

and will conservatively lower the amount of effluents that can be released. Therefore, it will not cause an increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures. The new settling pond limit is based on that quantity which would not exceed the effluent concentrations of 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B, Table 2, Column 2, at the nearest potable water supply if an uncontrolled release of settling pond inventory should occur. The effluent concentration limits in 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B, Table 2, are more conservative than the current limits in the licensee's TS. Thus the change proposed by the licensee results in a net decrease in the maximum quantity of radioactive material permitted in the settling ponds.

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 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 Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 26, 1995 the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Mr. Virgil Autry of the Bureau of Solid

and Hazardous Waste Management, Department of Health and Environmental 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 letter dated February 21, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated August 31, 1995, and December 4, 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 Fairfield County Library, 300 Washington Street, Winnsboro, SC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of December 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Frederick J. Hebdon,
Director, Project Directorate II-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-31253 Filed 12-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-245]

Northeast Utilities, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, has taken action with regard to a Petition dated January 8, 1995, by Mr. Anthony J. Ross. The Petition pertains to Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1.

In the Petition, the Petitioner raised concerns regarding the Millstone station site paging and site siren evacuation alarm system at Millstone Unit 1. The Petitioner requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) institute at least three sanctions against his department manager and institute sanctions against the Petitioner's coworker and maintenance first-line supervisor for engaging in deliberate misconduct in violation of 10 CFR 50.5. As grounds for this request, the Petitioner alleged that on numerous occasions since January 1994, his department manager had instructed the

Petitioner's coworkers to shut off or turn down the volume on the site paging and site siren evacuation alarm system in the Unit 1 maintenance shop, and the Petitioner's first-line supervisor and coworker had complied with this request, in violation of Technical Specification 6.8.1 and NUREG-0654.

The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has determined to deny the Petition. The reasons for this denial are explained in the "Director's Decision Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206" (DD-95-23), the complete text of which follows this notice and 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 Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360.

A copy of the Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c) of the Commission's regulations. As provided by this regulation, the Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after the date of issuance unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Decision in that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of December 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-31255 Filed 12-22-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Rel. No. IC-21605; File No. 812-9334]

New England Variable Life Insurance Company, et al.

December 18, 1995.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC" or the "Commission").

ACTION: Notice of application for an order of approval under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "1940 Act").

APPLICANTS: New England Variable Life Insurance Company ("NEVLICO"), New England Variable Annuity Separate Account ("NEVLICO Account"), New England Mutual Life Insurance Company ("New England"), The New