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. The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request. Such action would not change any 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 related to the operation of Wolf Creek Generating Station," dated June 1982 (NUREG–0878).

Agencies and Persons Consulted

The NRC staff consulted with the State of Kansas 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 November 23, 1994, 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 rooms located at the Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801, and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **Theodore R. Quay**,

Director, Project Directorate IV–2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–1815 Filed 1–24–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–M [Docket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457]

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

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF– 72 and NPF–77 issued to the Commonwealth Edison Company (the licensee) for operation of the Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Will County, Illinois.

The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications for Braidwood 1 and 2 by deleting Section 4.7.6.e.6 which presently requires a surveillance to verify that the control room ventilation system can be manually isolated and placed in the recirculation mode of operation. This manual isolation would be initiated in response to a report of a chlorine release in the vicinity of the Braidwood Station.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves 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 margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

A. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Elimination of the requirement to test control room ventilation manual isolation capability does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. This requirement had been previously necessary because of the potential of a rail borne chlorine accident. Since that time of the imposed surveillance, the Norfolk and Western railroad line which transported chlorine near Braidwood has been removed. In addition, a study has concluded that there are no potential stationary chlorine release

sources within a 10 mile radius that could pose a threat to control room habitability. The evaluation concluded that the realistic probability of a transported source of chlorine passing within the critical distance of 4900 feet of Braidwood Station is practically zero. Even using the very conservative assumption that all transported sources of chlorine use IL 53 or IL 129, the occurrence of an accidental release from these shipments was calculated to be only 2×10^{-6} events per year. Thus the probability of a chlorine release is within the requirements of NUREG-0800. Standard Review Plan (SRP), July 1981 Section 2.2.3, and removal of the requirement to conduct Control Room ventilation isolation tests every 18 months does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

To ensure that no potential stationary chlorine release source is introduced within a ten mile radius of Braidwood Station, the station will perform a survey every three years to ensure that the protection of the control room personnel from risk due to any potential chlorine accident is maintained sufficiently small.

B. The proposed changes does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The probability of a chlorine accident that could impact the control room environment has been shown to be within the requirements of SRP Section 2.2.3. Control Room isolation capability testing was performed only to address a chlorine accident. Therefore, removal of this requirement does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

C. The proposed changes does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Control room ventilation isolation testing was performed as a result of the possibility of a chlorine accident in the vicinity of Braidwood. As demonstrated by a recent study, the probability of this event occurring has been reduced to practically zero within the acceptable limits of SRP Section 2.2.3 for transportable chlorine. Survey of the ten mile radius around Braidwood found no stationary chlorine sources with large enough quantities to pose a hazard to control room personnel. Thus, the removal of the requirement to perform Control Room ventilation isolation tests every 18 months does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be