

not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule. Exemption from Appendix R, Paragraph O, requirements is needed for the licensee to have ROALs without a lube oil collection system for collecting oil from potential leak sites.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

With regard to environmental impact, the Commission has evaluated the proposed action as described below.

The proposed action will not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of accidents or result in a change in occupational or offsite dose. Therefore, there are no radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

The proposed action will not result in a change in nonradiological plant effluents and will have no other nonradiological environmental impact.

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

Alternative to the Proposed Action

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. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements related to operation of CR3, dated May 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 29, 1997 the staff consulted with the Florida State Official, Mr. Bill Passetti of the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption. Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this action, see the request for exemption dated September 5, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the

Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room located at Coastal Region Library, 8619 W. Crystal Street, Crystal River, Florida.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of October 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Leonard A. Wiens,

Acting Director, Project Directorate II-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-29141 Filed 11-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316]

Indiana Michigan Power Company; Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74, issued to Indiana Michigan Power Company (the licensee), for operation of the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Berrien County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is in response to the licensee's application dated August 5, 1997, for exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) regarding submission of revisions to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) and design change reports for facility changes made under 10 CFR 50.59 for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. Under the proposed exemption, the licensee would schedule updates to the single, unified FSAR for the two units that comprise the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant once per Unit 1 fuel cycle.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Section 50.71(e)(4) of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations requires licensees to submit updates to their UFSAR within 6 months after each refueling outage providing that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months. Since the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, share a common FSAR, the licensee must update the same document within 6 months after a

refueling outage for either unit. Because the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant units have alternating refueling outages, the regulatory requirement to submit an update after the completion of one unit's refueling outage when the other unit is scheduled for a refueling outage within 6 to 12 months results in an administrative burden which does not significantly enhance safety. The proposed exemption is needed to permit a single update of the unified FSAR for the two Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant units per each Unit 1 fuel cycle.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that it will not alter or affect plant operation. Allowing the exemption would maintain the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant FSAR current within 24 months of the last revision and would not exceed the 24-month interval for submission of the 10 CFR 50.59 design change report for either unit.

No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluent that may be released offsite and there is no increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action will not change nonradiological plant effluents and will have no other nonradiological environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no 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 NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. 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 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, dated August 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 30, 1997, the NRC staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Dennis Hahn of the Michigan Department of Public Health, Nuclear Facilities and Environmental Monitoring, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon its 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 August 5, 1997, 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 Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, MI 49085.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 29th day of October 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John B. Hickman,

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

[FR Doc. 97-29139 Filed 11-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SES Performance Review Board

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the membership of the OPM SES Performance Review Board.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Lynn Horst, Office of Human Resources and EEO, Office of Personnel Management, 1900 E Street, NW, Washington, DC 20415, (202) 606-2165.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 4314 (c) (1) through (5) of Title 5, U.S.C., requires each agency to establish, in accordance with

regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, one or more SES performance review boards. The board reviews and evaluates the initial appraisal of a senior executive's performance by the supervisor, along with any recommendations to the appointment authority relative to the performance of the senior executive.

Office of Personnel Management.

Janice R. Lachance,

Acting Director.

Following are the regular members of the SES Performance Review Board for the Office of Personnel Management:

William F. Flynn, III, Associate Director,

Retirement and Insurance Service

Richard A. Ferris, Associate Director,

Investigations Service

Mary Lou Lindholm, Associate Director,

Employment Service

Carol Okin, Associate Director, Office of

Merit Systems Oversight and

Effectiveness

Leigh M. Shein, Acting Chief of Staff

Rose M. Gwin, Director, Office of

Human Resources and EEO

[FR Doc. 97-29121 Filed 11-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6325-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and To Conduct a Scoping Meeting for the Proposed Expansion of Flying Cloud Airport, Eden Prairie, MN

AGENCY: Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and to conduct public scoping.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is issuing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared on the proposed expansion of the Flying Cloud Airport. The expansion consists of the extension of two parallel runways. The longer of the two runways (Runway 09R-27L) would be extended 1,100 feet to 5,000 feet from its current length of 3,900 feet. The other runway to be extended, (Runway 09L-27R) would be extended 300 feet to 3,900 feet from its current length of 3,600 feet. Two alternatives on the aircraft weight limitations currently in place at Flying Cloud Airport also are under consideration. The first alternative would retain the current limitation of 20,000 pounds maximum gross weight. The second alternative

would allow aircraft up to 30,000 pounds maximum gross weight. Land would be acquired for the expansion of State Safety Zones A and B at the west end of the parallel runways and for navigational aids and lights in the Runway Protection Zone. In addition, land would be acquired for the eventual construction of additional hangars south of the parallel runways and for an access road which would connect County Road 4 to the building area. To ensure that all significant issues related to the proposed action are identified, the FAA is soliciting information and comments from the public concerning this project and is advising Federal, State and local agencies and the public of the scoping process and scheduled meetings that will be conducted as a part of this process.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Glen Orcutt, Airports District Office, Federal Aviation Administration, 6020-28th Avenue South, Room 102, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55450 (612) 713-4354.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces that the FAA, in cooperation with the Minneapolis Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) will prepare a joint Federal/State EIS for the proposed expansion of Flying Cloud Airport. The EIS will evaluate a No-Action alternative, the proposed actions and other reasonable alternatives that may be identified during the agency and public scoping meetings. The EIS will compare all feasible alternatives, and will ensure that mitigating measures are considered to minimize adverse environmental consequences.

The Minnesota scoping process requires the preparation of an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) and Draft Scoping Decision (DSD), combined in one document. The format for the EAW is the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board's Environmental Assessment Worksheet. A Scoping EAW and DSD has been prepared by the MAC and will be circulated to Federal, State and Local agencies for their review and comment. The Scoping EAW and DSD addresses the alternatives and potential impacts and issues to be addressed in the Federal/State EIS.

The environmental review of the project will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amendment (42 U.S.C. 4371, *et seq.*), CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), FAA Orders 5050.4A and 1050.1D and all applicable Federal and State regulations and local ordinances.