61 performance objectives and technical requirements governing LLW site post-closure performance; and (c) implementation of NRC's LLW performance assessment methodology. In arriving at the proposed positions taken on these issues in the draft BTP, the staff has considered a number of alternatives. Nevertheless, the staff is interested in the public's views on both the suitability of approaches presented in the draft BTP for measuring the performance of LLW disposal facilities, as well as the staff's proposed positions on certain LLW regulatory issues: (a) Consideration of future site conditions, processes, and events; (b) performance of engineered barriers; (c) timeframe for an LLW performance assessment; (d) treatment of sensitivity and uncertainty; and (e) the role of performance assessment during the operational and closure periods.

To obtain early feedback on the guidance for LLW performance assessment under development by the staff, a preliminary draft of the BTP was distributed for comment to LLW-sited and host Agreement State regulatory entities; the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW); the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE); the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; and the U.S. Geological Survey in January 1994. The staff briefed the ACNW and the Commission on the scope and content of the BTP in March and April 1994, respectively. The staff subsequently held two workshops on the BTP and LLW performance assessment. The first was a 2-day workshop held at NRC Headquarters on November 16–17, 1994. The second was a half-day workshop, limited to certain technical issues in LLW performance assessment, held at the 16th Annual DOE/LLW Management Conference on December 13–15, 1994. Finally, the staff briefed the ACNW on key regulatory issues and its evaluation of the workshop comments on March 16, 1995. This draft BTP reflects the staff's consideration of feedback received during those interactions. However, the staff did not formally respond to these comments in preparing this version.

In a related matter, the staff would be interested in the views of the public concerning whether it would be appropriate to discount potential doses, from a hypothetical LLW disposal site, to future generations. In the context of LLW disposal, it does not appear that the use of the ''time-value of money'' approach to discounting is implementable considering the long time frames of performance considered. In the context of LLW disposal, application of discounting, either qualitative or quantitative, might more appropriately weigh present-day economic cost of design and performance features associated with LLW disposal against expectations about future health risks. This approach would not allow the standard to be exceeded, but would address the level of assurance necessary to demonstrate that the LLW performance objectives will be met. Although the draft BTP does not address this issue, the staff has been asked by the Commission to request comment on this concept as part of the public comment process.

Finally, the staff is aware that several entities have commented on aspects of the BTP, as presented in the January 1994, preliminary draft, through the Commission's November 1995 Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Initiative. The staff was directed by the Commission to inform it on how it plans to resolve those comments prior to a decision to finalize the BTP. As part of the public comment process, the staff will provide the Commission with a summary of all public comments, including those made during the Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining Initiative, and proposed resolutions to those comments prior to finalizing the BTP.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 1997.