

assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action would 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, the request for exemption dated January 4, 1995, and other documents are available for public inspection and for copying (for a fee) at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555, and at the Local Public Document Room located in the Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of March, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Donald A. Cool,

Director, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 95-6062 Filed 3-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket 70-364]

Babcock and Wilcox Co., Receipt of Petition for Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by Petition dated January 5, 1994, Citizens' Action for a Safe Environment (CASE) and the Kiski Valley Coalition to Save Our Children (The Coalition) (together referred to as Intervenors) filed a joint request for an informal hearing pursuant to 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart L, with regard to Babcock & Wilcox Company's (Licensee) application for renewal of Special Nuclear Materials License SNM-414 issued to the Licensee by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) for the Pennsylvania Nuclear Service Operation facility located in Parks Township, Armstrong County, Pennsylvania (Parks Township facility). In its Initial Decision, dated January 3, 1995, authorizing the renewal of the materials license, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, consistent with 10 C.F.R. 2.1205(k)(2), referred to the Commission's Executive Director for Operations for consideration as requests for action under 10 CFR 2.206, twelve areas of concern (see Sections B, H, I, M, P, Q, S, T, U, W, X, and Y, Initial Decision at pages 63 to 70) raised in that proceeding by the Intervenors. These concerns were referred to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. Each of these concerns has been reviewed with respect to the requirements of 10 CFR 2.206. Sections B, H, I, M, P, S, T, U, W and Y have

failed to satisfy the requirement of Section 2.206 that a request pursuant to section 2.206 must "specify the action requested and set forth the facts that constitute the basis for the request." However, Section B, H, M, P, S, T, U, W, and Y were addressed by the Commission staff in Michael A. Lamastra's affidavit dated September 22, 1994, and Section I was addressed by the Commission staff in Heather M. Astwood's affidavit dated September 22, 1994, filed in the Parks Township proceeding.

Section Q has been interpreted as a request for the Commission to test for radioactive contamination in the general vicinity of Kepple Hill and Riverview in Parks Township. The apparent concern is that this area is downwind of the Apollo facility which the Intervenors assert had been releasing radioactivity at a rate above regulatory limits. The Intervenors rely on letters dated April 20, 1966, and May 26, 1969, concerning the need for experimental data for an air surveillance program at the Apollo plant and authorization by the Commission's predecessor, the Atomic Energy Commission, for the discharge of radioactive materials in concentrations exceeding 10 CFR Part 20 limits.

Section X has been interpreted as a request for the Commission to investigate radiological contamination on the Farmers Delight Dairy Farm (apparently located in Parks Township). The apparent concern is that past operations of the Parks Townships facility caused radioactive contamination of the farm. As basis for this request, Intervenors assert that there is information in a 1966 U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) study that indicates that the cattle on the farm were having thyroid problems and that radionuclides were show-up in the cow's milk.

As provided by Section 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on these two requests within a reasonable period of time.

A copy of the Petition and Initial Decision is available for inspection in the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert M. Bernero,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 95-6065 Filed 3-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-498]

Houston Lighting and Power Co., City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Co., City of Austin, TX; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-6, issued to Houston Lighting & Power Company, et al., (the licensee) for operation of the South Texas Project (STP), Unit 1, located in Matagorda County, Texas.

The proposed amendment would modify the steam generator tube plugging criteria in Technical Specification 3/4.4.5, Steam Generators, and the allowable leakage for Unit 1 in Technical Specification 3/4.4.6.2, Operational Leakage, and the associated Bases.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Structural Considerations

Industry testing of model boiler and operating plant tube specimens for free span tubing at room temperature conditions shows typical burst pressures in excess of 5000 psi for indications of outer diameter stress corrosion cracking with voltage measurements at or below the structural limit of 4.0 volts. One model boiler specimen with a voltage amplitude of 19 volts also exhibited a burst pressure greater than 5000 psi. Burst testing performed on one intersection pulled