

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the NRC's FES is valid for operation at the proposed uprated power conditions for LGS, Units 1 and 2. The staff also concluded that the plant operating parameters impacted by the proposed uprate would remain within the bounding conditions on which the conclusions of the FES are based.

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.

The NRC staff finds the radiological and nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed small increase in power are very small and do not change the conclusion in the FES that the operation of LGS, Units 1 and 2, would cause no significant adverse impact upon the quality of the human environment.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological 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.

The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request. Such action would not significantly reduce the environmental impact of plant operation but would restrict operation of LGS, Units 1 and 2 to the currently licensed power level and prevent the facility from generating approximately 60 MWe (165 MWt) additional that is obtainable from the existing plant design.

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 Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2," dated April 1984.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the Bureau of Radiation Protection, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, 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 December 9, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated July 5, September 9, October 19, and November 19, 1994, and January 6, and January 23, 1995, which 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 located at the Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, PA 19464.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Chester Poslusny,

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

[FR Doc. 95-3520 Filed 2-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Draft NUREG: Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a draft report entitled, "Management of Radioactive Material Safety Programs at Medical Facilities" (NUREG-1516). This draft report, prepared by NRC staff and two representatives of Agreement States, is available for review and comment.

The draft report describes a systematic approach for effectively managing radiation safety programs at medical facilities. This is accomplished by defining and emphasizing the roles of an institution's executive management, radiation safety officer (RSO), and radiation safety committee, if required. Various aspects of program management are discussed and guidance is offered on selecting the RSO, determining adequate program resources, using contractual services such as consultants and service companies, conducting program audits, and clarifying the roles of physician authorized users and supervised individuals. NRC's reporting and notification requirements are outlined and a general description is given of how NRC's licensing, inspection, and enforcement programs work. There are 19 appendices that present detailed information on specific aspects of program management and include an

annotated bibliography prepared by the Radiological Sciences Division of Brookhaven National Laboratory.

This report presents regulatory guidance. It does not describe new or proposed regulations, and licensees are not required to adhere to its principles. Any discussion or specific information that implies a new or proposed regulatory requirement does so unintentionally. Rather, this should be viewed as a practical guide to present a management approach and describe management tools which regulatory agencies have observed to be effective when managing a radiation safety program at a medical facility. Even though the radiation safety principles and practices in NUREG-1516 are directed towards the safe use of byproduct material, they have universal applicability and may be used by the RSO and other responsible individuals to manage the safe use of other sources of radiation for medical use not specifically addressed in this report.

Comments and suggestions on the Draft NUREG-1516 should be sent to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Hand deliver comments to 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:15 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. on Federal workdays. Copies of the comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. Submit comments on this draft report by December 31, 1995. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to assure consideration only for those comments received by this date.

Copies of draft NUREG-1516 may be obtained by written request or telefax (301-504-2260) from Distribution Services, Printing and Mail Services Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

For further information contact Janet Schlueter, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Mail Stop, T-8F5, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, telephone (301) 415-7894.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Larry W. Camper,
*Acting Chief, Medical, Academic, and
 Commercial Use Safety Branch, Division of
 Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office
 of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*
 [FR Doc. 95-3521 Filed 2-10-95; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-313]

**Entergy Operations, Inc. (Arkansas
 Nuclear One, Unit 1); Exemption**

I

Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee) is the holder of Operating License No. DPR-51, which authorizes operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO-1). The operating license provides, among other things, that it is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now and hereafter in effect.

The facility consist of pressurized water reactor at the licensee's site in Pope County, Arkansas.

II

Section III.D.1(a) of appendix J to 10 CFR part 50 requires, " * * * a set of three Type A tests [Overall Integrated Containment Leakage Rate Tests, or ILRTs] shall be preformed, at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period. The third test of each set shall be conducted when the plant is shutdown for the 10-year plant inservice inspection." By letter dated November 8, 1994, the licensee requested an exemption from this requirement of the Commission's regulations.

The NRC may grant exemptions from the requirements of the regulations, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12, that (1) are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security; and (2) present special circumstances. Section 50.12(a)(2) of 10 CFR part 50 describes special circumstances as including cases that would not serve the underlying purpose of the rule or are not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

In its November 8, 1994, letter, the licensee also applied for an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-51 to change related provisions of the ANO-1 Technical Specifications (TSs). The TS amendment request will be addressed as a separate action.

III

The Type A test is defined in 10 CFR part 50, appendix J, section II.F, as a "test intended to measure the primary

reactor containment overall integrated leakage rate (1) after the containment has been completed and is ready for operation, and (2) at periodic intervals thereafter." A total of six Type A tests (ILRT) has been performed on the ANO-1 containment including the preoperational ILRT that was performed in 1973. Except for leakage detected by Type B and C tests, containment leakage rates have always been below the ANO-1 acceptance criteria. The requested exemption does not affect the performance of Type B and C leakage tests which are expected to detect the most probable sources of containment leakage.

In order to schedule the next ILRT (the third ILRT of this service period) such that it coincides with the 10-year inservice inspections, the licensee has requested a one-time exemption from the appendix J requirements. The exemption would permit the licensee to perform the ILRT together with the 10-year inservice inspections that are schedule during the thirteenth refueling outage. If performed during the thirteenth refueling outage, the third ILRT will not be completed until after the end of the current 10-year service period. To comply with regulations as written, an ILRT would be required during the twelfth refueling outage to satisfy the requirement for three ILRTs during the 10-year service period and another ILRT would be required during the thirteenth refueling outage to satisfy the requirement for the third ILRT to be performed when the plant is shutdown for the 10-year inservice inspections.

The thirteenth refueling outage is currently scheduled for the summer of 1996 and an ILRT performed during this refueling outage would result in a test interval between the second and third ILRTs of approximately 53 months. If the ILRT were performed during the twelfth refueling outage, currently scheduled for early 1995, the interval between the second and third ILRTs would be approximately 34 months. In the absence of the exemption and related technical specification changes, the licensee would be required to perform ILRTs during both the twelfth and thirteenth refueling outages. A requirement to perform ILRTs during two consecutive refueling is clearly beyond the intent of the regulations and given the satisfactory results of previous tests at ANO-1, there is little, if anything, to gain from two closely spaced tests.

For the reasons set forth above, the NRC staff concludes that this one-time relief from the requirement to perform the third ILRT within a 10-year service period is not significant in terms of

complying with the intent of appendix J, section III.D.1(a). Accordingly, the staff finds that the performance of ILRTs during both the twelfth and thirteenth refueling outages would not result in a commensurate increase in the confidence of containment integrity. Therefore, the subject exemption request meets the special circumstances of 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), in that in these particular circumstances, the fourth test is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

On this basis, the NRC staff finds that the licensee has demonstrated that special circumstances are present as required by 10 CFR 50.12. Further the staff also finds that extending the schedule for the third ILRT to beyond the 10-year service period will not present a undue risk to the public health and safety.

IV

Accordingly, the Commission has determined pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), that this exemption is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property or the common defense and security and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants Entergy Operations, Inc. an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, appendix J, section III.D.1(a).

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will have no significant impact of the quality of the human environment (60 FR 6568).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 3rd day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Elinor G. Adensam,

*Deputy Director, Division of Reactor Projects
 III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*
 [FR Doc. 95-3522 Filed 2-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

**PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY
 CORPORATION**

**Request for Review Under the
 Paperwork Reduction Act; Collection
 of Information Under 29 CFR Part 2645,
 Extension of Special Withdrawal
 Liability Rules**

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Notice of request for OMB review.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation has requested review by the Office of Management and Budget for a collection of information (1212-0023)