

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. 97-18362 Filed 7-11-97; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-263, 50-282, and 50-306]

Northern States Power Company; Withdrawal of Application for Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has permitted Northern States Power Company (NSP, the licensee) to withdraw its December 6, 1995, application for amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-22, DPR-42, and DPR-60 for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant and the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, respectively. The Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant is located in Wright County, Minnesota; the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant is located in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

The proposed amendments would have modified the operating licenses to reflect a transfer of control of the licenses resulting from the proposed merger of NSP with Wisconsin Energy Corporation. By letter dated June 10, 1997, NSP informed the Commission that on May 16, 1997, NSP and Wisconsin Energy Corporation announced an agreement to terminate plans to merge the two companies and that it was withdrawing the application for amendments.

The Commission had previously issued an Order Approving Transfer of Control of Licenses and Notice of Consideration of Proposed Issuance of Associated Amendments published in the **Federal Register** on April 11, 1997 (62 FR 17882). The order becomes null and void on September 30, 1997, by its own terms.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated December 6, 1995, the application for transfer of control of licenses dated October 20, 1995, and the licensee's letter dated June 10, 1997. 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 Minneapolis Public Library, Technology

and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Beth A. Wetzel,
*Project Manager, Project Directorate III-1,
 Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of
 Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*
 [FR Doc. 97-18364 Filed 7-11-97; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-155]

Consumers Power Company; Big Rock Point Plants 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, (CPCo, the licensee), for operation of the Big Rock Point Plant (BRP), located in Charlevoix County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise the Facility Operating License No. DPR-6 and the Technical Specifications (TS) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-6 for the Big Rock Point Plant. Specifically, the proposed action would amend the license to reflect the change in the licensee's name from Consumers Power Company to Consumers Energy Company.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated April 30, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to revise the company name in the license to reflect the corporate name change that occurred on March 11, 1997.

Environment Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed changes to the license and TS. According to the licensee, the name change will not impact the existing ownership of the Big Rock Point Plant or the existing entitlement to power and will not alter the existing antitrust license conditions applicable to CPCo or CPCo's ability to comply with these conditions or with any of its other obligations or responsibilities. As stated by the

licensee, "The corporate structure remains the same, and all legal characteristics remain the same. Thus, there is neither a change in the ownership, state of incorporation, registered agent, registered office, directors, officers, rights or liabilities of the Company, nor the function of the Company or the way in which it does business. The Company's financial responsibility for the Big Rock Point Plant and its sources of funds to support the facility remain the same. Further, this name change does not impact the Company's ability to comply with any of its obligations or responsibilities under the license." Therefore, 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 will be 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 is administrative in nature and does not involve any physical features of the plant. Thus, 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 June 13, 1997, the staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Dennis Hahn, of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Drinking Water and Radiological Protection Division, regarding the environmental impact of