## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-244]

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation; Ginna Nuclear Power Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License No. DPR-18, issued to Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E), (the licensee), for operation of the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, located in Wayne County, New York.

## **Environmental Assessment**

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant a one-time exemption from performing Type C tests for certain containment isolation valves (CIVs) during the 1995 refueling outage and extend the schedule required by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.3, up to 1-month of the 2-year interval.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for the exemption dated March 15, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is requested on a one-time basis only to support the current refueling outage schedule. Requiring a plant shutdown before the next scheduled refueling outage in April 1996, soley to perform surveillance tests would cause an unnecessary thermal transient on the plant and could result in unnecessary exposure to personnel. The performance of the CIVs and the plant's overall containment integrity have been good. RG&E proposes to limit the exemption to exclude those valves: (1) On which maintenance has been performed; and (2) on those valves that have not demonstrated acceptable leakage rate testing during the past two leakage tests.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed exemption would allow RG&E to conduct the local leak rate tests during the next refueling outage, an extension of up to 1 month. There will be no changes to the facility or the environment as a result of the exemption.

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 NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current 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 Ginna Nuclear Power Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 11, 1995, the staff consulted with the New York State official, Donna Ross, Acting State Liaison Officer of the New York Energy, Research, and Development Authority, 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 March 15, 1995, 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 Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **Ledyard B. Marsh**,

Director, Project Directorate I-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–10207 Filed 4–25–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

## I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97–415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from March 31, 1995, through April 14, 1995. The last biweekly notice was published on Wednesday, April 12, 1995 (60 FR 18621).

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a