hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1–(800) 248–5100 (in Missouri 1–(800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Frederick J. Hebdon: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to General Council, Tennessee Valley Authority, ET 11H, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1) (i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated July 19, 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 Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1101 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 26th day of July 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

David E. LaBarge, Sr.

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

[FR Doc. 95–18805 Filed 7–31–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–155]

Consumer Power Co.; Big Rock Point Plant; 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–6, issued to Consumers Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the Big Rock Point Plant, located in Charlevoix County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise the TS to conform to the wording of the revised 10 CFR part 20 which was published in the **Federal Register** on May 21, 1991 (56 FR 23391), and implemented at Big Rock Point on January 1, 1993. The proposed action would also change the TS to reflect a separation of chemistry and radiation responsibilities. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated March 4, 1993, as revised April 14, 1993, and as supplemented April 19 and May 31, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed in order to retain operational flexibility consistent with 10 CFR part 50, appendix I, concurrent with the implementation of the revised 10 CFR part 20.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that with respect to the proposed action, in regards to the actual release rates as referenced in TS as a dose rate to the maximally exposed member of the public, there will be no increase in the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes in the types or amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite, and 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 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 Big Rock Point Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 17, 1995, the staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Robert DeHaan (acting for Dennis Hahn) of the Nuclear Facilities and Environmental Monitoring section office of the Department of Public Health, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments. The Commission's staff reviewed the licensee's request and did not consult other agencies or persons.

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 application for amendment dated March 4, 1993, as revised April 14, 1993, as supplemented April 19 and May 31, 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 North Central Michigan College, 1515

Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

Dated at Rockville, Md., this 26th day of July 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

John N. Hannon,

Director, Project Directorate III–1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–18807 Filed 7–31–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Intent To Remove the United Technologies Pratt & Whitney Middletown, Conn. Site from the NRC Site Decommissioning Management Plan

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of intent to remove the United Technologies Pratt & Whitney Middletown, Connecticut site from the NRC Site Decommissioning Management Plan.

SUMMARY: This is a notice to inform the public that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering removing the United Technologies Pratt & Whitney Middletown, Connecticut site from the NRC Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP). The NRC expects to determine that remediation of residual radioactive contamination in a building on the site has successfully been completed and the facility meets the current NRC criteria for release for unrestricted use.

DATES: The NRC hereby provides notice of an opportunity to comment on the proposed NRC action. Comments must be submitted within thirty (30) days of the date of publication of this **Federal Register** notice.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to USNRC, Region I, Attn: Mark Roberts, Senior Health Physicist, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406. Hand deliver comments to 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406 between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Roberts, Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards, USNRC, Region I, 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406, Telephone: (610) 337–5094.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The United Technologies Pratt & Whitney site in Middletown, Connecticut was identified in 1992 by the NRC as a site where residual radioactive contamination might be present above NRC criteria as a result of past operations. Radioactive contamination was identified by Pratt & Whitney in one of the buildings on the site. In order to ensure that remediation of the building was accomplished in a timely manner, the NRC added this site to its SDMP. Pratt & Whitney has remediated residual contamination in the building, performed radiological surveys in that building and other buildings where radioactive materials may have been used, and requested by letter dated April 27, 1995, that the NRC remove the Middletown, Connecticut site from the SDMP. The request before the NRC at this time is to concur with the view of Pratt & Whitney that the site meets the current criteria for release for unrestricted use and thus can be released for unrestricted use and removed from the SDMP.

The staff of the NRC's Region I Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards has reviewed and approved various remediation activities since 1992. The staff has also reviewed various records of past activities at the site and the radiological surveys performed by Pratt & Whitney's contractor and conducted confirmatory radiological measurements at the site. The NRC staff has not yet completed all of these reviews, but, based on information available at this time, expects to determine that the facility meets the requirements for release for unrestricted use and to remove the site from the SDMP in 1995.

For further details with respect to this action, documents are available for inspection at the NRC's Region I offices located at 475 Allendale Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406. Persons desiring to review documents at the Region I Office should call Ms. Cheryl Buracker at (610) 337–5093 several days in advance to assure that the documents will be readily available for review.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 26th day of July, 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. 95–18809 Filed 7–31–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Review of Revised NRC Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) Program

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is reviewing its Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) program that was last revised on May 19, 1993. Public comments are requested on the revised program and its implementation. The NRC is soliciting comments from interested public interest groups, the regulated industry, States, and concerned citizens. Comments received will be used in the NRC's review of the SALP program.

DATES: The comment period expires August 31, 1995. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to: Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publication Services, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: T–6D–59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Hand deliver comments to: 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:45 am and 4:15 pm on Federal workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David L. Gamberoni, Mail Stop: O–12E–4, Inspection Program Branch, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone (301) 415–1144.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR) has begun a review of the implementation of the SALP program. The SALP program was revised on May 19, 1993, to improve the focus on significant performance issues, communication with licensees, and licensees' and the public's understanding of SALP results. Specific program changes included reducing the number of functional areas from seven to four, changing the board membership to Senior Executive Service (SES) members, shortening the SALP report, eliminating the draft initial report, changing the nature of the SALP meeting with the licensee from a presentation to more of a discussion, and focusing on the last six months of performance. Implementation of the revised program began for assessment periods ending after July 19, 1993.

This review will attempt to determine if the revisions to the SALP program have been effective in focusing the SALP reports on significant performance issues and have resulted in