public may access the electronic OMB clearance package by following the directions for electronic access provided in the preamble to the titled rulemaking.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by May 7, 1997: Edward Michlovich, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 3150–0002, NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Comments may also be communicated by telephone at (202) 395–3084. The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda J. Shelton, (301) 415–7233.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 1st day of April, 1997.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 97–8834 Filed 4–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–213]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; (Haddam Neck Plant); Correction to Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued a Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment for Facility Operating License No. DPR–61 for the Haddam Neck Plant on March 13, 1997. In the **Federal Register** issue of Monday, March 24, 1997, make the following correction:

On page 13899, first column, last paragraph, the date as issued ''this 13th day of March 1997,'' should have read ''this 17th day of March 1997.''

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of March.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James W. Andersen,

Project Manager, Special Projects Office—Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–8833 Filed 4–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Paducah, Kentucky

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 basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review 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.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) The application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. 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.

Date of amendment request: February 28, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to add a definition for completion times and to define the maximum interval between repetitive action completion times in the Technical Safety Requirements and to make the same changes to the Safety Analysis Report.

Basis for finding of no significance:

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions is an administrative action. As such, these changes have no

impact on plant effluents and will not result in any impact to the environment.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed amendment will not increase exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed amendment will not result in any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions will provide more formality for the conduct of plant operations. This inclusion will ensure consistent interpretation of the requirements. The proposed changes do not affect the potential for or radiological or chemical consequences from previously evaluated accidents.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions will ensure consistent interpretation of the requirements. The changes will not create new operating conditions or a new plant configuration that could lead to a new or different type of accident.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

A definition for completion time and the definition for a maximum time interval for repetitive actions were not formally defined in the past and were subject to interpretation. The addition of these definitions for completion time and the maximum time interval for repetitive actions provides more formality for the conduct of plant operations. The proposed changes cause no reductions in the margins of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions provides more formality for the conduct of plant operations. The effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

Effective date: 30 days after issuance

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–1: Amendment will incorporate a new Technical Safety Requirement, a revised Technical Safety Requirement and Safety Analysis Report changes.

Local Public Document Room location: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of March 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97–8831 Filed 4–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Discontinuance of Certain Commission Regulatory Authority Within the Commonwealth

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of agreement with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that Shirley Ann Jackson, Chairman of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and William F. Weld, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, have signed the Agreement set forth below for the discontinuance by the Commission and assumption by the Commonwealth of certain Commission regulatory authority. The Agreement is published pursuant to Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Under the Agreement, certain persons would be exempted from certain of the regulatory requirements of the Commission. The pertinent exemptions have been previously published in the **Federal Register** and are codified in the Commission's regulations as 10 CFR part 150.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard L. Blanton, Office of State Programs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Telephone (301) 415–2322 or e-mail RLB@NRC.GOV.

The draft of the Agreement was published in the **Federal Register** for comment on four separate dates (see, e.g. 61 FR 68066, December 26, 1996). One comment was received which requested that NRC retain jurisdiction over a site listed on the Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP) until the NRC license for the site is terminated. NRC expedited the actions necessary to terminate the subject SDMP site license and on March 21, 1997, NRC terminated the license and removed the site from the SDMP list.

Appendix—Text of the Agreement

Agreement Between the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the Discontinuance of Certain Commission Regulatory Authority and Responsibility Within the Commonwealth Pursuant to Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as Amended

Whereas, The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) is authorized under Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the Act), to enter into agreements with the Governor of any State providing for discontinuance of the regulatory authority of the Commission within the State under Chapters 6, 7, and 8, and Section 161 of the Act with respect to by-product materials as defined in Sections 11e.(1) and (2) of the Act, source materials, and special nuclear materials in quantities not sufficient to form a critical mass; and,

Whereas, The Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is authorized under Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 111H, to enter into this Agreement with the Commission; and,

Whereas, The Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certified on March 28, 1996, that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (hereinafter referred to as the Commonwealth) has a program for the control of radiation hazards adequate to protect public health and safety with respect to the materials within the Commonwealth covered by this Agreement, and that the Commonwealth desires to assume regulatory responsibility for such materials; and,

Whereas, The Commission found on March 3, 1997, that the program of the Commonwealth for the regulation of the materials covered by this Agreement is compatible with the Commission's program for the regulation of such materials and is adequate to protect public health and safety; and,

Whereas, The Commonwealth and the Commission recognize the desirability and importance of cooperation between the Commission and the Commonwealth in the formulation of standards for protection against hazards of radiation and in assuring that Commonwealth and Commission programs for protection against hazards