of 440 psig is not exceeded; (3) pigtail isolation system to limit the UF_6 release to less than 127 pounds in case of a pigtail failure; (4) assay monitoring to ensure that the TSR specified maximum assays for the accumulators and cylinders are not exceeded; (5) cylinder cart movement restrictions to ensure that a cylinder is not moved while it is connected to the withdrawal manifold; (6) liquid UF_6 cylinder movement methods and restrictions to minimize the risk of a liquid UF_6 cylinder drop and rupture; (7) UF_6 cylinder weight monitoring to ensure that the TSR specified fill weights are not exceeded; and (8) restrictions on heating solidified UF_6 plugs to prevent pipe rupture that could be caused by local liquefaction and expansion.

m. There are specific general design feature requirements and associated SRs related to (1) design, construction, testing and maintenance to ensure that the intended functions of UF_6 cylinders and pigtails are met so that they do not fail during normal operations; (2) cylinder lifting cranes and fixtures to ensure that a cylinder is not dropped and ruptured; and (3) Raschig rings in scale pits to enhance criticality safety. Consequently, there will be no significant increase in a risk of a criticality accident which could significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures.

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

The proposed amendment does not involve 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.

For similar reasons (adequacy of contingencies, reliability of controls, and unlikelihood of common-mode failures) provided in the assessment of criterion 2, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a criticality accident. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

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

Based on the adequacy of contingencies, reliability of controls, and unlikelihood of common-mode failures provided in the assessment of criterion 2, the NRC staff has determined that the proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

For similar reasons (adequacy of contingencies, reliability of controls, and unlikelihood of common-mode failures) provided in the assessment of criterion 2, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a criticality accident. In addition, the amendment is required to ensure proper operability of the ERP 1A scale, which performs the safety function of measuring the weight of the cylinder as it is being filled. Properly and safely weighing the cylinder is necessary to ensure safety of the facility. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin 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.

For similar reasons (adequacy of contingencies, reliability of controls, unlikelihood of common-mode failures, and operability of ERP 1A scale) provided in the assessment of criteria 2 and 6, the proposed amendment will not significantly increase the risk of a criticality or UF_6 release accident. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in a decrease in the plant's overall safety program.

The staff has not identified any safeguards or security related implications from the proposed amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plants safeguards or security programs.

Effective date: The amendment to GDP–2 will become effective 30 days after issuance by NRC.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–2: Amendment will incorporate a revised requirement of a General Design Feature contained in the Technical Safety Requirements.

Local Public Document Room location: Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of September 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William F. Kane,

Acting Deputy Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97–24380 Filed 9–12–97; 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, KY

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, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, 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: June 16, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to revise the Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) for the Nuclear Criticality Safety Program by adding a new program element.

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 change involves revision of the Nuclear Criticality Safety Program TSR to add a new program element on identification of safety structures, systems and components (SSCs) required to meet the double contingency. Because there are no effluent release associated with this change, the proposed changes will not affect the effluent.

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

The proposed changes do not relate to controls used to minimize occupational radiation exposures, therefore, the changes will not increase exposure.

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

The proposed changes 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 changes will not increase the probability of occurrence or consequence of any postulated accident currently identified in the safety analysis report. Therefore, there is no significant increase in 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.

Changing the TSR to add a new program element will not create a new or different type of accident. The proposed changes would not create new operating conditions or 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.

There are no increases in the probability or consequences of a criticality and no new accident initiators were identified. These changes do not increase the margins of safety. In fact safety may be enhanced by putting more emphasis on the clear identification of SSCs necessary to meet the double contingency principle.

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

Implementation of the proposed changes do not change the safety, safeguards, or security programs. Although the program element is being added to the TSR, there was already a commitment to identify the SSCs. The effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

Effective date: The amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 becomes effective 30 days after being signed by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–1: Amendment will revise Technical Safety Requirement for the nuclear criticality safety program by adding a new program element.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of September 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William F. Kane,

Acting Deputy Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97–24384 Filed 9–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subcommittee Meeting on Thermal-Hydraulic and Severe-Accident Phenomena; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Thermal-Hydraulic and Severe-Accident Phenomena will hold a meeting on September 29–30, 1997, Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

Most of the meeting will be closed to public attendance to discuss Westinghouse Electric Corporation proprietary information pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4).

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Monday, September 29, 1997—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

Tuesday, September 30, 1997—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will continue its review of the results of the Westinghouse Test and Analysis Program being conducted in support of the AP600 design certification and the associated NRC staff's Supplemental Draft Safety Evaluation Report. Specifically, the Subcommittee will review key elements of the passive containment cooling system test and analysis program. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the