

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-302]

Florida Power Company, Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3; 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-72 issued to Florida Power Company (the licensee) for operation of Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3, located in Citrus County, Florida.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed amendment would include provisions in Technical Specifications (TS) Section 3.7 which allow for the storage of fuel with an enrichment not to exceed 5.0 w/o U-235 in the new and spent fuel storage racks. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated January 26, 1995, as supplemented March 9, 1995, and May 24, 1995.

The Need for Proposed Action

The proposed changes are needed so that the licensee can use higher fuel enrichment to provide the flexibility of extending the fuel irradiation and to permit operation for longer fuel cycles.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revisions to the TS. The proposed revisions would permit use of fuel enriched to a nominal 5.0 weight percent Uranium 235. The safety considerations associated with reactor operation with higher enrichment and extended irradiation have been evaluated by the NRC staff. The staff has concluded that such changes would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed changes have no adverse effect on the probability of any accident. The higher enrichment, with fuel burnup to 60,000 megawatt days per metric ton uranium, may slightly change the mix of fission products that might be released in the event of a serious accident, but such small changes would not significantly affect the consequences of serious accidents. No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts of reactor operation with higher enrichment and extended irradiation, the proposed changes to the TS involve systems located within the restricted area, as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. They do not affect nonradiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment fuel and extended irradiation were published and discussed in the staff assessment entitled, "NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation," dated July 7, 1988, and published in the Federal Register (53 FR 30355) on August 11, 1988. As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of the proposed increase in the fuel enrichment and irradiation limits are either unchanged or may, in fact, be reduced from those summarized in Table S-4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c). Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any other alternative would have equal or greater environmental impacts and need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested amendments. This would not reduce the environmental impact of plant operations and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement related to operation of the Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 16, 1995, the NRC staff consulted with the Florida State official, Dr. Lyle Jerrett of the State Office of Radiation Control, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed license amendments.

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, we conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated January 26, 1995, and supplements to the application dated March 9, 1995, and May 24, 1995. These documents 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 for the Crystal River Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 3, located at the Coastal Region Library, 8619 W. Crystal Street, Crystal River, Florida 32629.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of December 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
David B. Matthews,
Director, Project Directorate II-1, Division of
Reactor Projects I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation.
[FR Doc. 95-30457 Filed 12-13-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316]

Indiana Michigan Power Company Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; 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 10 CFR 73.55 for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74, issued to Indiana Michigan Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the D.C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Berrien County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt the licensee from certain requirements

of 10 CFR 73.55, "Requirements for physical protection of licensed activities in nuclear power reactors against radiological sabotage." The proposed action would allow implementation of a hand geometry biometric system of site access control such that photograph identification badges can be taken off site.

This environmental assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of August 17, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Pursuant to 10 CFR 73.55, paragraph (a), the licensee shall establish and maintain an onsite physical protection system and security organization.

Paragraph (1) of 10 CFR 73.55(d), "Access Requirements," specifies that "licensee shall control all points of personnel and vehicle access into a protected area." It is specified in 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) that "A numbered picture badge identification system shall be used of all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escort." It also states that an individual not employed by the licensee (i.e., contractors) may be authorized access to protected areas without escort provided the individual "receives a picture badge upon entrance into the protected area which must be returned upon exit from the protected area."
* * *

Currently, unescorted access into the protected areas of the Cook Nuclear Plant is controlled through the use of a photograph on a combination badge and keycard. (Hereafter, these are referred to as badges). The security officers at the entrance station use the photograph on the badge to visually identify the individual requesting access. The badges for both licensee employees and contractor personnel who have been granted unescorted access are issued upon entrance at the entrance/exit location and are returned upon exit. The badges are stored and retrievable at the entrance/exit location. In accordance with 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5), contractor individuals are not allowed to take badges off site. In accordance with the plant's physical security plans, neither licensee employees nor contractors are allowed to take badges off site.

The licensee proposes to implement an alternative unescorted access control system which would eliminate the need to issue and retrieve badges at the entrance/exit location and would allow all individuals with unescorted access to keep their badges with them when departing the site.

An exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) is required to permit contractors to take their badges off site instead of returning them when exiting the site.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. Under the proposed system, each individual who is authorized for unescorted entry into protected areas would have the physical characteristics of their hand (hand geometry) registered with their badge number in the access control system. When an individual enters the badge into the card reader and places the hand on the measuring surface, the system would record the individual's hand image. The unique characteristics of the extracted hand image would be compared with the previously stored template to verify authorization for entry. Individuals, including licensee employees and contractors, would be allowed to keep their badges with them when they depart the site.

Based on a Sandia report entitled "A Performance Evaluation of Biometric Identification Devices" (SAND91-0276, UC-906 Unlimited Release, printed June 1991), and on its experience with the current photo-identification system, the licensee stated that the false acceptance rate of the proposed hand geometry system is comparable to that of the current system. The licensee stated that the use of the badges with the hand geometry system would increase the overall level of access control. Since both the badge and hand geometry would be necessary for access into the protected area, the proposed system would provide for a positive verification process. Potential loss of a badge by an individual, as a result of taking the badge off site, would not enable an unauthorized entry into protected areas. The licensee will implement a process for testing the proposed system to ensure continued overall level of performance equivalent to that specified in the regulation. The Physical Security Plan for D.C. Cook will be revised to include implementation and testing of the hand geometry access control system and to allow licensee employees and contractors to take their badges off site.

All other access processes, including search function capability and access revocation, will remain the same. A

security officer responsible for access control will continue to be positioned within a bullet-resistant structure. A numbered picture badge identification system will continue to be used for all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escorts. Badges will continue to be displayed by all individuals while inside the protected area. The proposed system is only for individuals with authorized unescorted access and will not be used for individuals requiring escorts.

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 off site, 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 November 20, 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 August 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 1st day of December 1995.

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. 95-30456 Filed 12-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application To Withdraw From Listing and Registration; (American Eco Corporation, Common Stock, No Par Value) File No. 1-10621

December 8, 1995.

American Eco Corporation ("Company") has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act") and Rule 12d2-2(d) promulgated thereunder, to withdraw the above specified security ("Security") from listing and registration on the American Stock Exchange, Inc. ("Amex").

The reasons alleged in the application for withdrawing the Security from listing and registration include the following:

According to the Company, its Board of Directors approved resolutions on September 14, 1995 to withdraw the Security from listing on the Amex and instead, to list the Security on the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations National Market System ("Nasdaq/NMS"). The NASD approved the Company's

application for initial inclusion on the Nasdaq/NMS on November 3, 1995.

The decision of the Board followed a thorough study of the matter and was based upon the belief that listing the Security on the Nasdaq/NMS will be more beneficial to the Company's shareholders than the present listing on the Amex for the following reasons:

(a) The Company believes that the Nasdaq/NMS system of competing market makers will result in increased visibility and sponsorship for the Security than is presently available on the Amex;

(b) The Company believes that the Nasdaq/NMS system will offer the Company's shareholders more liquidity than is presently available on the Amex and less volatility in quoted prices for share when trading volume is slight;

(c) The Company believes that the Nasdaq/NMS system will offer an opportunity for the Company to secure its own group of market makers and to expand the capital base available for trading in the Security; and

(d) The Company believes that the firms making a market in the Security on the Nasdaq/NMS system will also be inclined to issue research reports concerning the Company, thereby increasing the number of firms providing institutional research and advisory reports.

Any interested person may, on or before January 2, 1996 submit by letter to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the exchanges and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-30421 Filed 12-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

[Rel. No. IC-21587; No. 812-9156]

Safeco Life Insurance Company, et al.

December 7, 1995.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission").

ACTION: Notice of Application for an Order under the Investment Company Act of 1940 ("1940 Act").

APPLICANTS: Safeco Life Insurance Company ("SAFECO") and Separate Account SL ("Separate Account").

RELEVANT 1940 ACT SECTION: Order requested under Section 26(b) of the 1940 Act.¹

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants seek an order authorizing the substitution of shares of certain portfolios of the Variable Insurance Products Fund and the Variable Insurance Products Fund II ("VIP Trusts") for shares of certain portfolios of The Hudson River Trust ("Hudson Trust") currently held by the Separate Account.

FILING DATE: The application was filed on August 10, 1994, and amended on September 6, 1995.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the Application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Secretary of the Commission and serving Applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on December 27, 1995, and should be accompanied by proof of affidavit on Applicants in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the requester's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the Secretary of the Commission.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 5th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549. Applicants, c/o Leslie Harrison, Counsel, SAFECO Life Insurance Company, P.O. Box 34690, Seattle, Washington 98124-1690.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yvonne M. Hunold, Assistant Special Counsel, or Brenda Sneed, Assistant Director, Division of Investment Management (Office of Insurance Products), at (202) 942-0670.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application; the complete application is available for a fee from the Public Reference Branch of the Commission.

Applicants' Representations

1. SAFECO is a stock life insurance company licensed to sell insurance and

¹ Applicants represent that they will amend the application during the notice period to make this representation.