

public radiation exposure, and would not result in significant additional fuel cycle environmental impacts. Accordingly the Commission concludes

that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. The following table summarizes the radiological

environmental impacts of the EPU at CPS.

TABLE 5.—SUMMARY OF RADIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE EPU AT CPS

Impact	Staff conclusion regarding impact
Radiological Waste Stream Impacts .....	The increases projected in solid, liquid, or gaseous radioactive wastes are either recycled (liquid), fully contained on site (solid), or are released (gaseous) at levels that comply with Federal guidelines and that are well within the FES evaluation.
Dose Impacts .....	Both on-site occupational doses and off-site doses will remain well within regulatory guidance and will continue to be bounded by evaluations performed in the FES.
Accident Analysis Impacts .....	No significant increase in probability or consequences of accidents is expected.
Fuel Cycle and Transportation Impacts .....	No significant increase is expected. Impacts remain within the guidelines of Table S-3 and Table S-4 of 10 CFR part 51.

*Alternatives*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., “the no-action” alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts; however, in the CPS vicinity other generating facilities using nuclear or other alternative energy sources, such as coal or gas, would be built in order to supply generating capacity and power needs. Construction and operation of a coal plant would create impacts to air quality, land use and waste management. Construction and operation of a gas plant would also impact air quality and land use. Implementation of the EPU would have less of an impact on the environment than the construction and operation of a new generating facility and does not involve new environmental impacts that are significantly different from those presented in the FES. Therefore, the staff concludes that increasing CPS capacity is an acceptable option for increasing power supply. Furthermore, unlike fossil fuel plants, CPS does not routinely emit sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, carbon dioxide, or other atmospheric pollutants that may contribute to greenhouse gases or acid rain.

*Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of any resources different than those previously considered in the CPS FES, dated May 1982.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on January 28, 2002, prior to issuance of this environmental assessment, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Frank Nizidlek, of the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

**Finding of No Significant Impact**

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated June 18, 2001, as supplemented by letters dated September 7 and 28, October 17, 23, 26, and 31, November 8 (2 letters), 20, 21, 29, and 30, and December 5, 6, 7, 13 (2 letters), 20, 21, and 26, 2001, and January 8, 15, 16, and 24, 2002, which are available for public inspection at the Commission’s Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC Public Document Room Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737 or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of February 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Jon B. Hopkins,**

*Senior Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 02-3505 Filed 2-12-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-339]

**Virginia Electric and Power Company; North Anna Power Station, Unit 2, Environmental Assessment and Findings of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License (FOL) No. NPF-7, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the North Anna Power Station, Unit 2, located in Louisa County, Virginia. As required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

**Environmental Assessment**

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would revise the FOL to remove expired license conditions, make editorial changes, relocate license conditions, and remove license conditions associated with completed modifications.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee’s application dated January 9, 2001.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed because some requirements in the North Anna, Unit 2, FOL have become obsolete. In addition, the need for editorial changes has been identified.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed license amendment is administrative in nature and has no effect on plant equipment or plant operation.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or

consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the "no action" alternative). 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*

The action does not involve the use of any different resource than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the North Anna Power Station, Unit 2, dated April 1973.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

On January 15, 2002, the staff consulted with the Virginia State official, Mr. Les Foldesi of the Virginia Department of Health, Bureau of Radiological Health, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC 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 January 9, 2001. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor),

Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Public Electronic Reading Room). Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail at [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of February 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Stephen R. Monarque,**  
*Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing  
Project Management, Office of Nuclear  
Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 02-3504 Filed 2-12-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-U**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

### **Correction to Biweekly Notice Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations**

On January 22, 2002 (67 FR 2917), the **Federal Register** published the Biweekly Notice of Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations. On page 2923, top of column 3, the notice entitled "Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-333, James A. FitzPatrick (JAF) Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York," the Date of amendment request should be January 9, 2002, instead of November 2, 2001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of February 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**John A. Zwolinski,**  
*Director, Division of Licensing Project  
Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor  
Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 02-3506 Filed 2-12-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **POSTAL SERVICE**

### **Plan for Secure Postage Meter Technology**

**AGENCY:** Postal Service.

**ACTION:** Clarification of final plan.

**SUMMARY:** The Postal Service published the final plan for phases III and IV of the Postal Service's Plan for Secure Postage Meter Technology in the **Federal Register** on November 15, 2001 (Vol. 66, No. 221, pages 57492-57494). This

notice clarifies the definition of phase III and IV meters in the previous notice and details the requirements for each meter manufacturer to notify all customers of the retirement plan for any affected meters.

**DATES:** This clarification pertains to the final plan that was effective November 15, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Wayne Wilkerson by fax at (703) 292-4073.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In 1995, the Postal Service, in cooperation with all authorized postage meter manufacturers, began a phaseout of all mechanical postage meters because of identified cases of indiscernible tampering and misuse. Postal Service revenues were proven to be at serious risk. The completion of this effort, which resulted in the withdrawal of 776,000 mechanical meters from service, completed phase I of the Plan for Secure Postage Meter Technology. Phase II of the plan, the retirement of electronic meters that are manually set by Postal Service employees, is now being implemented. The plan for phases III and IV, describing the retirement of meters with nondigitally printed indicia, was published for comment in the **Federal Register**, August 21, 2000 (Vol. 65, No. 163, pages 50723-50724). Comments on the proposed plan were due by October 5, 2000. Responses to the comments and the final plan were published in the **Federal Register** on November 15, 2001. This notice clarifies the definition of the meters affected and the requirements for each manufacturer to notify customers of the plan.

### **Clarification of the Final Postal Service Plan for the Retirement of Letterpress Postage Meters**

(Changes are shown in italicized text.)

Phases III and IV of the Postal Service proposed Plan for Secure Postage Meter Technology affect *non-digitally printing* meters that are remotely reset under the Computerized Meter Resetting System (CMRS). *The affected meters are those meters that print indicia using older letterpress technology rather than digital printing, even if they have a digital display.* If such a meter has an *additional* feature that automatically disables the meter if it is not reset within a specified time period or when certain preprogrammed criteria are met, it is called an enhanced meter. Phase III of the proposed plan *required* that the users of nonenhanced CMRS letterpress meters *be* notified of the schedule for the retirement of their meters by December 31, 2001. The placement of nonenhanced CMRS letterpress meters