

included 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 Wolf Creek 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. New fuel shipping containers only carry two new fuel assemblies. The procedure used for new fuel receipt requires the use of the monorail auxiliary hoist on the cask handling crane for all lifting operations. A special new fuel handling tool is required to be attached to the monorail auxiliary hoist to lift each fuel assembly from the shipping container. This new fuel handling tool can only be attached to the top nozzle of one fuel assembly at a time. The attached fuel assembly is moved to either the new fuel storage racks or the new fuel elevator if the assembly is going to be stored in the spent fuel facility. Both of these storage positions will only accommodate one fuel assembly in a designed location. The spacing between new fuel assemblies in the storage racks is sufficient to maintain the array in a subcritical condition, even when flooded by non-borated water. The new fuel storage building provides space for dry storage of 66 new fuel assemblies, arranged in three double rows (2x11) of ports. Each port will hold just one fuel assembly. The ports within each double row are on 21 inch centers and there is a nominal 28 inch aisle between each pair of rows. The storage racks are protected from dropped objects by a steel protective cover. Therefore, the design of the new fuel storage rack, the fuel handling equipment, and the administrative controls are such that subcritically is assured under normal and accident conditions.

The spent fuel pool is divided into two separate and distinct regions, which for the purpose of criticality considerations may be considered as separate pools. Region 1, reserved for core-off-loading, has the capacity for a minimum of 200 assemblies. Region 2, reserved for fuel that has sustained at least 85 percent of design burnup, has an ultimate capacity to store 1140 spent fuel assemblies. Region 1 has fuel

assemblies stored in two out of four box positions in a checker board pattern; the unused boxes serve to allow cooling water flow. The center-to-center distance for actual fuel assemblies is 12.92 inches, measured diagonally. The center-to-center spacing between any two adjacent fuel assemblies in the same row is 18.28 inches. Region 2 has fuel assemblies stored in three out of four box positions. During a normal refueling operation, each fuel assembly is first removed from the reactor to Region 1. After the refueling operation is complete and the suitability of each spent fuel assembly for movement into Region 2 is verified, the fuel assembly may be moved into Region 2. Technical Specification (TS) 3.9.12 states that no spent fuel assemblies shall be placed in Region 2, nor shall any storage location be changed in designation from being in Region 1 to being in Region 2, while refueling operations are in progress. The TS also require that prior to storage of any fuel assembly in Region 2 that the burnup history of the fuel element be ascertained by analysis of its burnup history and independently verified. In summary, the training provided to all personnel involved in fuel handling operations, the design of the fuel handling equipment, the administrative controls, the technical specifications on new and spent fuel handling and storage and the design of the new and spent fuel storage racks preclude inadvertent or accidental criticality. In accordance with the NRC's Regulatory Position in Regulatory Guide 8.12, Revision 1, "Criticality Accident Alarm Systems," dated January 1981, 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, 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 the operation of Wolf Creek Generating Station," dated June 1982 (NUREG-0878).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 1, 1996, the staff consulted with the Kansas State official, Mr. Gerald Allen of the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, 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 September 19, 1995, 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 rooms located at the Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801, and the Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 6621.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James C. Stone,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-5363 Filed 3-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-390]

Tennessee Valley Authority Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Unit No. 1; Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated January 25, 1996, as

supplemented on January 30, 1996, Jane A. Fleming (Petitioner) has requested that the NRC take action with regard to Watts Bar Nuclear Plant. Specifically, the Petitioner requests that the low-power license for Watts Bar be suspended or revoked.

As a basis for her request, the Petitioner asserts that the NRC staff was not fully aware of the licensee's commitments and compliance with these commitments when it issued a low-power license on November 9, 1995. Specifically, the Petitioner asserts that a letter from Stewart D. Ebner, Regional Administrator, Region II, to Oliver Kingsley, TVA dated January 12, 1996, which states that open issues regarding the radiation monitoring system for Watts Bar existed when TVA requested the operating license, raises a question as to the conclusion drawn by the NRC staff in the Supplemental Safety Evaluation Report issued in September 1995, that the system meets the acceptance criteria of the NRC's Standard Review Plan and is, therefore, acceptable.

The Petition is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations and has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. By letter dated February 7, 1996, the Petitioner's request that the low-power license immediately be suspended or revoked was denied.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20037.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
William T. Russell,
Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-5365 Filed 3-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-282, 50-306]

**Northern States Power Company;
Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant
Receipt of Addendum To Petition for
Director's Decision Under 10 CFR
2.206**

Notice is hereby given that by letter dated February 19, 1996, the Nuclear Information and Resource Service (NIRS) and the Prairie Island Coalition request that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) take immediate action with regard to steam generator

tube inspections at the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant. The letter was an addendum to an earlier Petition dated June 5, 1995.

The Petitioners request that the NRC not allow Prairie Island Unit 1 to be returned to operation until a full-length inspection of all steam generator tubes is performed using the Zetec Plus Point probe.

As the basis for this request, the Petitioners state that in a briefing before the Commission on January 31, 1996, the Director of the NRC's Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation stated that NRC had learned of a few isolated cases of free span cracking in steam generator tubes, that is, cracks not located within the tube support plate or the tube sheet regions.

This addendum to the Petition is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations and has been referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. As provided by 10 CFR 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on the Petition within a reasonable time. By letter dated March 1, 1996, the Director denied the request for immediate action to not allow Prairie Island Unit 1 to be returned to operation.

Copies of the addendum to the Petition and the Director's letter are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC, and at the Local Public Document Room, Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
William T. Russell,
Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-5364 Filed 3-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and Purpose of information collection: Application for Survivor Insurance Annuities: OMB 3220-0030 Under Section 2(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act (RRA), monthly survivor annuities are payable to surviving widow(er)s, parents, unmarried children, and in certain cases, divorced wives (husbands), mothers (fathers), remarried widow(er)s, and grandchildren of deceased railroad employees. The collection obtains the information required by the RRB to determine entitlement of the annuity applied for.

The RRB currently utilizes Form(s) AA-17 (Application for Widow(ers) Annuity), AA-17b (Applications for Determination of Widow(er) Disability), AA-18 (Application for Mother's/Father's and Child's Annuity), AA-19 (Application for Child's Annuity), AA-19b (Application for Determination of Child Disability), AA-19s (Application for child's Annuity/Full-time Student), and AA-20 (Application for Parent's Annuity) to obtain the necessary information. One response is requested of each respondent. Completion is required to obtain benefits.

In order to implement a presumed Electronic Funds Transfer policy, revisions to Forms AA-17, AA-18, AA-19, and AA-20 are being proposed that request information about an applicant's financial institution. Additional changes to Forms AA-17 and AA-20 are being proposed that will expedite Medicare enrollment and reduce jurisdictional problems with other agencies. Modifications proposed to Form AA-19 will allow Form AA-19s to be eliminated. Assorted minor editorial and reformatting changes are also being proposed to all of the forms.

Estimate of Annual Respondent Burden

The estimated annual respondent burden is as follows: