

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**George Kalman,**  
*Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
 [FR Doc. 97-10332 Filed 4-21-97; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-346]

### Toledo Edison Company, Centorior Service Company and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1); Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Toledo Edison Company, Centorior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees) to withdraw their June 6, 1994, application, as supplemented by letters dated July 20, 1994, November 11, 1994, April 12, 1995, September 19, 1995, September 27, 1995, and October 30, 1995, for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, located in Ottawa County, Ohio. The September 19, 1995, submittal included a request for license transfer pursuant to 10 CFR 50.80.

The proposed amendment would have revised the license to reflect the proposed merger of Toledo Edison Company into The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on July 6, 1994, (59 FR 34669) and an Environmental Assessment published in the **Federal Register** on July 20, 1994 (59 FR 37059). However, by letter dated October 9, 1996, the licensee withdrew the proposed changes, including the request for license transfer.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensees' application for amendment dated June 6, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated July 20, 1994, November 11, 1994, April 12, 1995, September 19, 1995, September 27, 1995, and October 30, 1995, and the licensees' letter dated October 9, 1996, which withdrew the application for license amendment and the request for license transfer. The above documents 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 University of Toledo, William Carlson Library, Government Documents Collection, 2801 West Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of April 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**Allen G. Hansen,**  
*Project Manager, Project Directorate III-3, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
 [FR Doc. 97-10330 Filed 4-21-97; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70-7001]

### Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP-1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination, the staff concluded that: (1) There is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for

a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the Decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the Decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review 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.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items 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.

Date of amendment request: December 23, 1996.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Safety Requirement surveillance for the

Autoclave High Pressure Systems to reflect the ability to test all inner and outer penetration isolation valves.

#### **Basis for Finding of No Significance**

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed TSR changes reflect the autoclave piping modifications that permit independent testing of the inner and outer penetration isolation valves. Testing of these valves demonstrates the ability to establish containment in the event of uranium hexafluoride leakage from the cylinder into the autoclave. The proposed changes provide enhanced assurance that the containment function will be available if needed. These changes have no impact on plant effluents and will not result in any impact to the environment.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed changes provide enhanced assurance that the autoclave containment function will be available if needed. The changes will not result in increased individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed changes will not result in any building construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed changes allow testing of the inner and outer penetration isolation valves. This testing of the autoclave containment function is not involved in any precursor to an evaluated event; therefore, the potential of occurrence of an evaluated event is unaffected. The proposed changes provide enhanced assurance that the function will be available if required; the consequences of previously evaluated accidents are not increased.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The autoclave piping configuration modifications permit independent testing of the inner and outer penetration isolation valves to demonstrate the ability to establish containment in the event of a leak from the cylinder into the autoclave. The changes affect only the autoclave isolation valves and create no new

operating conditions or new plant configuration that could lead to a new or different type of accident.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The proposed changes reflect modifications that permit independent testing of the inner and outer penetration isolation valves. The proposed changes enhance the availability of the autoclave containment function. There is no reduction in the margin of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

The proposed changes reflect the autoclave piping configuration modifications made to permit independent testing of inner and outer penetration isolation valves. Testing of these valves demonstrates the ability to establish containment in the event of uranium hexafluoride leakage from the cylinder into the autoclave. The changes do not affect any other equipment functions or administrative requirements. The testing of the autoclave containment function is not addressed in the safeguards and security programs. The effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

Effective date: June 23, 1997.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-1: Amendment will revise the Technical Safety Requirements.

Local Public Document Room location: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of April 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Carl J. Paperiello,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 97-10326 Filed 4-21-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[Docket No. 50-368]**

#### **Entergy Operations, Inc.; Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 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 to Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee), in connection with

operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2, located in Pope County, Arkansas, under Facility Operating License No. NPF-6.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirement to have an oil collection system for the RCP lube oil addition system, thus allowing the licensee to utilize compensatory actions and procedures to add lube oil to reactor coolant pumps (RCPs) in limited quantities at power. The requirement is contained in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III.0, which provides that the licensee shall have a collection system "capable of collecting lube oil from all pressurized and unpressurized leakage sites in the reactor coolant pump lube oil systems." It also specifies that "leakage points to be protected shall include lift pump and piping, overflow lines, lube oil cooler, oil fill and drain lines and plugs, flanged connections on oil lines, and lube oil reservoirs where such features exist on the reactor coolant pumps."

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for an exemption dated December 23, 1997.

##### **The Need for the Proposed Action**

The proposed action is needed to reduce dose and personnel hazards to workers who periodically add oil to the RCP lube oil system during power operation.

##### **Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action**

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and has concluded that despite not having a lube oil collection system for the reactor coolant pump lube oil fill lines, the design of the oil filling system and the level of protection provided by compensatory measures during oil fill operations provide reasonable assurance that a lube oil fire will not occur. The staff also has concluded that in the event of a worst-case postulated fire, it would be of limited magnitude and extent. In addition, such a fire would not cause significant damage in the containment building and would not prevent the operators from achieving and maintaining safe shutdown conditions.

The proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational