NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–387]

Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–14 issued to Pennsylvania Power and Light Company (the licensee) for operation of the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, located in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.

The proposed amendment would revise the Minimum Critical Power Ratio safety limit values, adding two references to reflect the use of the ANF–B Critical Power Ratio Correlation and to reflect the use of the ABB Combustion Engineering licensing methodology, with a modification to the associated Bases.

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 10 CFR 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. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The change to the ANFB correlation and corresponding MCPR Safety Limits does not physically change the plant systems, structures, or components. Thus, the probability of occurrence of an event evaluated in the SAR [Safety Analysis Report] is not increased. The acceptance criterion for the MCPR Safety Limit (i.e., 99.9% of the fuel rods expected to avoid boiling transition) is not changed. Only the methodology used to demonstrate compliance is changed. Therefore, the consequences of anticipated operational occurrence (which must show the Safety Limit is not violated) are not changed.

Adding the reference of CENPD–300–P, ''Reference Safety Report for Boiling Water Reactor Reload Fuel,'' to the list of references in Unit 1 Technical Specifications will allow the use of the ABB methodology to calculate the operating limits for the four Lead Use Assemblies which are of different mechanical design from the Siemens 9x9–2 fuel. The use of this ABB methodology will ensure that the applicable safety limits of the safety analysis are met for the four LUAs [Lead Use Assemblies]. Results of incorporating this change will not significantly increase the probability or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

As stated above, this methodology change does not impact the acceptance criterion for the MCPR Safety Limits and does not physically change the plant safety, structures, or components. Since no changes to the physical plant are being made, this change does not create the possibility of a new event not previously evaluated in the SAR.

The incorporation of this change will allow the use of the ABB methodology to be referenced as the methodology to show that all applicable limits of the safety analysis are met by the four ABB LUAs. Therefore, the incorporation of this change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

A cycle specific MCPR Safety Limit analysis was performed by SPC [Siemens Power Corporation]. The analysis used NRC approved methods described in the SPC report: ANF–524(P)(A), Revision 2 and Supplement 1, Revision 2. The MCPR Safety Limit value is calculated such that at least 99.9% of the fuel rods are expect to avoid boiling transition during normal operation or anticipated operational occurrences. Both the existing analysis using XN–3 and the new analysis using ANFB utilize NRC approved methods to accomplish this same objective. Therefore, the change to ANFB based Safety Limit does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The use of the ABB methodology will not result in a change in safety margin, but will ensure that the safety margin is maintained with the insertion of the four ABB LUAs in the Unit 1 Cycle 10 core. Therefore, the incorporation of these changes will have no impact on current safety margins, nor will they 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 the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing 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 Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications 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 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

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

By October 9, 1996, 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 2.714 which is available 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 Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, 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 with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of 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 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. Petitioner must provide 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 who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies 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, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

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.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1–(800) 248–5100 (in Missouri 1–(800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to John F. Stolz: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to Jay Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street NW., Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1) (i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated May 28, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated July 25, 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 Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of September 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Chester Poslusny,

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

[FR Doc. 96–22924 Filed 9–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; Medically Underserved Areas for 1997

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice of medically underserved areas for 1997.

SUMMARY: The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) has completed its annual calculation of the States that qualify as Medically Underserved Areas under the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program for the calendar year 1997. This is necessary to comply with a provision of FEHB law that mandates special consideration for enrollees of certain FEHB plans who receive covered health services in states with critical shortages of primary care physicians. Accordingly, for calendar year 1997, OPM's calculations show that the following States are Medically Underserved Areas under the FEHB Program: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Arkansas and