

enrichment fuel would allow extended fuel irradiation and thus achieve longer fuel cycles in the future.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the TS. The proposed revision would allow the use of fuel having an initial composition of natural or slightly enriched uranium dioxide as fuel material, consistent with the limitation of NUREG-1432, "Standard Technical Specifications for Combustion Engineering Plants." In effect, the fuel would be limited to a maximum uranium-235 enrichment of 4.5 weight percent, as specified in TS 4.3.1.1 and 4.3.1.2, relating to the spent fuel pool limits for storing new and spent fuel. The safety considerations associated with the use of such fuel have been evaluated by the NRC staff. The staff has concluded that such a change would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed change has no adverse effect on the probability of any accident. No change is being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment fuel and extended irradiation (an enveloping case for the Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, because fuel burnup remains unchanged) were published and discussed in the staff assessment titled, "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), in connection with Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of the proposed increase in the fuel enrichment and irradiation limits are either unchanged or may, in fact, be reduced from those summarized in Summary Table S-4 of 10 CFR 51.52(c). Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts of reactor operation with higher enrichment, the proposed action involves features located entirely within the restricted

area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The proposed action 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.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 26, 1995, the staff consulted with the Maine State official, Mr. Patrick J. Dostie of the Department of Human Services, 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 action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letters dated August 30, 1995, and January 15, 1996, 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 Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, P.O. Box 367, Wiscasset, ME 04578.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
John A. Zwolinski,
Deputy Director, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-4682 Filed 2-28-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-336]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company; Correction

The February 14, 1996, Federal Register contained a "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing," for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2. This notice corrects the notice published in the Federal Register on February 14, 1996, (61 FR 5816). The "Date of amendment request: January 26, 1996" is corrected to January 16, 1996.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Guy S. Vissing,

Senior Project Manager, Northeast Utilities Project Directorate, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-4685 Filed 2-28-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-029]

Yankee Atomic Electric Company (License No. DPR-3); Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has taken action with respect to a Petition, dated January 17, 1996, by Citizens Awareness Network and New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution (Petitioners). The Petitioners requested 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).

Petitioners requested 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 requested that the Commission immediately order:

(1) YAEC not to undertake, and the NRC staff not to approve, further major