

Gaseous radioactive effluents are produced during both normal operation and abnormal operation occurrences. These effluents are collected, controlled, processed, stored, and disposed of by the gaseous radioactive waste management systems which include the various building ventilation systems, the off gas system, and the SGTS. The concentration of radioactive gaseous effluents released through the building ventilation systems during normal operation is not expected to increase significantly due to the proposed power uprate since the amount of fission products released into the reactor coolant (and subsequently into the building atmosphere) depends on the number and nature of fuel rod defects and is not dependent on reactor power level. The concentration of activation products contained in the reactor coolant is expected to remain unchanged, since the linear increase in the production of these activation products will be offset by the linear increase in steaming rate. Therefore, based on its review of the various building ventilation systems, GPC has concluded that there will not be a significant adverse effect on airborne radioactive effluents as a result of the proposed power uprate.

Radiolysis of the reactor coolant causes the formation of hydrogen and oxygen, the quantities of which increase linearly with core power. These additional quantities of hydrogen and oxygen would increase the flow to the recombiners by 5 percent during uprated power conditions. However, the operational increases in hydrogen and oxygen remain within the design capacity of the system.

The SGTS is designed to minimize offsite and control room radiation dose rates during venting and purging of both the primary and secondary containment atmospheres under accident or abnormal conditions. This is accomplished by maintaining the secondary containment at a slightly negative pressure with respect to the outside atmosphere and discharging the secondary containment atmosphere through high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters and charcoal absorbers. The SGTS charcoal absorbers are designed for a charcoal loading capacity of 2.5 mgI/gC for the 30-day loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) scenario. The proposed power uprate will increase the post-LOCA iodine loading by 5 percent; however, the charcoal loading will remain within the 2.5 mgI/gC design limit. Therefore, there will be no significant increase in environmental impact.

Georgia Power Company evaluated the effects of the power uprate on in-plant radiation levels for Plant Hatch during both normal operation and post-accident. GPC's conclusions are that radiation levels during both normal operation and post-accident may increase slightly (approximately proportional to the increase in power level). The slight increases in in-plant radiation levels expected due to the proposed power uprate should not affect radiation zoning or shielding requirements. Individual worker occupational exposures will be maintained within acceptable limits by the existing as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) program which GPC uses to control access to radiation areas. Therefore, the slightly increased in-plant radiation levels will not have a significant environmental impact.

The offsite doses associated with normal operation are not significantly affected by operation at the proposed uprated power level and are expected to remain well within the limits of 10 CFR part 20 and 10 CFR part 50, Appendix I. Existing Technical Specifications limits will not be changed due to uprate. Therefore, offsite doses due to power uprate conditions will not result in a significant environmental impact.

Georgia Power Company performed dose evaluations for design basis accidents at or above 102% of the uprated power level and reported these results in Reference 1. The offsite doses remain below regulatory limits and the increase due to power uprate is 5% or less.

The NRC staff agrees with GPC's assessment of the radiological effects of 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 of plant operation, but would restrict operation of Plant Hatch to the currently licensed power level. 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 Plant Hatch.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 20, 1995, the staff consulted with the Georgia State official, James L. Setser of the Environmental Protection Division, Department of Natural 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 January 13, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated April 5 and June 20, 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 Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

#### **References**

1. Georgia Power Company HL-4724, J. T. Beckham, Jr., to NRC, "Power Uprate Operation," dated January 13, 1995.
2. Georgia Power Company HL-4812, J. T. Beckham, Jr., to NRC, "Response to Request for Additional Information—Power Uprate Submittal," dated April 5, 1995.
3. **Federal Register** Vol. 60, No. 41, "Niagara Mohawk Corporation; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact," dated March 2, 1995.
4. Georgia Power Company "Final Environmental Statement for Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2," October 1972.
5. Georgia Power Company Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant—Unit 2 Environmental Report, Operating License Stage, June 1975.
6. Georgia Power Company "NUREG-0417," Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Unit No. 2, March 1978.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of July 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Herbert N. Berkow,**

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

[FR Doc. 95-18444 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

**Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Consideration; Correction to Biweekly Notice**

On June 21, 1995, the **Federal Register** published the Biweekly Notice of Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Consideration. On page 32374, Column 1, the third paragraph should read as follows:

The second proposed change which is applicable to all MODES of operation, allows 48 hours to restore diesel generator fuel oil inventory to the seven-day level as long as the inventory does not fall below the six-day level. The probability of a LOOP during this period is low. The 6-day fuel oil supply is calculated with adequate margin similar to the calculation of 7-day fuel oil inventory. In spite of the potential that there may be slightly less fuel available in inventory at the time of an event, actions would have been initiated to obtain replenishment within this brief period. Based on this and the low probability of an event during this brief period, it is considered that this change request does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of July 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. 95-18445 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-458]

**Energy Operations, Inc.; Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) has issued Amendment No. 81 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-47 issued to Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee), which revised the Technical Specifications for operation of the River Bend Station, Unit 1, located in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

The amendment modified the technical specifications by replacing the existing technical specifications in their entirety with a new set of technical specifications based on NUREG-1434, "Improving BWR-6 Technical Specifications," dated September 1992. This amendment was based on the licensee's submittal of November 30, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated

January 18, June 6, June 30, and July 14, 1995.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment and Opportunity for Hearing in connection with this action was published in the **Federal Register** on April 21, 1994 (59 FR 19030). No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following this notice.

The Commission has prepared an Environmental Assessment related to the action and has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement. Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission has concluded that the issuance of this amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (60 FR 29867, dated June 6, 1995).

For further details with respect to the action see (1) The application for amendment dated November 30, 1993, and supplemented by letters dated January 18, June 6, June 30, and July 14, 1995, (2) Amendment No. 81 to License No. NPF-47, (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation, and (4) the Commission's Environmental Assessment. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555, and at the local public document room located at the Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of July 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Paul W. O'Connor,**

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

[FR Doc. 95-18443 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**Requests Under Review by Office of Management and Budget**

*Agency Clearance Officer:* Michael E. Bartell, (202) 942-8800.

*Upon Written Request Copies Available From:* Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, D.C. 20549

**Extension**

Rule 15a-4—File No. 270-7

Rule 15b6-1 and Form BDW—File No. 270-17

Rule 15Bc3-1 and Form MSDW—File No. 270-93

Rule 17a-1—File No. 270-244

Rule 17a-2—File No. 270-189

Rule 17a-3—File No. 270-26

Rule 17a-7—File No. 270-147

Rule 17f-1(g)—File No. 270-30

Rule 17Ad-6—File No. 270-151

Rule 17Ad-7—File No. 270-152

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission has submitted for extension of OMB approval the following rules under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934:

Rule 15a-4 permits a natural person member of a securities exchange who terminates its association with a registered broker-dealer to continue to do business on the exchange while the Commission reviews his application for registration as a broker-dealer, if the exchange files a statement indicating that there does not appear to be any ground for disapproving the application. The total annual burden is 400 hours, based on approximately 50 submissions, each requiring 8 hours to complete.

Rule 15b6-1 provides that a notice of withdrawal from registration as a broker-dealer is to be filed on Form BDW. Approximately 850 respondents file 1 response per year, with each response requiring approximately half an hour, resulting in a total average annual burden of 425 hours.

Rule 15Bc3-1 and Form MSDW provide that a notice of withdrawal from registration as a bank municipal securities dealer is to be filed on Form MSDW. Approximately 20 respondents file 1 response each per year, with each response requiring approximately half an hour, resulting in a total average annual burden of 10 hours.

Rule 17a-1 requires that all national securities exchanges, national securities associations, registered clearing agencies, and the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board keep on file for a period of five years, two years in an accessible place, all documents which it makes or receives respecting its self-regulatory activities, and that such documents be made available for examination by the Commission. The average number of hours necessary for compliance with the requirements of