

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