

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on March 29, 1995 (60 FR 16195). However, by letter dated March 19, 1997, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated January 13, 1995, as supplemented by letter dated June 2, 1995, and the licensee's letter dated March 19, 1997, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents 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 Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Joseph W. Shea,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-12465 Filed 5-12-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-388]

### Pennsylvania Power and Light Company; & Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) has issued Amendment No. 139 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-22 issued to Pennsylvania Power & Light (the licensee), which revised the Technical Specifications for operation of the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2, located in Luzerne County, PA. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

The amendment modified the Technical Specifications to authorize the use of ATRIUM-10 fuel in the reactor for the ninth refueling cycle for this plant.

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 to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing in connection with this action was published in the **Federal Register** on March 18, 1997 (62 FR 12859). 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 the amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (62 FR 24669).

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment dated December 18, 1996 as supplemented on February 26, March 12 and 27, April 3, 9, 16, 18, and 24, 1997, (2) Amendment No. 139 to License No. NPF-22, (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, and at the local public document room located at the Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Chester Poslusny, Sr.,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-12464 Filed 5-12-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-346]

### Toledo Edison Company; Centerior Service Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company; Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of no Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering approval, by issuance of an order under 10 CFR 50.80, of the indirect transfer of Facility Operating

License No. NPF-3, issued to Toledo Edison Company, et al., the licensees, for operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, located in Ottawa County, Ohio.

### Environmental Assessment

#### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would consent to the indirect transfer of the license with respect to a proposed merger between Centerior Energy Corporation (the parent corporation for Toledo Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and Centerior Service Company, the licensees for Davis-Besse) and Ohio Edison Company. The merger would result in the formation of a new single holding company, FirstEnergy Corporation.

The proposed action is in accordance with the Toledo Edison Company and Centerior Service Company request for approval dated December 13, 1996. Supplemental information was submitted by letter dated February 14, 1997.

#### The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is required to obtain the necessary consent to the indirect transfer of the license discussed above. According to the licensees, the underlying transaction is needed to create a stronger, more competitive enterprise that is expected to save over \$1 billion over the first 10 years of FirstEnergy operation.

#### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has reviewed the proposed action and concludes that there will be no changes to the facility or its operation as a result of the proposed action. Accordingly, the NRC staff 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 NRC staff concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

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.