

is precluded through compliance with the Farley Technical Specifications, including reactivity requirements (e.g., shutdown margins, limits on control rod movement), instrumentation requirements (e.g., reactor power and radiation monitors), and controls on refueling operations (e.g., control rod interlocks and source range monitor requirements). In addition, the operators' continuous attention directed toward instruments monitoring behavior of the nuclear fuel in the reactor assures that the facility is operated in such a manner as to preclude inadvertent criticality. Finally, since access to the fuel in the reactor vessel is not physically possible while in use and is procedurally controlled during refueling, there are no concerns associated with loss or diversion of the fuel.

SNM as nuclear fuel is stored in one of two locations—the spent fuel pool or the new fuel storage area. The spent fuel pool is used to store irradiated fuel under water after its discharge from the reactor. The pool is designed to store the fuel in a geometric array that precludes criticality. In addition, existing Technical Specification limits on k_{eff} are maintained less than or equal to 0.95, even in the event of a fuel handling accident.

The new fuel storage area is used to receive and store new fuel in a dry condition upon arrival on site and prior to loading in the reactor. The new fuel storage area is designed to store new fuel in a geometric array that precludes criticality. In addition, existing safety evaluations demonstrate that k_{eff} is maintained less than or equal to 0.95 when the new fuel racks are fully loaded and dry or flooded with unborated water and less than or equal to 0.98 for optimum moderation conditions (e.g., because of the presence of aqueous foam or mist) or in the event of a fuel handling accident.

Fresh fuel is shipped in a plastic wrap. In some cases the fuel is stored in the new fuel storage racks with the plastic wrap in place and in other cases the plastic wrap is removed prior to storage. In all cases where fuel is stored with the plastic wrap in place, the wrap either cannot hold water due to its design or it is rendered incapable of holding water prior to fuel storage. Therefore, there is no concern that the plastic wrap used as part of fresh fuel storage will hold water from flooding from overhead sources. Additionally, as discussed above, the new fuel storage racks have been analyzed for a postulated flooded condition and the results showed that k_{eff} is maintained less than or equal to 0.95.

Both irradiated and unirradiated fuel is moved to and from the reactor vessel, and the spent fuel pool to accommodate refueling operations. Also, unirradiated fuel can be moved to and from the new fuel storage area. In addition, movements of fuel into the facility and within the reactor vessel or within the spent fuel pool occur. In all cases, fuel movements are procedurally controlled and designed to preclude conditions involving criticality concerns. Moreover, previous accident analyses have demonstrated that a fuel handling accident (i.e., a dropped fuel element) will not create conditions which exceed design specification. In addition, the Technical Specifications specifically address the refueling operations and limit the handling of fuel to ensure against an accidental criticality and to preclude certain movements over the spent fuel pool and the reactor vessel.

In summary, exemptions from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 70, Section 70.24 approved by the NRC in connection with the SNM licenses for Farley Units 1 and 2 were based upon NRC's finding that the inherent features associated with the storage and inspection of unirradiated fuel established good cause for granting the exemption and that granting such an exemption at this time will not endanger public life or property or the common defense and security and is otherwise in the public interest. The training provided to all personnel involved in fuel handling operations, the administrative controls, the Technical Specifications on new and spent fuel handling and storage, and the design of the new and spent fuel storage racks in place preclude inadvertent or accidental criticality. Since the facilities, storage, and inspection and procedures currently in place are consistent with those in place at the time the exemptions were granted in connection with the SNM licenses, an exemption from 10 CFR 70.24 is appropriate.

The proposed exemption will not affect radiological plant effluents nor cause any significant occupational exposures. Only a small amount, if any, of radioactive waste is generated during the receipt and handling of new fuel (e.g., smear papers or contaminated packaging material). The amount of waste would not be changed by the exemption.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption involves systems located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemption. 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 related to the operation of Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, dated June 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 14, 1996, the staff consulted with the Alabama State official, Mr. Kirk Whatley, of the Alabama Department of Public Health, 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 May 31, 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 Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Doltham, Alabama.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of June 1996.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Byron L. Siegel,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate II-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-16554 Filed 6-27-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittee on Westinghouse Standard Plant Designs; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Westinghouse Standard Plant Designs will hold a meeting on July 19, 1996, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance with the exception of a portion that may be closed to discuss Westinghouse proprietary information pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4).

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Friday, July 19, 1996—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will discuss SECY-96-128, "Policy and Key Technical Issues Pertaining to the Westinghouse AP600 Standardized Passive Reactor Design," dated June 12, 1996, which contains proposed staff positions on three policy issues: Prevention and Mitigation of Severe Accidents, Post-72-Hour Actions, and External Reactor Vessel Cooling, as well as the status of resolution of seven key technical issues. 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, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, 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. (EDT). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: June 24, 1996.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 96-16552 Filed 6-27-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Joint Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittees on Probabilistic Risk Assessment and on Plant Operations

The ACRS Subcommittees on Probabilistic Risk Assessment and on Plant Operations will hold a joint meeting on July 17-18, 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:

Wednesday, July 17, 1996—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittees will discuss risk-based analysis of reactor operating experience.

Thursday, July 18, 1996—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittees will discuss the issues identified in the Staff Requirements Memoranda dated May 15 and June 11, 1996, including the role of performance-based regulation in the PRA Implementation Plan, plant-specific application of safety goals, requirement for risk neutrality versus the allowance for an acceptable increase in risk, risk-informed inservice testing (IST) and inservice inspection (ISI) requirements, and methods for judging the acceptability and unacceptability of assumptions and models used in performing PRAs. The Subcommittees will also discuss the pilot applications for risk-informed and performance-based regulations. 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 Subcommittees, their 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 Subcommittees, along with any of their consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittees will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, its consultants, representatives of the Nuclear Energy Institute, 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. Michael T. Markley (telephone 301/415-6885) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: June 20, 1996.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 96-16553 Filed 6-27-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Sunshine Act Meetings; Notice of Vote to Amend Agenda

At the June 3, 1996, meeting of the Board of Governors, noticed in the Federal Register on May 14, 1996 (61 FR 24341), and May 23, 1996, (61 FR 25928), the members voted unanimously to add to its agenda consideration of an officer change and officers' compensation, and that no earlier public announcement of the new item on the agenda was possible.

The Board determined that discussion of the matters would likely disclose information relating to internal personnel practices.