

Vicki A. Novak, Executive Director,
Personnel Division, NASA
Headquarters

Michael I. Mott, Associate Deputy
Administrator (Technical), NASA
Headquarters

Robert E. Whitehead, Associate
Administrator for Aeronautics and
Space Transportation Technology,
NASA Headquarters

Spence M. Armstrong, Associate
Administrator for Human Resources
and Education, NASA Headquarters

Daniel S. Goldin,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97-22254 Filed 8-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Telecommunications Service Priority System Oversight Committee

AGENCY: National Communications
System (NCS).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

A meeting of the Telecommunications Service Priority (TSP) System Oversight Committee will convene Thursday September 25, 1997 from 9 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. The meeting will be held at Booz-Allen & Hamilton 8283 Greensboro Drive, McLean VA.

—Opening/Administrative Remarks
—Status of the TSP Program
—Working Group Reports
—CPAS Program Update

Anyone interested in attending or presenting additional information to the Committee, please contact LCDR Angela Abrahamson, Manager, TSP Program Office, (703) 607-4930, or Betty Hoskin (703) 607-4932 by September 15, 1997.

Frank M. McClelland,

*Acting Federal Register Liaison Officer,
National Communications System.*

[FR Doc. 97-22125 Filed 8-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3610-05-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389]

Florida Power and Light Company, et al., St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2; Exemption

I

The Florida Power and Light Company, *et al.* (FPL or the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16, which authorize operation of the St. Lucie

Plant, Units 1 and 2. The licenses provide, among other things, that the licensee is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect.

The facility consists of two pressurized-water reactors at the licensee's site located in St. Lucie County, Florida.

II

Section 70.24 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, "Criticality Accident Requirements," requires that each licensee authorized to possess special nuclear material (SNM) shall maintain a criticality accident monitoring system in each area where such material is handled, used, or stored. Subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) of 10 CFR 70.24 specify detection and sensitivity requirements that these monitors must meet. Subsection (a)(1) also specifies that all areas subject to criticality accident monitoring must be covered by two detectors. Subsection (a)(3) of 10 CFR 70.24 requires licensees to maintain emergency procedures for each area in which this licensed SNM is handled, used, or stored and provides that (1) the procedures ensure that all personnel withdraw to an area of safety upon the sounding of a criticality accident monitor alarm, (2) the procedures must include drills to familiarize personnel with the evacuation plan, and (3) the procedures designate responsible individuals for determining the cause of the alarm and placement of radiation survey instruments in accessible locations for use in such an emergency. Subsection (b)(1) of 10 CFR 70.24 requires licensees to have a means to identify quickly personnel who have received a dose of 10 rads or more. Subsection (b)(2) of 10 CFR 70.24 requires licensees to maintain personnel decontamination facilities, to maintain arrangements for a physician and other medical personnel qualified to handle radiation emergencies, and to maintain arrangements for the transportation of contaminated individuals to treatment facilities outside the site boundary. Paragraph (c) of 10 CFR 70.24 exempts Part 50 licensees from the requirements of paragraph (b) of 10 CFR 70.24 for SNM used or to be used in the reactor. Paragraph (d) of 10 CFR 70.24 states that any licensee who believes that there is good cause why he should be granted an exemption from all or part of 10 CFR 70.24 may apply to the Commission for such an exemption and shall specify the reasons for the relief requested.

III

The SNM that could be assembled into a critical mass at St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2, is in the form of nuclear fuel; the quantity of SNM other than fuel that is stored on site is small enough to preclude achieving a critical mass. The Commission's technical staff has evaluated the possibility of an inadvertent criticality of the nuclear fuel at St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2, and has determined that it is extremely unlikely for such an accident to occur if the licensee meets the following seven criteria:

1. Only one fuel assembly is allowed out of a shipping cask or storage rack at one time.

2. The k-effective does not exceed 0.95, at a 95% probability, 95% confidence level in the event that the fresh fuel storage racks are filled with fuel of the maximum permissible U-235 enrichment and flooded with pure water.

3. If optimum moderation occurs at low moderator density, then the k-effective does not exceed 0.98, at a 95% probability, 95% confidence level in the event that the fresh fuel storage racks are filled with fuel of the maximum permissible U-235 enrichment and flooded with a moderator at the density corresponding to optimum moderation.

4. The k-effective does not exceed 0.95, at a 95% probability, 95% confidence level in the event that the spent fuel storage racks are filled with fuel of the maximum permissible U-235 enrichment and flooded with pure water.

5. The quantity of forms of special nuclear material, other than nuclear fuel, that are stored on site in any given area is less than the quantity necessary for a critical mass.

6. Radiation monitors, as required by General Design Criterion 63, are provided in fuel storage and handling areas to detect excessive radiation levels and to initiate appropriate safety actions.

7. The maximum nominal U-235 enrichment is limited to 5.0 weight percent.

By letter dated February 19, 1997, and supplemented July 10, 1997, the licensee requested an exemption from 10 CFR 70.24. In this request the licensee addressed the seven criteria given above. The Commission's technical staff has reviewed the licensee's submittals and has determined that St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2, meets the criteria for prevention of inadvertent criticality; therefore, the staff has determined that it is extremely unlikely for an inadvertent criticality to

occur in SNM handling or storage areas at St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2.

The purpose of the criticality monitors required by 10 CFR 70.24 is to ensure that if a criticality were to occur during the handling of SNM, personnel would be alerted to that fact and would take appropriate action. The staff has determined that it is extremely unlikely that such an accident could occur; furthermore, the licensee has radiation monitors, as required by General Design Criterion 63, in fuel storage and handling areas. These monitors will alert personnel to excessive radiation levels and allow them to initiate appropriate safety actions. The low probability of an inadvertent criticality, together with the licensee's adherence to General Design Criterion 63, constitutes good cause for granting an exemption to the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24.

IV

The Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 70.14, this exemption is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants the Florida Power and Light Company, et al., an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will have no significant impact on the environment (62 FR 43363).

This exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of August 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-22178 Filed 8-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-U

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287]

Duke Power Company; Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47, and DPR-55, issued to Duke Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the Oconee Nuclear

Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 located in Oconee County, South Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would amend the licenses to reflect the licensee's name change from "Duke Power Company" to "Duke Energy Corporation."

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated June 12, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Duke Power Company changed its name to "Duke Energy Corporation." The facility operating licenses for Oconee indicate the name of the licensee as "Duke Power Company," and therefore need to be amended to substitute the new name of the licensee. The proposed action is purely administrative.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there is no significant environmental impact if the amendments are granted. No changes will be made to the design and licensing bases, or procedures of the three units at the Oconee Nuclear Station. Other than the name change, no other changes will be made to the facility operating licenses.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action 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 there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of

the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. 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 Oconee Nuclear Station.

Agencies and Persons Contacted

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 12, 1997, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Virgil Autrey of the Bureau of Radiological Health, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed amendments. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed amendments 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 amendments.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's request for the amendments dated June 12, 1997, 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 Oconee County Library, 501 West South Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of August 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herbert N. Berkow,

Director, Project Directorate II-2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-22180 Filed 8-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-U

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-280 and 50-281]

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Surry Power Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is