	Schedule
Drug:	
Heroin (9200)	I.
Morphine (9300)	II.

The firm plans to import the listed controlled substances in small quantities for the manufacture of reference standards.

Any manufacturer holding, or applying for, registration as a bulk manufacturer of these basic classes of controlled substances may file written comments on or objections to the application described above and may, at the same time, file a written request for a hearing on such application in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.54 in such form as prescribed by 21 CFR 1316.47.

Any such comments, objections, or requests for a hearing may be addressed to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than (30 days from publication).

This procedure is to be conducted simultaneously with and independent of the procedures described in 21 CFR 1311.42 (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f). As noted in a previous notice at 40 FR 43745–46 (September 23, 1975), all applicants for registration to import basic classes of any controlled substances in Schedule I or II are and will continue to be required to demonstrate to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration that the requirements for such registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 958(a), 21 U.S.C. 823(a), and 21 CFR 1311.42 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) are satisfied.

Dated: June 27, 1996.

Gene R. Haislip,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–17831 Filed 7–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 72–8 (50–317/318)]

Notice of Transfer of Authority to Receive, Possess, Store and Transfer Spent Fuel at the Calvert Cliffs Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation From Baltimore Gas and Electric Company to Constellation Energy Corporation

Notice is hereby given that the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) is considering approval under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 72.50, of the transfer of the license to receive, possess, store and transfer spent fuel at the Calvert Cliffs Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI), from Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BG&E) to Constellation Energy Corporation (CEC). By application dated April 5, 1996, BG&E requested consent to the transfer, pursuant to 10 CFR 72.50, of the Materials License SNM–2505 for the Calvert Cliffs ISFSI. The approval of the proposed license transfer is requested in connection with the pending merger between BG&E and Potomac Electric Power Company into Constellation Energy Corporation. The proposed license transfer would transfer authority to receive, possess, store, and transfer spent fuel at the Calvert Cliffs ISFSI from BG&E to CEC.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 72.50, the Commission may approve the transfer of a license, after notice to interested persons, upon the Commission's determination that the holder of the license following the transfer is qualified to be a holder of the license and the transfer is otherwise consistent with applicable provisions of law, regulations, and orders of the Commission. BG&E submitted the April 5, 1996, application to amend the license to reflect the transfer of the license from BG&E to CEC.

For further details with respect to this action, see the April 5, 1996, letter, 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 Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William D. Travers,

Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 96–17940 Filed 7–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–321 and 50–366]

Georgia Power Company, et al.; Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–57 and NPF–5, issued to Georgia Power Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Edwin I. Hatch (Hatch) Nuclear Plants, Units 1 and 2, located in Appling County, Georgia.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24, which requires, in each area in which special nuclear material is handled, used, or stored, a monitoring system that will energize clearly audible alarms if accidental criticality occurs. The proposed action would also exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24(a)(3) to maintain emergency procedures for each area in which this licensed special nuclear material is handled, used, or stored to ensure that all personnel withdraw to an area of safety upon the sounding of the alarm and to conduct drills and designate responsible individuals for such emergency procedures.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated June 4, 1996.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Power reactor license applications are evaluated for the safe handling, use, and storage of special nuclear materials. The proposed exemption from criticality accident requirements is based on the original design for radiation monitoring at Hatch. Exemptions from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24(a) ''Criticality Accident Requirements'' were granted in the Special Nuclear Material (SNM) licenses for each unit as part of the 10 CFR Part 70 license. However, with the issuance of the Part 50 license this exemption expired because it was inadvertently omitted in that license. Therefore, the exemption is needed to clearly define the design of the plant as evaluated and approved for licensing.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC staff has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there is no significant

environmental impact if the exemption is granted. Inadvertent or accidental criticality will be precluded through compliance with the Hatch Technical Specifications, the geometric spacing of fuel assemblies in the new fuel storage facility and spent fuel storage pool, and administrative controls imposed on fuel handling procedures.

Inadvertent or accidental criticality of SNM while in use in the reactor vessel is precluded through compliance with the Hatch Technical Specifications, including reactivity requirements (e.g., shutdown margins, limits on control rod movement), instrumentation requirements (e.g., reactor power and radiation monitors), and controls on refueling operations (e.g., control rod interlocks and source range monitor requirements). In addition, the operators' continuous attention directed toward instruments monitoring behavior of the nuclear fuel in the reactor assures that the facility is operated in such a manner as to preclude inadvertent criticality. Finally, since access to the fuel in the reactor vessel is not physically possible while in use and is procedurally controlled during refueling, there are no concerns associated with loss or diversion of the fuel.

SNM as a nuclear fuel is stored in one of two locations—the spent fuel pool or the new fuel vault. The spent fuel pool is used to store irradiated fuel under water after its removal from the reactor. The pool is designed to store fuel in a geometric array that precludes criticality. In addition, existing Technical Specification limits on k_{eff} are maintained less than or equal to 0.95, even in the event of a fuel handling accident.

The new fuel vault is used to receive and store new fuel in a dry condition upon arrival on site and prior to loading in the reactor. The new fuel vault is designed to store new fuel in a geometric array that precludes criticality. In addition, existing safety evaluations demonstrate that an effective multiplication factor is maintained less than or equal to 0.95 when the new fuel racks are fully loaded and dry or flooded with unborated water, or in the event of a fuel handling accident.

New fuel is shipped in a plastic wrap. When the fuel is removed from its transportation cask, the wrap is removed and the fuel is placed in the fuel inspection stand. Following inspection, the new fuel can either be placed in the new fuel storage vault or in the spent fuel pool (typically placed in the spent fuel pool). In no case is the plastic wrap reinserted on the fuel. Removal of the wrap requires it to be slit down the length of the new fuel assembly, thereby making its reuse highly unlikely. Therefore, there is no concern that the plastic wrap used as part of the new fuel package will be capable of holding water from flooding from overhead sources. Additionally, as discussed above, the new fuel storage racks were analyzed for a postulated flooded condition, and the results show that k_{eff} is maintained less than or equal to 0.95.

Both irradiated and unirradiated fuel is moved to and from the reactor vessel and the spent fuel pool to accommodate refueling operations. Also, unirradiated fuel can be moved to and from the new fuel vault. In addition, fuel movements into the facility and within the reactor vessel and the spent fuel pool occur. In all cases, fuel movements are procedurally controlled and designed to preclude conditions involving criticality concerns. Moreover, previous accident analyses demonstrate that a fuel handling accident (i.e., a dropped fuel element) will not create conditions that exceed design specifications. In addition, the Technical Specifications and Technical Requirements Manuals specifically address refueling operations and limit the handling of fuel to ensure against an accidental criticality and preclude certain movements over the spent fuel pool and the reactor vessel.

In summary, exemptions from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 70, Section 70.24 approved by the NRC in connection with the SNM licenses for Hatch Units 1 and 2 were based upon NRC's finding that the inherent features associated with the storage and inspection of unirradiated fuel established good cause for granting the exemption and that granting such an exemption at this time will not endanger public life or property or the common defense and security and is otherwise in the public interest. The training provided to all personnel involved in fuel handling operations, the administrative controls, the Technical Specifications requirements, and the design of the fuel storage racks preclude inadvertent or accidental criticality. Since the facilities, storage, and inspection and procedures currently in place are consistent with those in place at the time the exemptions were granted in connection with the SNM licenses, an exemption from 10 CFR 70.24 is appropriate.

The proposed exemption will not affect radiological plant effluents nor cause any significant occupational exposures. Only a small amount, if any, of radioactive waste is generated during the receipt and handling of new fuel (e.g., smear papers or contaminated packaging material). The amount of waste would not be changed by the exemption.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption involves systems located 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 that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative would be to deny the requested exemption. 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 related to an operating license for the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, and of a construction permit for Unit 2, dated October 1972, and the Final Environmental Statement related to the operation of Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, dated March 1978.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 24, 1996, the staff consulted with the Georgia State official, Mr. James L. Setser, of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, 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 letter dated June 4, 1996, 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

Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of July 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Kahtan N. Jabbour,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate II–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–17939 Filed 7–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Correction to Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

On June 17, 1996 (61 FR 30643), notice of issuance of Director's Decision DD–96–06 under 10 CFR 2.206 was published, concerning Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 and 3. However, reference to one of the licensees, the Power Authority of the State of New York, was inadvertently omitted from the heading on page 30643.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of July 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–17937 Filed 7–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–335]

Florida Power and Light Company, St. Lucie Plant, Units No. 1 and 2; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by letter dated June 12, 1996, Thomas J. Saporito, Jr., for himself and on behalf of the National Litigation Consultants (Petitioners) requested that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) take action with regard to operations at the Florida Power and Light Company's (licensee's) St. Lucie Plant, Units No. 1 and 2 pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206.

The Petitioners request that the Commission (1) issue a confirmatory order requiring that the licensee not operate St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 1, above 50 percent of its power level capacity, (2) require the licensee to specifically identify the ''root cause'' for the premature failure of the steam generator tubing, and (3) require the licensee to specifically state what corrective measures will be implemented to prevent recurrence of steam generator tube failures in all the steam generators in Unit 1 and Unit 2.

As basis for the requests, the Petitioners assert that (1) the licensee's Unit 1 steam generator tubes have degraded to the extent that more than 2,500 of the tubes have been plugged, (2) the licensee has not identified the root cause for the premature failure of the steam generator tubing, (3) the licensee will most likely experience similar tube ruptures on other steam generators at the station, and (4) the licensee's ''FSAR's [Final Safety Analysis Reports] and the NRC's CFR's [*Code of Federal Regulations*] require that the integrity of the primary systems on Unit 1 and Unit 2 not be breached.''

The Petition is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. The Petition has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. As provided by Section 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on this request within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for 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 Indian River Junior College Library, 3209 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, Florida.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of July 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–17941 Filed 7–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 040–08724]

Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206.

I. Introduction

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has issued a decision concerning a Petition dated January 6, 1989, submitted by Dr. Klaus R. Romer, on behalf of McGean-Rohco, Inc.

By letter dated January 6, 1989, Dr. Klaus R. Romer, on behalf of McGean-Rohco, Inc. (Petitioner or McGean), requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take action pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 with respect to Chemetron Corporation (Chemetron), an NRC licensee. McGean requested that NRC exercise its enforcement powers to compel Chemetron, at the time a subsidiary of Allegheny International, Inc. (Allegheny), to immediately commence decontamination of its facilities at 2910 Harvard Avenue, Cuyahoga Heights, Ohio, (the Harvard Avenue site) under the terms agreed to by Allegheny in its Confirmation of Commitment dated November 14, 1988. The Petitioner also requested the NRC to impose sanctions upon Chemetron for its failure to carry out the decontamination of the Harvard Avenue site. McGean alleged the following bases for its requests:

(1) On November 14, 1988, Chemetron committed to begin decontamination of the Harvard Avenue site immediately and complete the job by March 17, 1989;

(2) The NRC had stated that the March completion deadline would be relaxed only if Chemetron made a compelling showing of diligent efforts to clean up the site and good cause;

(3) Chemetron's letter to the NRC of December 12, 1988, which requests an extension of the deadline for good cause, fails to make a compelling showing of good cause; and

(4) Chemetron has not made a good faith effort to decontaminate the site.

On March 22, 1989, the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, formally acknowledged receipt of the Petition and informed Petitioner that its request was being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the NRC's regulations. A notice of the receipt of the Petition was published in the Federal Register notice on March 28, 1989 (54 FR 12698). In the March 22, 1989, letter, the Director denied the Petitioner's request for immediate relief because NRC considered that Chemetron's actions demonstrated minimally sufficient progress towards decontamination. However, the Director deferred a decision on the remainder of the Petition.

II. Background

In 1965, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 40, the Atomic Energy Commission issued Source Material License No. SUB–852 to Chemetron, which through its McGean Unit of the Inorganic Chemical Division, manufactured catalysts containing depleted uranium. These operations were carried out between 1965 and 1972 in facilities located at the Harvard Avenue site. By February 1972, manufacture of the catalysts had been terminated, and in December 1973, the License was amended to authorize storage only for the remaining depleted uranium. No activities involving source material, other than decontamination, have been conducted at the site since the termination of the catalyst production by Chemetron in 1972.