

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Gerald F. Cranford,
*Designated Senior Official for Information
Resources Management.*
[FR Doc. 96-8102 Filed 4-2-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

**Agency Information Collection
Activities: Submission for OMB
Review; Comment Request**

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory
Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of
information collection and solicitation
of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently
submitted to OMB for review the
following proposal for the collection of
information under the provisions of the
Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44
U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby
informs potential respondents that an
agency may not conduct or sponsor, and
that a person is not required to respond
to, a collection of information unless it
displays a currently valid OMB control
number.

1. Type of submission, new, revision,
or extension: Revision/Extension.
2. The title of the information
collection: Exercise of Discretion for an
Operating Facility, NRC Enforcement
Policy (NUREG-1600).
3. The form number if applicable: Not
applicable.
4. How often the collection is
required: On occasion.
5. Who will be required or asked to
report: Nuclear power reactor licensees.
6. An estimate of the number of
responses: 1.
7. The estimated number of annual
respondents: 36.
8. An estimate of the total number of
hours needed annually to complete the
requirement or request: 2,160.
9. An indication of whether Section
3507(d), Pub. L. 104-13 applies: Not
applicable.
10. Abstract: The NRC's revised
Enforcement Policy includes the
circumstances in which the NRC may
exercise enforcement discretion. This
enforcement discretion is designated as
a Notice of Enforcement Discretion
(NOED) and relates to circumstances
which may arise where a licensee's
compliance with a Technical
Specification Limiting Condition for
Operation or with other license
conditions would involve an
unnecessary plant transient or
performance of testing, inspection, or
system realignment that is inappropriate
for the specific plant conditions, or
unnecessary delays in plant startup

without a corresponding health and
safety benefit. A licensee seeking the
issuance of a NOED must provide a
written justification, which documents
the safety basis for the request and
provides whatever other information the
NRC staff deems necessary to decide
whether or not to exercise discretion.

A copy of the submittal may be
viewed free of charge at the NRC Public
Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW
(Lower Level), Washington, DC.
Members of the public who are in the
Washington, DC, area can access the
submittal via modem on the Public
Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's
Advanced Copy Document Library) NRC
subsystem at FedWorld, 703-321-3339.
Members of the public who are located
outside of the Washington, DC, area can
dial FedWorld, 1-800-303-9672, or use
the FedWorld Internet address:
fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document
will be available on the bulletin board
for 30 days after the signature date of
this notice. If assistance is needed in
accessing the document, please contact
the FedWorld help desk at 703-487-
4608. Additional assistance in locating
the document is available from the NRC
Public Document Room, nationally at 1-
800-397-4209, or within the
Washington, DC, area at 202-634-3273.

Comments and questions should be
directed to the OMB reviewer by May 3,
1996: Peter Francis, Office of
Information and Regulatory Affairs
(3150-0136), NEOB-10202, Office of
Management and Budget, Washington,
DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by
telephone at (202) 395-3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda
Jo. Shelton, (301) 415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day
of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Gerald F. Cranford,
*Designated Senior Official for Information
Resources Management.*

[FR Doc. 96-8103 Filed 4-2-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499]

**Houston Lighting and Power
Company, City Public Service Board of
San Antonio Central Power and Light
Company, City of Austin, Texas; Notice
of Consideration of Issuance of
Amendments to Facility Operating
Licenses; Proposed Involves 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 Nos. NPF-
76 and NPF-80, issued to Houston
Lighting & Power Company, et. al., (the
licensee) for operation of the South
Texas Project, Units 1 & 2, located in
Matagorda County, Texas. The original
application dated May 30, 1995, was
previously published in the Federal
Register on July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37092).
That application was supplemented by
letter dated February 8, 1996.

The proposed amendment would
increase the spent fuel pool heat load
licensing basis to provide greater
flexibility for normal refueling practices.

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 changes do not involve a
significant increase in the probability or
consequences of an accident previously
evaluated because:

(a) The Spent Fuel Pool conditions are not
indicative of accident initiators.

(b) Design and operability requirements of
equipment important to safety are not
affected.

(c) Spent Fuel Pool boiling will not occur
and the Spent Fuel Pool components will
remain within their design bases.

(d) The complete loss of Spent Fuel Pool
cooling event has previously been analyzed
and described in Supplement 6 to the Safety
Evaluation Report, Appendix BB. The dose
consequences for this event have been
evaluated and the safety evaluation is
described in Updated Final Safety Analysis
Report Section 9.1.3.3.4. The results of the
evaluation show that the Spent Fuel Pool
components would remain within their
design bases. Also, the dose consequences of
iodine release as a result of Spent Fuel Pool
boiling are significantly below the allowable
dose limits of 10 CFR 100.

2. The proposed changes do not create the
possibility of a new or different kind of
accident from any accident previously
because: