

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed one-time exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the results of previous Type A tests performed at the D.C. Cook Nuclear Plant to show adequate 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 would 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 or amounts 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 involves 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. 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 D.C. Cook, Units 1 and 2, dated August 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 31, 1995, the NRC staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Dennis Hahn, of the Michigan Department of Public Health, Nuclear Facilities and Environmental Monitoring, 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 March 17, 1995, 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 Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
John B. Hickman,

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

[FR Doc. 95-15142 Filed 6-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 40-9022]**SCA Services Inc., Finding of No Significant Impact, and Opportunity for a Hearing****Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) related to the issuance of Source Material License No. SUC-1565. On the basis of the EA, the NRC has concluded that this licensing action would not significantly affect the environment and does not warrant the preparation of an

environmental impact statement. Accordingly, it has been determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

The above document related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at the NRC's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555.

Opportunity for a Hearing

Any person whose interest may be affected by the issuance of this license may file a request for a hearing. Any request for hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, within 30 days of the publication of this **Federal Register** notice; be served on the NRC staff (Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852) and on the applicant (SCA Services, Inc., 17250 Newburgh Rd., Livonia, MI 48152) and must comply with the requirements for requesting a hearing set forth in the Commission's regulations, 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L, "Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials Licensing Proceedings."

These requirements, which the requestor must address in detail, are:

1. The interest of the requester in the proceeding;
2. How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing;
3. The requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and
4. The circumstances establishing that the request for hearing is timely, that is, filed within 30 days of the date of this notice.

In addressing how the requestor's interest may be affected by the proceeding, the request should describe the nature of the requestor's right under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to be made a party to the proceeding; the nature and extent of the requestor's property, financial, or other (i.e., health, safety, environmental) interest in the proceeding; and the possible effect of any order that may be entered in the proceeding upon the requestor's interest.

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

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