

**SUMMARY:** The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR Part 32, Specific Domestic Licenses to Manufacture or Transfer Certain Items Containing Byproduct Material.  
2. Current OMB Approval Number: 3150-0001  
3. How often the collection is required: There is a one-time submittal of information to receive a license. Renewal applications are submitted every 5 years. In addition, recordkeeping must be performed on an on-going basis, and reports of transfer of byproduct material must be reported every 5 years.

4. Who is required or asked to report: All specific licensees who manufacture or initially transfer items containing byproduct material for sale or distribution to general licensees or persons exempt from licensing.

5. The number of annual respondents: 265 NRC licensees and 333 Agreement State licensees.

6. The number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 53,333 hours or 201.26 hours per NRC licensee and 95,306.9 hours or 286.21 hours per Agreement State licensee. The difference in individual licensee burden between NRC and Agreement States is due to the fact that a higher percentage of the Agreement State licensees are nuclear pharmacies, which have a large recordkeeping burden because of the labeling requirements for radiopharmaceuticals.

7. Abstract: 10 CFR Part 32 establishes requirements for specific licenses for the introduction of byproduct material into products or materials and transfer of the products or materials to general licensees or persons exempt from licensing. It also prescribes requirements governing holders of the specific licenses. Some of the requirements are information which must be submitted in an application for a specific license, records which must be kept, reports which must be submitted, and information which must be forwarded to general licensees and persons exempt from licensing. In addition, 10 CFR Part 32 prescribes requirements for the issuance of certificates of registration (concerning radiation safety information about a product) to manufacturers or initial transferors of sealed sources and devices. Submission or retention of the

information is mandatory for persons subject to the 10 CFR Part 32 requirements. The information is used by NRC to make licensing and other regulatory determinations concerning the use of radioactive byproduct material in products and devices.

Submit, by March 22, 1996, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, (Lower Level), Washington, DC. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access this document via modem on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advanced Copy Document Library), NRC subsystem at FedWorld, 703-321-3339. Members of the public who are located outside of the Washington, DC, area can dial FedWorld, 1-800-303-9672, or use the FedWorld Internet address: fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document will be available on the bulletin board for 30 days after the signature date of this notice. If assistance is needed in accessing the document, please contact the FedWorld help desk at 703-487-4608.

Comments and questions may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T-6 F33, Washington, DC, 20555-0001, or by telephone at (301) 415-7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of January, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
Gerald F. Cranford,  
*Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.*

[FR Doc. 96-677 Filed 1-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-213]

**Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; Haddam Neck Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-61, issued to Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCO, the licensee), for operation of the Haddam Neck Plant, located in Middlesex County, Connecticut.

Environmental Assessment

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed amendment will revise the Haddam Neck Technical Specifications (TS) to delete TS Sections 1.38 and 1.39, "Definitions, Fuel Assembly Types," revise TS Sections 3/4.9.3, "Refueling Operations, Decay Time" and 3/4.9.14, "Refueling Operations, Spent Fuel Pool—Reactivity Condition," replace TS Sections 5.6.1.1, "Spent Fuel," and 5.6.3, "Capacity," and add a new TS Section 3/4.9.15, "Refueling Operations, Spent Fuel Pool Cooling." The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated March 31, 1995, as supplemented November 14, 1995.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed TS changes support a rerack of the spent fuel pool to expand the spent fuel pool's storage capacity from 1168 assemblies to 1480 assemblies so as to accommodate a full-core-discharge through the current validity date of the Haddam Neck Operating License (2007). The Haddam Neck Plant received its provisional Operating License in June 1967. The original spent fuel pool capacity was 336 fuel assemblies. In 1975-1976, CYAPCO performed a rerack to increase the capacity of the spent fuel pool from 368 to 1172 fuel assemblies. The licensee believed, at that time, that the increase to 1172 fuel assemblies would provide sufficient space until the mid-1990's, at which time a fuel reprocessing facility would be in operation. At the present time, CYAPCO has contracted with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to begin taking delivery of its spent fuel in 1998. However, DOE has indicated that all of CYAPCO's spent fuel may remain at the site until a repository is operational or until some other facility is constructed under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. CYAPCO does not believe that such a facility will be operational in time for the Haddam

Neck Plant to avoid loss of full-core-discharge capability. CYAPCO evaluated spent fuel storage alternatives that have been licensed by the NRC and that are currently feasible for use at the Haddam Neck site. The result of this evaluation is that a rerack of the spent fuel pool is the most cost-effective alternative. This TS change is necessary for support of the rerack of the Haddam Neck spent fuel pool.

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

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the TS. The staff has concluded the following for the various design considerations of the rerack of the Haddam Neck spent fuel pool (SFP):

1. The staff finds the criticality aspects of the proposed increase in the storage capacity of the Haddam Neck spent fuel pool storage racks are acceptable and meet the requirements of General Design Criterion 62 for the prevention of criticality in fuel storage and handling.

2. The staff has reviewed the licensee's rationale for SPF cooling, performed confirmatory decay heat load calculations, reviewed the effects of SFP boiling, and the heavy load capability of the SFP building cranes, and concludes that the above issues relating to the increase in the SFP storage capacity from 1168 to 1480 fuel assemblies are acceptable.

3. The staff concludes that the materials selected for the Haddam Neck Plant spent fuel rack modifications have been carefully and satisfactorily thought out and no occurrence of degradation of the material selected for the rack modification is expected. The racks are constructed from a type 304 stainless steel and fabricated according to an approved ASME specification. The choice of Boral as a poison material will ensure reliable criticality control. The design of the fuel racks accounts for the possibility of hydrogen production by corrosion of Boral and provides ventilation outlets that would relieve hydrogen pressure which otherwise could cause deformation of the rack cells.

4. The Boral Surveillance Program will provide a reliable method of assessing the potential degradation of Boral panels which are exposed to radiation in the spent fuel area over time. The staff concludes that the licensee's selection of structural, welding and poison materials meets current industry and regulatory standards. These materials are acceptable for construction of the new rack modules because they meet the

requirements of General Design Criterion 62, as it applies to providing physical systems for prevention of criticality in fuel storage.

5. The staff concludes that CYAPCO's structural analysis and design of the spent fuel rack modules and the spent fuel pool structure are adequate to withstand the effects of the required loads. The analysis and design are in compliance with the current licensing basis set forth in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report and applicable provisions of the Standard Review Plan, and are therefore acceptable.

The TS change 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 radiation exposure. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with this proposed TS amendment.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed amendment involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed amendment, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the amendment would be to deny the amendment request. Such action would not enhance the protection of the environment and would result in unjustified cost to the licensee.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of resources not considered previously in the Final Environmental Statement for the Haddam Neck Plant.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 5, 1996, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official, Alan B. Wang of the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 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 amendment.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated March 31, 1995, as supplemented by letter dated November 14, 1995, which 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 Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown Connecticut.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
Phillip McKee,  
*Director, Project Directorate I-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 96-702 Filed 1-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste; Notice of Meeting**

The Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste (ACNW) will hold its 81st meeting on January 24, 25 and 26, 1996, Room T-2B3, at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the Federal Register on Wednesday, December 6, 1995 (60 FR 62485).

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for this meeting shall be as follows:

*Wednesday, January 24, 1996—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.*

*Thursday, January 25, 1996—8:30 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.*

*Friday, January 26, 1996—8:30 A.M. until 4:00 P.M.*

During this meeting the Committee plans to consider the following:

A. *Design Bases Events for Geologic Repository Operations Area*—The Committee will hear a presentation by the staff on the proposed resolution of public comments on changes to Part 60 relevant to design basis events for a proposed geologic repository operations area.

B. *Meeting with the Executive Director for Operations*—The Committee will meet with the Executive Director for Operations to discuss items of current interest, e.g., status of the Phase 1 rebaselining effort, anticipated impact of