(1) Security lighting, required by 10 CFR 73.55, powered by the diesel generator, would be used for exterior lighting in lieu of 8-hour battery powered emergency lighting units specified by Section III.J;

(2) Portable lights powered by an 8-hour battery supply, for actions in high radiation areas would be used in lieu of 8-hour battery powered emergency lighting units; and

(3) Helmet lanterns would be used inside of switchgear cabinets in lieu of 8-hour battery powered emergency lighting units.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated October 6, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated July 22, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The exemption is needed to reduce the hardships or costs associated with complying with Appendix R, Section III.J.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action will not adversely affect safety.

The proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant 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 (i.e., the ''no-action'' alternative). 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 Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 10, 1999, the staff consulted with the Maryland State official, Richard J. McLean of the Department of Natural Resources, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of 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 October 6, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated July 22, 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 Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of March 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

S. Singh Bajwa,

Director, Project Directorate I–1, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–7165 Filed 3–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–250 and 50–251]

Florida Power and Light Company, Turkey Point Units 3 and 4; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Florida Power and Light Company (the licensee), holder of Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–31 and DPR–41 for operation of Turkey Point Units 3 and 4, respectively, located in Dade County, Florida.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of Appendix R, ''Fire Protection Program for Nuclear Power Facilities Operating Prior to January 1, 1979,'' for Turkey Point Units 3 and 4. Specifically, the licensee requested an exemption from the requirements of Appendix R, Subsection III.G.2.a, for raceway fire barriers in the control building roof which includes fire zone 106R.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated November 2, 1998, as supplemented by a submittal dated February 11, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The Thermo-Lag fire barriers installed at Turkey Point Units 3 and 4 have a rating that does not meet the requirements specified in Subsection III.G.2.a. The proposed exemption is needed because compliance with the regulation would result in significant additional costs.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the underlying purpose of the regulation, to provide reasonable assurance that at least one means of achieving and maintaining safe shutdown conditions will remain available during and after any postulated fire in the plant, will be met. This is based on the fact that the control building roof which includes fire zone 106R is considered to have a negligible contribution to the in situ combustible load and the gravel on the roof would resist fire from, and to, the roof. In addition the control building roof provides high resistance to severe fire and is equivalent to the standards of the Underwriter's Laboratory requirements for resistance to severe fire.

The proposed action will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological

plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the ''no-action'' alternative). 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 Statements related to operation of Turkey Point Units 3 and 4, dated July 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 25, 1999, the NRC staff consulted with the Florida State official, Mr. William Passetti of the Bureau of Radiation Control, 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 request dated November 2, 1998, as supplemented by a submittal dated February 11, 1999, 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 Florida International University, University Park, Miami, Florida.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of March 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Cecil O. Thomas,

Director, Project Directorate II–3, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99–7162 Filed 3–23–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 72–2]

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Regarding the Proposed Exemption From Requirements of 10 CFR Part 72

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption, pursuant to 10 CFR 72.7, from the provisions of 10 CFR 72.72(d) to Virginia Electric and Power Company (Virginia Power or applicant). The requested exemption would allow Virginia Power to maintain a single set of spent fuel records at a records storage facility, that satisfies the requirements set forth in ANSI N45.2.9–1974, for the Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) at the Surry Power Station (Docket Nos. 50–280 and 50–281) in Surry County, Virginia.

Environmental Assessment (EA)

Identification of Proposed Action

By letter dated September 10, 1998, Virginia Power requested an exemption from the requirement in 10 CFR 72.72(d) which states in part that ''Records of spent fuel and high level radioactive waste in storage must be kept in duplicate. The duplicate set of records must be kept at a separate location sufficiently remote from the original records that a single event would not destroy both sets of records.'' The applicant proposes to maintain a single set of spent fuel records in storage at a records storage facility that satisfies the requirements set forth in ANSI N45.2.9–1974.

The proposed action before the Commission is whether to grant this exemption pursuant to 10 CFR 72.7.

Need for the Proposed Action

The applicant stated that, pursuant to 10 CFR 72.140(d), the Virginia Power Operational Quality Assurance (QA) Program Topical Report will be used to satisfy the QA requirements for the ISFSI. The QA Program Topical Report states that QA records are maintained in accordance with commitments to ANSI N45.2.9–1974. ANSI N45.2.9–1974 allows for the storage of QA records in a duplicate storage location sufficiently remote from the original records or in a records storage facility subject to certain provisions designed to protect the records from fire and other adverse conditions. The applicant seeks to streamline and standardize recordkeeping procedures and processes for the Surry Power Station and ISFSI spent fuel records. The applicant states that requiring a separate method of record storage for ISFSI records diverts resources unnecessarily.

ANSI N45.2.9–1974 provides requirements for the protection of nuclear power plant QA records against degradation. It specifies design requirements for use in the construction of record storage facilities when use of a single storage facility is desired. It includes specific requirements for protection against degradation mechanisms such as fire, humidity, and condensation. The requirements in ANSI N45.2.9–1974 have been endorsed by the NRC in Regulatory Guide 1.88, ''Collection, Storage and Maintenance of Nuclear Power Plant Quality Assurance Records,'' as adequate for satisfying the recordkeeping requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B. ANSI N45.2.9–1974 also satisfies the requirements of 10 CFR 72.72 by providing for adequate maintenance of records regarding the identity and history of the spent fuel in storage. Such records would be subject to and need to be protected from the same types of degradation mechanisms as nuclear power plant QA records.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

Elimination of the requirement to store ISFSI records at a duplicate facility has no impact on the environment. Storage of records does not change the methods by which spent fuel will be handled and stored at the Surry Power Station and ISFSI and does not change the amount of any effluents, radiological or non-radiological, associated with the ISFSI.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since there are no environmental impacts associated with the proposed action, alternatives are not evaluated other than the no action alternative. The alternative to the proposed action would be to deny approval of the exemption and, therefore, not allow storage of ISFSI spent fuel records at a single qualified record storage facility. However, the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative would be the same.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

On February 19, 1999, Mr. Les Foldesi from the State of Virginia Bureau of Radiological Health was contacted about the environmental assessment for the proposed action and had no comments.