

be operated safely with the use of the 5.0 w/o nominal U-235 fuel with its slightly different length and weight and the changes in this package associated with the WRB-1 correlation, the limitation on void fraction, the uncertainties associated with LHGR, or the administrative changes to Section 5.0 and 6.9, since plant operation and fuel placement are still predicated on the limitations contained in the TSs, Technical Report for Supporting Cycle Operation and plant procedures. The use of the Westinghouse methodologies for Cycle 19 operation are an application of a generically approved methodology by the NRC. The staff has reviewed the plant specific application to assure that the cycle specific parameters have been chosen to ensure the plant is operated safely.

The proposed 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. Accordingly, 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 does involve 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. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of more highly enriched fuel and extended burnup rates have been discussed in the generic staff assessment entitled "NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation," dated July 7, 1988, and published in the **Federal Register** on August 11, 1988 (53 FR 30355) as corrected on August 24, 1988 (53 FR 32322). As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of the proposed increase in fuel enrichment and irradiation limits are either unchanged or may in fact be reduced from those summarized in Table S-4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c).

Therefore, the staff concludes that there are no significant radiological or 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. 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 resources not considered previously in the Final Environmental Statement for the Haddam Neck Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official 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 May 17, 1994, as supplemented September 9, 1994, 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 06547.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of February 1995.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Phillip F. McKee,

Director, Project Directorate I-4, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-3231 Filed 2-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

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

[Docket No. 50-213]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the "Commission") is

considering issuance of an amendment to Facilitate 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 would revise Technical Specifications (TS) 3.1.1.3, "Shutdown Margin," and TS 3.3.3.9, "Boron Dilution Alarm," and their associated Bases sections and add a new TS 3.1.1.4, "Shutdown Margin." TSs 3.1.2.2, 3.1.2.4, and 3.1.2.6, will be revised to reference TS 3.1.1.3 rather than specify the required shutdown margin at 200° F. In addition, editorial changes will be made to a reference on TS pages 3/4 1-13 and 14 to reletter surveillance specification 4.5.1.c.3 to 4.5.1.b.3. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated September 7, 1994.

The Need for Proposed Action

During the development of the core design for the upcoming Cycle 19, CYAPCO determined that the incore neutron sources would have to be relocated during the refueling outage due to mechanical considerations concerning the new fuel design. As part of the determination of the new locations for these sources, a review of the adequacy of the existing source locations was made. This review identified that the incore neutron sources were located too close to the excore detectors. As a result of the current incore neutron locations, the response of the excore detectors to a dilution event did not bound the response assumed in the safety analysis. The time allowed for operator action to terminate an inadvertent boron dilution event was less than the required 15 minutes from the time of the alarm to criticality. TS changes are being proposed to the shutdown margin requirements for Modes 4 and 5 and the boron dilution setpoint to assure that the required margin for operator action in a boron dilution accident is met. The associated Bases sections will be modified to reflect the new shutdown margin and boron dilution setpoint. In addition, an administrative change to three TSs will be made to reference the shutdown margin TS rather than provide the shutdown margin requirements and two editorial changes to correct two references to surveillance specifications 4.5.1.c.3 that had been

related to 4.5.1.b.3 in a previous TS change.

Environmental Impacts to the Proposed Action

The proposed changes will provide additional time for operator action in a boron dilution event to assure that there is at least 15 minutes between the time to boron dilution alarm assuming an alarm penalty of 1.3 and the time to criticality for Modes 1 through 5 and 30 minutes for Mode 6 for operator action. The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed TS changes and concludes that the combination of the shutdown margin increases and the lower credited boron dilution alarm setpoint assuming an alarm penalty factor of 1.3 will provide assurance that the criteria for operator action will be met. In addition, the neutron sources will be moved further away from the excore detectors for the Cycle 19 startup (approximately March 1995). This will provide additional margin in the alarm setpoint as the need for any penalty factor will be significantly reduced or completely eliminated. In addition, the staff agrees that the change in references in TS 3.1.2.2, 3.1.2.4, and 3.1.2.6, and Surveillance Specifications 4.1.2.3.1 and 4.1.2.4.1 are editorial in nature.

The proposed 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. Accordingly, 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 does involve 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. Accordingly, 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. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of 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 resources not considered previously in the Final Environmental Statement for the Haddam Neck Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official has 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 September 7, 1994, 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 Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, CT 06547.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Phillip F. McKee,

Director, Project Directorate I-4, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-3232 Filed 2-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company; Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3; 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. NPF-49, issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee), for operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, located in New London County, Connecticut.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.5.2.a by granting a one-time extension of the allowable Residual Heat Removal (RHR)

pump outage time for mechanical seal replacement and related modifications from 72 hours to 120 hours. This exception would only be used one time per pump and expire on April 30, 1995. The amendment would clearly define the times in which each RHR pump and associated RHR heat exchanger must be restored to an operable state.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated August 16, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated January 10, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would reduce the potential for an unnecessary plant shutdown, thus, eliminating a source of unnecessary challenges to the plant's safety systems.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that one-time extension of the RHR pump outage time from 72 hours to 120 hours to acceptable.

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

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve 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. 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 there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. 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.