

DATE: Oral argument will be held at 3:00 P.M., November 25, 1996, at the NTSB headquarters, 490 L'Enfant Plaza East, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20594.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Althea Walker, (202) 314-6080.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The public is invited to attend and observe the oral argument. Audience participation will not be permitted, however.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT: Bea Hardesty, (202) 314-6065.

Dated: November 13, 1996.

Bea Hardesty,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-29520 Filed 11-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7533-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-461]

Illinois Power Company, Soyland Power Cooperative; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval of the transfer of Facility Operating License No. NPF-62, to the extent held by Soyland Power Cooperative, for the Clinton Power Station, Unit 1 (CPS), located in DeWitt County, Illinois, and issuance of conforming amendments.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would consent to the transfer of the 13.21% minority ownership of the facilities for the Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1 (CPS) from Soyland Power Cooperative (Soyland) to Illinova Power Marketing, Inc. (IPMI), the unregulated power marketing affiliate of Illinois Power Company (Illinois Power), and a wholly owned subsidiary of Illinova Corporation (Illinova) and approve the issuance of conforming amendments to the licensee.

The proposed action is in accordance with Illinois Power's request for approval dated October 17, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to obtain the necessary consent to the transfer of the license and approval of amendments discussed above. Soyland is a minority owner of CPS with an ownership share of 13.21%. Due to severe financial difficulties arising in large part because of its CPS-related

debt, Soyland has been forced to seek significant refinancing of its outstanding obligations. As a condition precedent to said refinancing, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, acting through the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Services, required Soyland to completely divest itself of any ownership of, or responsibility for, CPS. As a result, Soyland and Illinova entered into an agreement wherein Illinova assumed full financial responsibility for Soyland's CPS obligations as of September 1, 1996, and Soyland agreed to transfer its entire ownership interest in CPS to Illinova, subject to receipt of all necessary regulatory approvals.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has reviewed the proposed action and concludes that there will be no changes to the facility or its operation as a result of the proposed action. Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

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 Clinton Power Station, Unit 1, documented in NUREG-0854.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 30, 1996, the staff consulted with the Illinois state official of the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, 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 Illinois Power submittal dated October 17, 1996, 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 Vespasian Warner Public Library, 120 West Johnson Street, Clinton, Illinois.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 13th day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jon B. Hopkins,

Acting Director, Project Directorate III-3, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-29585 Filed 11-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446]

Texas Utilities Electric Company; Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) under 10 CFR 50.80, is considering approval of an application regarding the corporate restructuring of the holding company for Texas Utilities Electric Company (TUE, the licensee), holder of Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89, for the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Units 1 and 2, located in Somervell County, Texas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would consent, by issuance of an order, to the corporate restructuring of Texas Utilities Company (TUC) to facilitate the acquisition of ENSERCH Corporation (ENSERCH), which is a company engaged in natural gas and oil exploration and production, natural gas pipeline gathering, processing and marketing, and natural gas distribution and power generation. TUC's acquisition of ENSERCH will be accomplished through the following merger transactions: (1) The formation of a new Texas Corporation, TUC Holding Company, and two new subsidiaries of TUC Holding Company (i.e., TUC Merger Corporation and Enserch Merger Corporation); (2) the merger of TUC Merger Corporation with

and into TUC with TUC being the surviving corporation; and (3) the merger of Enserch Merger Corporation with and into ENSERCH with ENSERCH being the surviving company. Upon the consummation of these transactions, TUC and ENSERCH will both become wholly owned subsidiaries of TUC Holding Company, which will change its name to Texas Utilities Company. TUE would continue to remain the sole owner and operator of CPSES, Units 1 and 2. Upon consummation of the restructuring, current stockholders of TUC would become stockholders of the new Texas Utilities Company and would hold approximately 94 percent of the issued and outstanding shares of common stock of the new Texas Utilities Company, while current stockholders of ENSERCH would likewise become stockholders of the new Texas Utilities Company and hold the remaining 6 percent. The proposed action is in accordance with TUEC's application dated September 20, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to facilitate the acquisition of ENSERCH by TUC.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed acquisition and concludes that there will be no physical or operational changes to Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station. The acquisition will not affect the qualifications or organizational affiliation of the personnel who operate the facilities, as TUE will continue to be responsible for the operation of Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2.

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 acquisition, and that post-accident radiological releases would not be greater than previously determined. Further, the Commission has determined that the acquisition 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 acquisition 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 Statement for the CPSES, Units 1 and 2, dated October 1989.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 13, 1996, the staff consulted with the Texas State official, Mr. Arthur Tate of the Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control, 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 September 20, 1996, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P. O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
William D. Beckner,

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

[FR Doc. 96-29587 Filed 11-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Subcommittee Meeting on Human Factors

The ACRS Subcommittee on Human Factors will hold a meeting on December 3, 1996, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Tuesday, December 3, 1996—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business.

The Subcommittee will review the activities of the Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data (AEOD) and the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) associated with the Human Performance Program Plan and will also discuss staff responses to the questions raised at the September 20, 1996 Human Factors Subcommittee meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. 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 Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, its consultants, and other interested persons regarding this review.

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 the cognizant ACRS staff engineer, Mr. Noel F. Dudley (telephone 301/415-6888) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EST). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named