

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael F. Weber,

*Chief, Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning
Projects Branch, Division of Waste
Management, Office of Nuclear Material
Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 95-15140 Filed 6-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-445]

**Texas Utilities Electric Company;
Comanche Peak Steam Electric
Station, Unit 1; Environmental
Assessment and Finding of No
Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations for Facility Operating License No. NPF-87, issued to Texas Utilities Electric Company (TU Electric, the licensee), for the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Unit 1, located in Somervell County, Texas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed exemption would extend the first inservice test (IST) program interval for Unit 1 from 120 months to approximately 156 months.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated March 1, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated August 12, 1994.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to extend the CPSES Unit 1 IST program interval beyond the 120 months specified in 10 CFR 50.55a(f)(4)(ii) which began on the Unit 1 commercial operation date (August 13, 1990) to 120 months from the Unit 2 commercial operation date (August 3, 1993). This extension from 120 months to 156 months for the Unit 1 IST interval is being requested in order to maintain the consistency of the IST program between CPSES Units 1 and 2.

The licensee intends to perform all future IST program updates for both units at 120-month intervals based on the Unit 2 commercial operation date.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it is advantageous for a facility with two similar units to implement an IST program which is consistent between units by testing each unit to the same Code edition and by

scheduling 120-month program updates on each unit to coincide. CPSES Units 1 and 2 are similar units and the licensee has therefore attempted to capture these advantages through the use of one IST program which specifies the same test requirements for both units based on the same ASME Code Edition.

The advantages include a significant reduction in the administrative effort required in preparing periodic program updates, a corresponding reduction in the program review effort by the NRC staff and a reduction in the potential for personnel errors in the performance of testing requirements. Further, a significant unit difference is eliminated by applying the same Code requirements to the testing of both units. In addition, this exemption increases plant safety through simplification and standardization of plant testing procedures, does not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security.

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. According, 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 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 for the CPSES, Units 1 and 2, dated October 1989.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 31, 1995, the staff consulted with the Texas State official, Mr. Arthur Tate of the Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control, 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 exemption request letter dated March 1, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated August 12, 1994, 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 University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, Texas 76019.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Timothy J. Polich, Project Manager,

*Project Directorate IV-1 Division of Reactor
Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-15141 Filed 6-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281]

**Virginia Electric & Power Co.; Surry
Power Station, Units 1 and 2;
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-32 and DPR-37, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Surry County, Virginia.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would increase the rates core power level at each Surry

unit from 2441 Megawatts thermal (MW_t) to 2546 MW_t, which is an increase in the rated core power of approximately 4.3 percent.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated August 30, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated February 6, 1995, February 13, 1995, February 27, 1995, March 23, 1995, March 28, 1995, April 13, 1995, April 20, 1995, April 28, 1995, and May 5, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would increase the electrical output for each unit by 34 Megawatts-electrical (MW_e) and thus provide additional electrical power to the grid which services the commercial and domestic areas in the State of Virginia.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that a slight change in the environmental impact can be expected for the proposed increase in power. The proposed core uprating is projected to increase the rejected heat by 6 percent. However, the Environmental Report and the NRC-approved Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), as amended, have already addressed plant operation up to a stretch core power of 2546 MW_t. Thus, the 6 percent increase in rejected heat has already been evaluated and determined to not significantly impact on the quality of the human environment. Also, the proposed increase in core power involved no significant change in types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite which has not already been evaluated and approved in the FEIS, as amended, for a stretch core power level of 2546 MW_t. Similarly, as enveloped by the FEIS, as amended, there would be no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The waste heat will not exceed the 12.0x10⁹ BTUs per hour permitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

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 involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR part 20. Except for heat load, which is bounded by previous analysis, as described above, the amendment 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 significant 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

The action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 16, 1995, the staff consulted with the Virginia State official, L. Foldesi, of the State Health Department, 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 August 30, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated February 6, 1995, February 13, 1995, February 27, 1995, March 23, 1995, March 28, 1995, April 13, 1995, April 20, 1995, April 28, 1995, and May 5, 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 Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David B. Matthews,

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

[FR Doc. 95-15138 Filed 6-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-1-M

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Meeting Agenda

In accordance with the purposes of Sections 29 and 182b. of the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 2039, 2332b), the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards will hold a meeting on July 13-15, 1995, in Conference Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The date of this meeting was previously published in the **Federal Register** on Wednesday, December 28, 1994 (59 FR 66977).

Thursday, July 13, 1995

8:30 a.m.—8:45 a.m.: Opening Remarks by the ACRS Chairman (Open)—The ACRS Chairman will make opening remarks regarding conduct of the meeting and comment briefly regarding items of current interest. During this session, the Committee will discuss priorities for preparation of ACRS reports.

8:45 a.m.—10:15 a.m.: Revised Health Effects Valuation: Dollars/Person-Rem (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding proposed revisions to NRC health effects valuation.

Representatives of the industry will participate, as appropriate.

10:30 a.m.—12:00 noon: Meeting with the NRC Executive Director for Operations (EDO) and Other Office Directors (Open)—The Committee will meet with the Executive Director for Operations and other NRC program Office Directors to discuss items of mutual interest, including risk/performance-based regulations; PRA policy statement and the use of PRA in the regulatory process; maintaining long-term technical capabilities; and NRC participation in national and international technical exchange meetings.

1:00 p.m.—2:30 p.m.: NRC Technical Training Center (TTC) Curricula (Open)—The Committee will hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff regarding TTC curricula, with emphasis in the areas of PRA and digital instrumentation and control systems.