

views and opinions of interested persons or firms concerning NASA's procurement policies and practices. The purpose of the meeting is to have an open discussion between NASA's Associate Administrator for Procurement, industry, and the public.

**DATES:** August 31, 1995, from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Von Karman Auditorium located at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, California, 91109.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lydia Casarez, NASA Management Office—Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Code 180-801, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109, (818) 354-5359.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Format**

There will be a presentation by the Associate Administrator for Procurement, followed by a question and answer period. Procurement issues will be discussed including NASA policies used in the award and administration of contracts.

**Admittance**

Doors will open at 1:30 p.m. Admittance will be on a first-come, first-served basis. Auditorium capacity is limited to approximately 225 persons; therefore, a maximum of two representatives per firm is requested. No reservations will be accepted. Questions for the open forum should be presented at the meeting and should not be submitted in advance. Position papers are not being solicited.

**Initiatives**

In addition to the general discussion mentioned above, NASA invites comments or questions relative to its ongoing Procurement Initiatives, some of which include the following:

**Cost Control.** NASA is developing this initiative to increase the emphasis on cost control with its contractors and within the agency.

**Source Selection.** NASA is working to reduce the time and effort that contractors and source selection personnel spend on a contract.

**Performance Based Contracting.** NASA's newest procurement initiative is focused on structuring an acquisition around the purpose of the work to be performed instead of how the work is to be performed or broad and imprecise statements of work.

**Change Order Reduction and Process Change.** NASA is attempting to improve overall change order management through the use of better technical

direction, realistic cost estimates and more effective and timely negotiations.

**Award Fee Initiative.** NASA has published regulations for Award Fee policy at 48 CFR part 1816, subpart 4.

**MidRange Procurement Procedure.** A test program for a third category of procurements between \$25,000 and \$500,000 (annually) has been implemented at all NASA Centers.

**Procurement Reinvention Laboratory.** The NASA Headquarters Acquisition Division is participating in this initiative which grew out of the National Performance Review. This Procurement Reinvention Laboratory is one of several Procurement Reinvention Labs underway across the Government.

**Deidre A. Lee,**

*Associate Administrator for Procurement.*

[FR Doc. 95-17238 Filed 7-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-298]

**Nebraska Public Power District; Cooper Nuclear Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering the issuance of an exemption from the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 to the Nebraska Public Power District (the licensee) for the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS), located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

**Environmental Assessment**

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would grant an exemption from the requirements of Section III.D.2(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, to allow Type B testing (local leak rate testing) of the drywell head and manport primary containment penetrations to be deferred from the current due date of July 17, 1995, until the next refueling outage, which is scheduled to commence on October 13, 1995.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's request for exemption dated December 27, 1994.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed to avoid a plant shutdown solely for the performance of two Type B tests of the subject penetrations. Plant shutdown is undesirable because it subjects the reactor and its supporting systems to transients which increase the potential

for malfunctions that may challenge safety systems. Additionally, every shutdown and restart results in radiation exposure for plant workers as they perform shutdown and restart related tasks in radiation areas in various parts of the plant.

There is no overriding technical need for the Type B tests. The tests are intended to detect local leaks and to measure leakage across each pressure-containing or leakage-limiting boundary for certain reactor containment penetrations, thereby providing assurance that maximum allowable containment leakage rates are not exceeded. Section III.D.2(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 requires that Type B leak rate tests, except for airlocks, be performed during reactor shutdown for refueling, or at other convenient intervals, but in no case at intervals greater than two years. The requested exemption for an extension of the 2-year surveillance interval would allow these penetrations to be tested at the next refueling outage, scheduled to commence on October 13, 1995. The current 2-year interval ends on July 17, 1995, when the plan this expected to be at power. The current operating cycle for CNS commenced on August 1, 1993, and has included an extended, unplanned outage of nearly nine months (May 25, 1994, through February 21, 1995). This factor, along with the anticipated load demand and fuel capacity, has resulted in the rescheduling of the next refueling outage to October 1995.

In its December 27, 1994, exemption request, the licensee cited several factors to demonstrate that a high level of confidence exists that the subject penetrations will still be capable of performing their intended function if the required testing is deferred for a short time. The drywell head and manport penetrations have never failed a Type B local leak rate test in the more than 20 years the plant has been operating; therefore, the potential for any significant degradation of the penetrations during the few months that the tests would be deferred is extremely low. Although the drywell head seal is made from a silicone rubber compound and environmental conditions such as heat and radiation have been shown to cause degradation in silicone compounds, the current operating cycle will consist of a maximum of 18 months of power operation. Typically, the seal is expected to function for a much longer period, as Appendix J allows up to 2 years of power operation between tests. Finally, gross failure of the penetrations is highly unlikely, as the drywell head and manport penetrations

are not active components, and therefore, are not subject to active failure criteria.

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

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed exemption is appropriate. The exemption would allow a one-time schedular exemption from Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 to allow the Type B testing of two primary containment penetrations to be deferred until the next refueling outage, resulting in approximately three additional months of plant operation beyond the date that those penetrations are currently required to be tested.

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 areas 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 that 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 requested exemption. 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 Cooper Nuclear Station, dated February 1973.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 5, 1995, the staff consulted with

the Nebraska State official, Ms. Julia Schmidt, Division of Radiological Health, Nebraska 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 this action, see the licensee's request for exemption dated December 27, 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 Commission's Local Public Document Room at the Auburn Public Library, 118 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68305.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of July 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**James R. Hall, Sr.,**

*Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-17296 Filed 7-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

#### **[Docket No. 50-315]**

#### **In the Matter of: Indiana Michigan Power Company (D.C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit 1); Exemption**

##### **I**

Indiana Michigan Power Company (IMPCo, the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. DPR-58 which authorizes operation of the Donald C. Cook Unit 1 Nuclear Plant at steady-state reactor power levels not in excess of 3250 megawatts thermal. The Cook 1 facility is a pressurized water reactor located at the licensee's site in Berrien County, Michigan. The license provides, among other things, that the facility is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) now or hereafter in effect.

##### **II**

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), the NRC may grant exemptions from the requirements of the regulations (1) which are authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and are consistent with the common defense and security;

and (2) where special circumstances are present.

Section III.D.1.(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 requires the performance of three Type A containment integrated leakage rate tests (ILRTs), at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period of the primary containment. The third test of each set shall be conducted when the plant is shut down for the 10-year inservice inspection required by 10 CFR 50.55a.

##### **III**

By letter dated March 17, 1995, IMPCo requested temporary relief from the requirement to perform a set of three Type A tests at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period of the primary containment. The requested exemption would permit a one-time interval extension of the third Type A test by approximately 20 months (from the 1995 refueling outage, currently scheduled to begin in September 1995, to the 1997 refueling outage) and would permit the third Type A test of the second 10-year inservice inspection period to not correspond with the end of the current American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code) inservice inspection interval.

The licensee's request cites the special circumstances of 10 CFR 50.12, paragraph (a)(2)(ii), as the basis for the exemption. In addition, the licensee states that the exemption would eliminate a cost of \$130,000 for the Type A test which is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule. 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix J, states that the purpose of the Type A, B, and C tests is to assure that leakage through the primary containment shall not exceed the allowable leakage rate values as specified in the technical specifications or associated bases. IMPCo points out that the existing Type B and C testing programs are not being modified by this request and will continue to effectively detect containment leakage caused by the degradation of active containment isolation components as well as containment penetrations. It has been the experience at the D.C. Cook Plant that during the six Type A tests conducted from 1974 to date, any significant containment leakage paths are detected by the Type B and C testing. The Type A test results have only been confirmatory of the results of the Type B and C test results. The testing history, structural capability of the containment, and the risk assessment establish that there is