

amended by the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Pub. L. 100-418), the Department of Labor herein presents the results of an investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance.

In order to make an affirmative determination and issue a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act must be met. It is determined in this case that all of the requirements have been met.

The investigation was initiated in response to a petition received on February 14, 1995 and filed on behalf of workers at Wirekraft Industries, Incorporated, Marion, Ohio. The workers produced wire harnesses.

The investigation revealed that a major customer of the subject firm increased their imports of electrical wire harnesses during the relevant period under investigation and is transferring production formerly supplied by the subject firm to foreign sources.

Conclusion

After careful review of the facts obtained in the investigation, I conclude that increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with wire harnesses produced at Wirekraft Industries, Incorporated, Marion, Ohio contributed importantly to the decline in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers of that firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Wirekraft Industries, Incorporated, Marion, Ohio engaged in employment related to the production of wire harnesses who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after February 9, 1994 through two years from the date of certification are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, D.C. this 17th day of February, 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-8333 Filed 4-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-219]

GPU Nuclear Corporation; Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-16, issued to GPU Nuclear Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station (OCNGS), located in Ocean County, New Jersey.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise the Technical Specification (TS) to allow 2645 fuel assemblies to be stored in the fuel pool. This is an increase of 45 fuel assemblies from the current limit of 2600 contained in TS 5.3.1.E. The 45 additional storage locations exist in racks in the fuel pool.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated November 25, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated February 15, 1995.

Background

During the spent fuel pool expansion project in 1983, the licensee designed and installed 10 free standing high density spent fuel racks in the spent fuel pool to increase the spent fuel storage capacity from 1800 to 2645 spent fuel assemblies. However, the licensee elected to impose a TS limit of 2600 spent fuel assemblies (approved by the staff in License Amendment No. 76, dated September 17, 1984) to be stored in the spent fuel pool at the time. The increased capacity from 1800 to 2600 spent fuel assemblies would meet anticipated spent fuel storage requirements through 1992. An Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact supporting this action was issued on September 13, 1984. The additional 45 fuel assembly storage locations were not licensed with License Amendment No. 76 because it was believed that they would not be needed for spent fuel storage. (It was anticipated that an off-site spent fuel storage facility would be available after 1992.) These additional storage locations were, therefore, used for the storage of miscellaneous equipment such as fuel channels.

As the result of the recent refueling (Cycle 15R) which took place in

December 1994 and the present unavailability of an off-site spent fuel storage facility, OCNGS has lost the capability to completely offload the reactor core. The licensee is in the process of installing a dry storage facility on-site which is scheduled to be operational in 1996. This provision of a dry storage facility on-site will allow full core offload beyond the current operating cycle (Cycle 15) until such time as an off-site spent fuel storage facility is available. The OCNGS on-site spent fuel storage facility is presently under construction. Consequently, the licensee proposed to use the additional 45 fuel assembly storage locations for spent fuel storage.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required should a full core offload be necessary during Cycle 15 with the proposed dry spent fuel storage facility not yet in service. Without the ability to fully offload the core, any inspection or repair activity will most likely result in higher personnel exposure and schedular delays. Full core offload capability, in particular, would facilitate any in-vessel repair which requires draining of the vessel.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that based on its review, the licensee's proposal to increase the spent fuel pool capacity to 2645 fuel assemblies is acceptable. In addition, the staff has determined that the conclusions reached in the staff's SE dated September 17, 1984, supporting Amendment No. 76, and the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact—Spent Fuel Pool Expansion dated September 13, 1994 remains applicable.

Radiological Environmental Impacts

In the staff's Environmental Assessment dated September 13, 1984, regarding increasing the spent fuel pool capacity from 1800 to 2600 spent fuel assemblies, the staff concluded that the potential radiological environmental impacts associated with the expansion of the spent fuel storage capacity were evaluated and determined to be environmentally insignificant. The basis for the staff's conclusions were determined by the staff's evaluation of (1) radioactive materials released to the atmosphere, (2) solid radioactive wastes, (3) liquid radioactive waste, and (4) the staff's radiological assessment.

Considering the small incremental addition to the licensed storage

capacity, the environmental radiological conclusions stated in the staff's Environmental Assessment dated September 13, 1984, are not altered by the storage of 45 additional spent fuel assemblies.

Nonradiological Assessment

In the staff's Environmental Assessment dated September 13, 1984, the staff also concluded that the nonradiological impacts of the OCNCS as designed, were considered in the Final Environmental Statement (FES) issued in December 1974 and that the OCNCS spent fuel pool expansion will not result in nonradiological environmental effects significantly greater or different from those already reviewed and analyzed in the FES.

Considering the smaller incremental addition to the licensed storage capacity, the environmental nonradiological conclusions stated in the staff's Environmental Assessment dated September 13, 1984, are not altered by the storage of 45 additional spent fuel assemblies.

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 likely result in higher personnel exposure and scheduler delays. As discussed previously the licensee is constructing an on-site spent fuel storage facility.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the New Jersey State official 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 November 25, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated February 15, 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 Ocean County Library, Toms River, NJ 08753.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of March 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Phillip F. McKee,

Director, Project Directorate I-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-8311 Filed 4-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-410]

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation; Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station—Unit 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of exemptions from Facility Operating License No. NPF-69, issued to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (NMP-2) located in Oswego County, New York.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of March 9, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from: (1) The requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to permit a one-time interval extension between the first and second Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) for approximately 24 months from the 1995 refueling outage to the 1997 refueling outage.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to defer the Type A test from the 1995 refueling outage to the 1997 refueling outage, thereby deferring the cost of performing the tests and eliminating the time required to perform the test from the critical path schedule during the upcoming spring 1995 refueling outage.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the one-time interval

extension between the first and second Type A tests would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed exemptions would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the results of previous Type A tests performed at NMP-2 to show good containment performance and will continue to be required to conduct the Type B and C local leak rate tests which historically have been shown to be the principal means of detecting containment leakage paths with the Type A tests confirming the Type B and C test results. It is also noted that the licensee, as a condition of the proposed exemption, will perform the visual containment inspection although it is only required by Appendix J to be conducted in conjunction with Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary. 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 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 involve features located entirely 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 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 NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2.