been shown to provide little or no safety benefit, their removal from the ITS may be appropriate. In most cases, relaxations granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of (a) generic NRC actions, (b) new NRC staff positions that have evolved from technological advancements and operating experience, or (c) resolution of the Owners Groups' comments on the ITS. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG–1433 were reviewed by the staff and found to be acceptable because they are consistent with current licensing practices and NRC regulations.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the TS. Changes which are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on the technical content of the TS and are acceptable. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operators' control of the plant in normal and accident conditions. Relocation of requirements to other licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Further changes to these requirements may be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC approved control mechanisms, which ensures continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found to be in conformance with the guidelines of NUREG–1433 and the Final Policy Statement, and are, therefore, acceptable.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to enhance plant safety and to be acceptable.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit or to place unnecessary burden on the licensee, their removal from the TS was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the Owners Groups and found to be acceptable for DAEC. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG–1433 have also been reviewed by the NRC staff and have been found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revisions to the TS were found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

These TS changes 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. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed TS amendments.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed amendment involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. They do not affect nonradiological plant effluents and have no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed TS amendments.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed amendments, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to this action would be to deny the amendment request. Such action would not reduce the environmental impact of plant operations.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the DAEC.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 23, 1998, the Commission consulted with the Iowa State official, Ms. Parween Baig, 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 application dated October 30, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated June 10, September 5, 17, 25, and 30, October 16, November 18 and 21, December 8 and 15, 1997, January 2, 5, 12, 22 and 23, and February 10 and 26, 1998, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20555, and at the local public document room located at the Cedar Rapids Public Library, 500 First Street, SE., Cedar Rapids, IA 52401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of March 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Richard J. Laufer,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III–3, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 98–6823 Filed 3–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–280 and 50–281]

Virginia Electric and Power Company; Surry Power Station, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–32 and DPR–37, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Surry Power Station (SPS) located in Surry County, Virginia.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

By letter dated November 5, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated January 28, 1998, the licensee proposed to change the technical specifications (TS) to allow an increase in fuel enrichment (Uranium 235, U–235) to 4.3 weight percent. Surry TS currently limit fuel in the spent fuel pool and reactor to a maximum enrichment of 4.1 weight percent of U–235.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee intends, in the future, to use the more highly enriched fuel to support longer fuel cycles. Currently, TS 5.3.A.3 and 5.4.B limit the enrichment of reload fuel for the reactor core and the spent fuel storage racks to 4.1 weight percent U–235. The amendment is needed to give the licensee the flexibility to use more highly enriched fuel to support longer fuel cycles.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to

the TS and concludes that storage and use of fuel enriched with U–235 up to 4.3 weight is acceptable. The safety considerations associated with higher enrichments were evaluated by the NRC staff and the staff concluded that such changes would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed changes will not increase the probability of any accident. The higher enrichment and increased fuel burnup may slightly change the mix of fission products that might be released in the event of a serious accident, but such small changes would not significantly affect the consequences of accidents.

No changes are being made in the types or quantity of any effluents that may be released offsite, no changes are being made to the authorized power level, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment and extended irradiation are discussed in the staff assessment entitled ''NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation,'' dated July 7, 1988. This assessment was published in the **Federal Register** on August 11, 1988 (53 FR 30355) as corrected on August 24, 1988 (53 FR 32322) in connection with an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact related to the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1. As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of an increase in fuel enrichment of up to 5 weight percent U–235 and irradiation limits of up to 60 gigawatt days per metric ton (GWD/MT) are either unchanged, or may in fact be reduced from those summarized in Table S–4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c). These findings are applicable to these proposed amendments for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, given that the proposal involves less than 5% enrichment and burnup of less than 60 GWD/MT. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action involves 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 significant 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 of plant operation and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Surry Power Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 4, 1998, the staff consulted with the Virginia State official, Mr. L. Foldese of the Virginia Department of Health, 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 5, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated January 28, 1998, which 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 Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this day of 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gordon E. Edison, Sr.,

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

[FR Doc. 98–6781 Filed 3–16–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Advanced Reactor Designs; Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Advanced Reactor Designs will hold a meeting on March 31 and April 1, 1998, Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

Portions of the meeting may be closed to public attendance to discuss Westinghouse Electric Company safeguards information related to the AP600 pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3).

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Tuesday, March 31, 1998—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

Wednesday, April 1, 1998—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business

The Subcommittee will hear discussion with representatives of the NRC staff and Westinghouse regarding the AP600 Standard Safety Analysis Report and the draft Final Safety Evaluation Report Chapters 2, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff, Westinghouse Electric, their consultants and other interested persons regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, the scheduling of sessions which are open to the public, the Chairman's ruling on