The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (the licensee) to withdraw its December 15, 2004, application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–28 for the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, located in Windham County. The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specifications pertaining to control rod operability, scram time and control rod accumulator technical specification surveillance testing requirements. The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the Federal Register on January 18, 2005 (70 FR 2889). However, by letter dated August 10, 2006, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated December 15, 2004, as supplemented on December 12, 2005, and July 6, 2006, and the licensee’s letter dated August 10, 2006, which withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the internet at the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference Staff by telephone at 1–800–397–4209, or 301–415–4737 or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of August 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James Shea,
Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch I–1, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E6–14525 Filed 8–31–06; 8:45 am]
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Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

[DOCKET No. 50–271]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–42, issued to Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Wolf Creek Generating Station, located in Coffey County, Kansas.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.2, “Main Steam Isolation Valves (MSIVs),” and TS 3.7.3, “Main Feedwater Isolation Valves (MFIVs),” to add the associated actuator trains to (1) the limiting condition for operation (LCO), (2) the conditions, required actions, and completion times for the LCO, and (3) the surveillance requirements. Each MSIV and MFIV has

---

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

[DOCKET No. 50–482]

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–42, issued to Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Wolf Creek Generating Station, located in Coffey County, Kansas.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.2, “Main Steam Isolation Valves (MSIVs),” and TS 3.7.3, “Main Feedwater Isolation Valves (MFIVs),” to add the associated actuator trains to (1) the limiting condition for operation (LCO), (2) the conditions, required actions, and completion times for the LCO, and (3) the surveillance requirements. Each MSIV and MFIV has
two actuator trains. The Table of Contents for the TSs would be changed to account for the resulting renumbering of TS page numbers.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission’s regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission’s regulations in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes to incorporate requirements for the MSIV and MFIV actuator trains do not involve any design or physical changes to the facility, including the MSIVs, MFIVs, and actuator trains themselves. The design and functional performance requirements, operational characteristics, and reliability of the MSIVs, MFIVs, and actuator trains are thus unchanged. Therefore, there is no change with respect to the safety function of the MSIVs and MFIVs to close (as an accident mitigator), nor is there any change with respect to inadvertent closure of an MSIV or MFIV (as a potential transient initiator). Since no failure mode or initiating condition that could cause an accident (including any plant transient) evaluated per the Updated Safety Analysis Report-described safety analyses is created or affected, the change cannot involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

With regard to the consequences of an accident and the equipment required for mitigation of the accident, the proposed changes involve no design or physical changes to the MSIVs, MFIVs, or any other equipment required for accident mitigation. With respect to MSIV and MFIV actuator train Completion Times, the consequences of an accident are independent of equipment Completion Times as long as adequate equipment availability is maintained. The proposed MSIV and MFIV actuator Completion Times take into account the redundancy of the actuator trains, only 3 of 4 MSIVs and MFIVs are assumed to close in the accident analyses, and are limited in extent consistent with other Completion Times specified in the Technical Specifications. Adequate equipment availability would be required for the MSIV and MFIV actuator trains to continue to be required by the Technical Specifications. On this basis, the consequences of applicable, analyzed accidents (such as a main steam line break) are not significantly impacted by the proposed changes.

Based on all of the above, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

(2) Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes to incorporate requirements for the MSIV and MFIV actuator trains do not involve any design or physical changes to the facility, including the MSIVs, MFIVs, and actuator trains themselves. No physical alteration of the plant is involved, as no new or different type of equipment is to be installed. The proposed changes do not alter any assumptions made in the safety analyses, nor do they involve any changes to plant procedures for ensuring that the plant is operated within analyzed limits. As such, no new failure modes or mechanisms that could cause a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated are being introduced. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change to incorporate requirements for the MSIV and MFIV actuator trains does not alter the manner in which safety limits or limiting safety system settings are determined. No changes to instrument/system actuation setpoints are involved. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change and the proposed change will not permit plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee’s analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility.

Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission’s “Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings” in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the Commission’s PDR, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville,
Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System’s (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted and the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition must also identify the specific contents which the petitioner/requestor seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner/requestor shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner/requestor must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact.

Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner/requestor who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

Nontimely requests and/or petitions and contentions will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission or the presiding officer of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition, request and/or the contentions should be granted based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)–(viii).

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed by: (1) First class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; (2) courier, express mail, and expedited delivery services: Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; (3) e-mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, hearingdocket@nrc.gov; or (4) facsimile transmission addressed to the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff at (301) 415–1100, verification number is (301) 415–1966. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and it is requested that copies be transmitted either by means of facsimile transmission to 301–415–3725 or by e-mail to OGCMailCenter@nrc.gov. A copy of the request for hearing and petition for leave to intervene should also be sent to Jay Silberg, Esq., Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 25, 2006, which is available for public inspection at the Commission’s PDR, located at One White Flint North, File Public Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System’s (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of August 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jack Donohew,
Senior Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch IV, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E6–14511 Filed 8–31–06; 8:45 am]
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Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for License Amendment for Heritage Minerals, Inc.; Manchester Township, NJ

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marjorie McLaughlin, Project Manager, Decommissioning Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region I, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, 19406–1415. Telephone: (610) 337–5240; fax number: (610) 337–5260; e-mail: mm3@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: I. Introduction

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering the