

environmental assessment, the Commission has concluded that the issuance of the amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (62 FR 50409).

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment dated August 27, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated December 18, 1996, January 17, February 18, March 27, April 4, April 25, April 29, May 30, June 2, June 13, June 18, August 4, August 8, September 10, October 2 (RNP RA/97-0216), October 2 (RNP RA/97-0207), October 13, and October 21, 1997, (2) Amendment No. 176 to License No. DPR-23, (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation, and (4) the Commission's Environmental Assessment. All of 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 located at the Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College Avenue, Hartsville, South Carolina 29550.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 24th day of October 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David C. Trimble,

Project Manager, Project Directorate II-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-28754 Filed 10-29-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-423]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) to withdraw its April 28, 1997, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-49 for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3, located in New London County, Connecticut.

Technical Specification Surveillances 4.1.2.3.1, 4.1.2.4.1, 4.5.2.f, and 4.5.2.h require the charging and safety injection pumps to be tested on a periodic basis and after modifications that alter subsystem flow characteristics. The proposed amendment would have made

changes to these surveillance requirements.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on June 4, 1997 (62 FR 30635). However, by letter dated October 15, 1997, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 28, 1997, and the licensee's letter dated October 15, 1997, which withdrew the application for license amendment. 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of October 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James W. Andersen,

Project Manager, Special Projects Office—Licensing Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-28757 Filed 10-29-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-423]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) to withdraw its May 30, 1997, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-49 for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3, located in New London County, Connecticut.

Technical Specification (TS) Surveillances 4.5.2.f and 4.6.2.2.b require the periodic flow testing of the recirculation spray system pumps. The proposed amendment would have changed the surveillances by replacing the pump differential acceptance criteria with a pump acceptance curve.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in

the **Federal Register** on July 2, 1997 (62 FR 35849). However, by letter dated October 15, 1997, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated May 30, 1997, and the licensee's letter dated October 15, 1997, which withdrew the application for license amendment. 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of October 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James W. Andersen,

Project Manager, Special Projects Office—Licensing Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-28758 Filed 10-29-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 70-7002]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP-2 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Portsmouth, Ohio

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 described 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 Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PORTS). 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: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, 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: June 9, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment, in accordance with a commitment made in the USEC certificate application, revises Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) 2.1.3.5 entitled "Autoclave Shell High Pressure Containment Shutdown," to account for the added capability to separately test inner and outer loop containment valves on autoclaves in buildings X-342, X-343, and X-344.

The Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant uses thirteen autoclaves in buildings X-342, X-343 and X-344 to feed, transfer and sample UF₆. These autoclaves were designed and constructed in accordance with ASME Section VIII and are utilized to confine UF₆ and any reaction products in the event of a major UF₆ release inside an autoclave. Steam used to heat a UF₆ cylinder within an autoclave is typically controlled at approximately 5 psig. However, if a large UF₆ release occurs inside an autoclave, its internal pressure could rise to as high as 90 psig very rapidly. To ensure that the contents of a release are confined inside the autoclave, except for that which is released due to the proper operation of the autoclave pressure relief system (rupture disc rated at near 150 psig and relief valve), each line which penetrates the autoclave boundary is equipped with at least two valves that can serve as isolation valves. These close automatically to isolate the autoclave in the event of high internal pressure; the actuation pressure being less than or equal to 15 psig.

As noted in the Description of Noncompliance for Issue 3 of the "Plan for Achieving Compliance with NRC Regulations at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant" Revision 3 (Compliance Plan) dated July 9, 1996, the capability to pressure decay test the autoclave containment valves (i.e., inner and outer loop valves) separately did not exist. According to item 1 of the Plan of Action and Schedule (POA) for Issue 3 of the Compliance Plan, USEC was committed to providing this capability before July 1, 1997, and

submitting to the NRC, a revised TSR to reflect the new autoclave containment valve configuration. In addition, the POA stated that until the capability to separately test the inner and outer loop containment valve is provided, the applicable TSR requirement will be to declare an autoclave inoperable and taken out of service when, in any mode of operation, either containment valve is determined to be inoperable or, in the heating mode, either pressure instrument channel is determined to be inoperable. According to USEC's certificate amendment request, since this capability has been provided, the Action conditions of TSR 2.1.3.5 should allow completion of the current operating cycle if only one instrument channel, or one containment isolation valve on one or more autoclave penetrations, is operable. However, if both instrument channels or all containment isolation valves on any one autoclave penetration are inoperable, then TSR 2.1.3.5 requires USEC to shut down the autoclave within one hour.

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.

Each line penetration for the thirteen autoclaves at PORTS, has at least two valves, that when actuated, would isolate the autoclaves. In addition, each autoclave has, as part of the autoclave shell high pressure containment shutdown system, two independent high pressure containment actuation channels. The proposed change to TSR 2.1.3.5 allows completion of the current autoclave operating cycle if one instrument channel, or one containment isolation valve on one or more autoclave penetrations, is inoperable. It is noted that the proposed TSR 2.1.3.5 still requires at least two channels and two isolation valves on each autoclave penetration to be operable prior to initiating a new operating cycle. Allowing an autoclave cycle to be completed, with one instrument channel and one containment valve operable, instead of requiring it to be shut down within one hour, will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite for the reasons given in the following paragraph.

The UF₆ containment boundaries provided by the cylinder, pigtail and valves inside an autoclave, and steam and UF₆ reaction product confinement boundaries provided by the autoclave shell and piping and valves out to and

including the second containment valve, are designated as "Q" systems. As such, USEC is required to apply the highest level of quality control (ASME NQA-1) to ensure that the pressure boundaries within these systems are maintained. Taking into consideration the applicable safety features (administrative and installed hardware) for preventing and mitigating UF₆ releases associated with autoclaves, and past operational history at PORTS, the staff concludes that a major accidental release of UF₆ inside an autoclave is highly unlikely. The probability of inoperability of a containment valve or an instrument channel during an operating cycle is also low (none have been reported since March 3, 1997). According to the surveillance requirements of TSR 2.1.3.5, these containment valves are required to be calibrated semiannually at or below 15 psig, and to be quarterly functionally tested and separately pressure decay tested at 90 psig with an acceptable leak rate of 10 psig/hour or 12 standard cubic feet per minute. It should be noted that requiring an autoclave to prematurely shut down prior to completing an operating cycle could introduce added risk by necessitating additional handling of cylinders containing liquid UF₆ for feed, sampling and transfer autoclaves, or by introducing cascade process upsets for feed autoclaves.

The staff has concluded that since completing the current operating cycle following inoperability of one instrument channel or one containment valve on an autoclave penetration will not significantly increase the risk of a UF₆ release, this amendment will not result in a significant change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

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

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 1, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a UF₆ release. Therefore, allowing an autoclave cycle to be completed, instead of requiring it to be shut down within one hour after discovery of one inoperable instrument channel or containment valve, will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures.

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

The proposed amendment does not involve any 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.

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 1, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a UF₆ release. Therefore, allowing an autoclave cycle to be completed, instead of requiring it to be shut down within one hour after discovering one inoperable instrument channel or containment valve, will not significantly increase the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

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

Based on the staff's review of the proposed amendment, no new or different accidents were identified.

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

For the reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 1, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a UF₆ release. Based on the staff's review of the proposed amendment, the staff concludes that there will be no significant reduction of any 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.

For similar reasons provided in the assessment of criterion 1, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a UF₆ release. In addition, the staff has not identified any criticality related implications from the proposed amendment. Based on the staff's review of the proposed amendment, the staff concludes that there will be no decrease in the effectiveness of the overall plant's safety program.

The staff has not identified any safeguards or security related implications from the proposed amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safeguards, or security programs.

Effective date: The amendment to GDP-2 will become effective 60 days after issuance by NRC.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-2: Amendment will revise the Technical Safety Requirements.

Local Public Document Room location: Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23d day of October 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97-28756 Filed 10-29-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Privacy Act of 1974, As Amended; Minor Revisions to Existing System of Records

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Minor revisions to an existing system of records.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (Privacy Act), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is revising and republishing in its entirety the system of records (system) notice for NRC-22, "Personnel Performance Appraisals—NRC," to reflect minor corrective and administrative changes that will more accurately and clearly describe the following sections of the system notice: System Location, Categories of Individuals Covered by the System, Authority for Maintenance of the System, Routine Uses of Records Maintained in the System, Storage, Retrieval, Safeguards, Retention and Disposal, System Manager(s) and Address, Notification Procedure, Record Access Procedures, and Contesting Record Procedures.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 30, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jona L. Souder, Freedom of Information/Local Public Document Room Branch, Office of Information Resources Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone: 301-415-7170.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NRC's system of records notice for NRC-22, "Personnel Performance Appraisals—NRC," is being revised in its entirety to more accurately and clearly describe the system. The revisions reflect organizational and address changes within the agency since the notice was last published in the **Federal Register** on July 7, 1993 (58 FR 36469), as well as the current General Records Schedule (GRS) authorized disposition for performance appraisal records. The revisions to the system notice consist of minor corrective and administrative changes that do not require the submission of an altered system of records report pursuant to subsection (r)