

Identification of the Proposed Amendment

The current licensing basis for CPSES allows up to 1116 fuel assemblies in two storage pools. The currently authorized as-installed configuration has 20 low density racks installed in Spent Fuel Pool No. 1 (SFP1) (556 fuel assembly locations). The proposed action would authorize the use of high density spent fuel storage racks in Spent Fuel Pool No. 2 (SFP2) with a capacity for storing 735 fuel assemblies, for a total of 1291 fuel assemblies.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for license amendment dated December 30, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated July 28, September 14, and November 29, 1995, and January 2, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS) on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel," NUREG-0575, Volumes 1-3, concluded that the environmental impact of interim storage of spent fuel was negligible and the cost of various alternatives reflects the advantage of continued generation of nuclear power with the accompanying spent fuel storage. Because the differences in design, the FGEIS recommended evaluating spent fuel pool expansion on a case-by-case basis.

For CPSES, the expansion of the storage capacity of SFP2 will not create any significant additional radiological effects or nonradiological environmental impacts.

The additional whole body dose that might be received by an individual at the site boundary and the estimated dose to the population within 80 kilometer radius is believed to be too small to have any significance when compared to the fluctuations in the annual dose this population receives from exposure to background radiation. The occupational radiation dose for the proposed operation of the expanded spent fuel pool is estimated to be less than one percent of the total annual occupational radiation exposure for this facility.

The only nonradiological impact affected by the expansion of SFP2 is the waste heat rejected. The total increase in heat load rejected to the environment will be small in comparison to the amount of total heat currently being released. There is no significant environmental impact attributed to the waste heat from the plant due to this very small increase.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The staff has reviewed the proposed spent fuel pool expansion to the facility relative to the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51. Based on this assessment, the staff concludes that there is no significant radiological or nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed action and that the issuance of the proposed amendment to the license will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.31, no environmental impact statement needs to be prepared for this action.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment to the TSs dated December 30, 1994, as supplemented July 28, September 14, and November 29, 1995, and January 2, 1996, (2) the FGEIS on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel (NUREG-0575), (3) the Final Environmental Statement for the CPSES, Units 1 and 2, dated October 1989, and (4) the Environmental Assessment dated February 5, 1996.

These 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 Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P. O. Box 19497, Arlington, Texas 76019.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
William D. Beckner,

Director, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-2835 Filed 2-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Relocation of the Pressure Temperature Limit Curves and Low Temperature Overpressure Protection System Limits; Issued

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of issuance.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued Generic Letter 96-03 to advise licensees of nuclear power reactors that they may request a license amendment to relocate the pressure temperature (P/T) limit curves from their plant technical specifications to a pressure temperature limits report (PTLR) or a similar

document. The low temperature overpressure protection (LTOP) system limits may also be relocated to the same document at the discretion of the licensee. This generic letter is available in the Public Document Rooms under accession number 9601290350.

DATES: The generic letter was issued on January 31, 1996.

ADDRESSEES: Not applicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maggalean W. Weston at (301) 415-3151.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: None.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of February, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Dennis M. Crutchfield,
Director, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-2836 Filed 2-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-029, (License No. DPR-3)]

Yankee Atomic Electric Company, Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 C.F.R. 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by an "Emergency Motion for Compliance with Circuit Court Opinion" (Petition), dated January 17, 1996, Citizens Awareness Network and New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution (Petitioners) request that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take action with regard to operation by Yankee Atomic Energy Company (YAEC or Licensee) of its Nuclear Power Station at Rowe, Massachusetts (Yankee Rowe).

By an Order dated January 23, 1996, the Commission referred the Emergency Motion to the NRC staff for treatment as a petition pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The Commission ordered the NRC staff to respond to the Petitioners' claim of emergency within 10 days, or February 2, 1996, and to the Petition as a whole within 30 days, or February 22, 1996.

Petitioners request that the NRC comply with *Citizens Awareness Network Inc. v. United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Yankee Atomic Electric Company*, 59 F.3d 284 (1st Cir. 1995) (*CAN v. NRC*). Specifically, Petitioners request that the Commission immediately order:

(1) YAEC not to undertake, and the NRC staff not to approve, further major dismantling activities or other decommissioning activities, unless such activities are necessary to assure the protection of occupational and public