

the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) The application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the Local Public Document Room.

*Date of amendment request:* February 28, 1997.

#### **Brief Description of Amendment**

The amendment proposes to add a definition for completion times and to define the maximum time interval between repetitive action completion times in the Technical Safety Requirements and to make the same changes to the Safety Analysis Report.

#### **Basis for Finding of No Significance**

1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions is an administrative

action. As such, these changes have no impact on plant effluents and will not result in any impact to the environment.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed amendment will not increase radiation exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed amendment will not result in any construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions will provide more formality for the conduct of plant operations. This inclusion will ensure consistent interpretation of the requirements. The proposed changes do not affect the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously evaluated accidents.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions will ensure consistent interpretation of the requirements. The changes will not create new operating conditions or a new plant configuration that could lead to a new or different type of accident.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

A definition for completion time and the definition for a maximum time interval for repetitive actions were not formally defined in the past and were subject to interpretation. The addition of these definitions for completion time and the maximum time interval for repetitive actions provides more formality for the conduct of plant operations. The proposed changes cause no reductions in the margins of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

The proposed amendment to include a definition for completion time and to define the maximum time interval for repetitive actions provides more formality for the conduct of plant operations. The effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** Thirty days after issuance.

#### **Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-2**

Amendment will incorporate a new Technical Safety Requirement, a revised Technical Safety Requirement and Safety Analysis Report changes.

Local Public Document Room location: Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of April 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Carl J. Paperiello,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 97-11859 Filed 5-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388]

#### **Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 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 to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22, issued to Pennsylvania Power & Light Company (the licensee), for operation of the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania, from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4).

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would allow exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) regarding the submission of revisions to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) and safety evaluation summary reports for facility changes made under 10 CFR 50.59 for Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES). Specifically, the exemption requests that Pennsylvania Power & Light Company be allowed to schedule updates to both units of the SSES FSAR and submit safety evaluation summary reports based upon the refueling cycle frequency for Unit 2. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated September 6, 1996.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

It is required in 10 CFR 50.71 (e)(4) that licensees are to submit the updates

to their FSAR within 6 months after each refueling outage provided that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months. Since SSES Units 1 and 2 share a common FSAR, the licensee must update the same document within 6 months after a refueling outage for either unit. The proposed action would maintain the SSES FSAR current within 24 months of the last revision and would not exceed the 24-month interval for submission of the 10 CFR 50.59 design change report for either unit.

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

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that 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 involve 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 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 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, dated June 1981.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 24, 1997, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr.

David Ney of the Bureau of Radiation Protection, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, 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 proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated September 6, 1996, 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 Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**John F. Stolz,**  
Director, Project Directorate I-2, Division of  
Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear  
Reactor Regulation.  
[FR Doc. 97-11832 Filed 5-6-97; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-440]

#### **The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Et Al., Perry Nuclear Power Plant, 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-58, issued to The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, *et al.*, the licensees, for operation of the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, located in Lake 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 The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Toledo

Edison Company, and Centerior Service Company; licensees for Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1) and Ohio Edison Company (Perry licensee). Ohio Edison Company is also the parent company for OES Nuclear, Inc., and Pennsylvania Power Company, which are also licensees for Perry. The merger would result in the formation of a new single holding company, First Energy Corp.

The proposed action is in accordance with The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company's 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 licensee, 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.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, documented in NUREG-0884.