special circumstances required by 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii) apply to this situation.

The CR–3 containment is a reinforced concrete structure with a cylindrical wall, a flat foundation mat, and a shallow dome roof. The cylinder wall is prestressed with a post-tensioning system in the vertical and horizontal directions. The dome roof is prestressed using a three-way post-tensioning system. The inside surface of the containment has a carbon steel liner to ensure a high degree of leak-tightness during operating and accident conditions. The liner is anchored to the concrete to ensure composite action with the concrete shell. Piping penetrations have been designed to ensure that the liner would not be breached due to rupture of any process pipe. The containment is designed with an allowable leakage rate of 0.25% of containment air weight per day (L_a) at the calculated maximum allowable containment pressure (P_a) of 54.2 psig resulting from the limiting design basis accidents.

The historical Type A test results as set forth in the exemption request demonstrate that CR–3 has a low-leakage containment. The current 10-year inservice inspection and inservice testing service period is the second service period and started in March 1987 and ends in March 1997. During this service period, the licensee performed one ILRT in November 7, 1991. A prior ILRT conducted in November 1987 was counted as the third test of the first 10-year interval and therefore, the licensee did not take credit for the November 1991 test for the current interval. These two ILRTs which have been performed during the last seven years have shown acceptable containment leakage rates. There have been no permanent or temporary modifications to the containment structure, liner or penetrations since the last two Type A tests, and no future modifications are planned prior to the 1998 refueling outage that could adversely affect the Type A test results.

The licensee will continue to be required to conduct the Type B and C local leak rate tests, which are in general the principal means of detecting containment leakage paths, with the Type A tests confirming the Type B and C test results. Types B and C testing history at CR–3 shows that the overall combined as-found leakage has been less than the allowed combined leakage rate of 0.6 L_a (266,431 SCCM) at the calculated maximum peak containment pressure as specified in Appendix J. Successful performance of Types B and C testing demonstrates the leak-tightness of the penetrations and associated components and provides a high degree of assurance that the overall Type A leakage rate would remain satisfactory while this exemption is in effect. The licensee has stated that it will perform the general containment inspection, although it is required by Appendix J (Section V.A.) to be performed only in conjunction with Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary.

The purpose of containment leak testing is to detect containment leakage which could be the result of failures (active or passive) before an accident occurs. Containment leakage caused by degradation of sealing material within containment penetrations and containment isolation components will continue to be effectively measured by the Type B and C testing programs. The Type A tests are only confirmatory of the results of the Type B and C test results. The only potential failures not covered by Types B and C testing are failures of the containment due to structural deterioration because of parameters such as pressure or temperature. However, structural deterioration would require longer than the proposed period for the exemption.

There are no mechanisms that would adversely affect the structural capability of the containment, which is the only leakage mode not captured by the Type B and C testing that will be performed. Absent actual accident conditions, structural deterioration of containment due to temperature, radiation, chemical, or other such effects is a gradual phenomenon requiring periods of time well in excess of the proposed interval extension and is subject to detection by periodic visual inspections. At CR–3, there has been no evidence of structural deterioration that would impact structural integrity or leak tightness. Other than postulated accident conditions, the only over-pressure challenge to containment is the integrated leak rate test itself. Thus, there is significant assurance that the extended interval between Type A tests in concert with Type B and C testing will continue to provide adequate verification of the leak tight integrity of the containment. The proposed one-time change in Type A leakage test frequency only affects the length of time that the containment could be in an undetected failed state as a result of a failure. As part of the CR–3 Individual Plant Examination (IPE) program, the risk of losing containment integrity is considered negligible compared to other risks such as those resulting from small break loss of coolant accidents or station blackout.

Draft NUREG–1493, which provides the technical justification for the ongoing Appendix J rulemaking effort (including a 10-year test frequency), has shown that essentially all containment leakage can be detected by LLRTs (Type B and C). According to results given in NUREG–1493, only 5 ILRT failures out of 180 ILRT reports that covered 110 individual reactors and approximately 770 years of operating history, were found that local leak rate testing could not have detected. Therefore, it is unlikely that this one-time exemption for the performance of Type A testing at CR–3 would result in significant degradation of the overall containment integrity.

In summary, the testing history, structural capability of the containment, and the risk assessment discussed previously establish that (1) CR–3 has had acceptable containment leakage rate test results, (2) the structural integrity of containment is assured, and (3) there is negligible risk impact in changing the Type A test schedule on a one-time basis.

Therefore, application of the regulation in this particular circumstance would not serve, nor is it necessary to achieve, the underlying purpose of the rule, and the exemption request meets the requirements of 10 CFR 50.12.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), an exemption is authorized by law, will not endanger life or property or common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants Florida Power Corporation a one-time exemption from those requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, relating to containment overall leak rate test and allows deferring the performance of a Type A test from the spring 1996 to the spring 1998 refueling outage, provided that the general containment inspection is performed during the spring 1996 outage. Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact (60 FR 46320).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of September 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Steven A. Varga,

Director, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–24895 Filed 10–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–387 and 50–388]

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating Licenses

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted a request by Pennsylvania Power and Light Company (the licensee) to withdraw its November 11, 1994 application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–14 and NPF–22, for Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specifications (TS) to extend the main turbine valve surveillance test interval from a weekly basis to no greater that 92 days for all main turbine stop, control, and combined intermediate valves.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the Federal Register on December 21, 1994 (59 FR 65821). However, by letter dated August 21, 1995, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated November 11, 1994, and the licensee's letter dated August 21, 1995, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents 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 Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of October 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Chester Poslusny,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–24896 Filed 10–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 35–26384]

Filings Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as Amended (''Act'')

September 29, 1995.

Notice is hereby given that the following filing(s) has/have been made with the Commission pursuant to provisions of the Act and rules promulgated thereunder. All interested persons are referred to the application(s) and/or declaration(s) for complete statements of the proposed transaction(s) summarized below. The application(s) and/or declaration(s) and any amendments thereto is/are available for public inspection through the Commission's Office of Public Reference.

Interested persons wishing to comment or request a hearing on the application(s) and/or declaration(s) should submit their views in writing by October 23, 1995, to the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C. 20549, and serve a copy on the relevant applicant(s) and/or declarant(s) at the address(es) specified below. Proof of service (by affidavit or, in case of an attorney at law, by certificate) should be filed with the request. Any request for hearing shall identify specifically the issues of fact or law that are disputed. A person who so requests will be notified of any hearing, if ordered, and will receive a copy of any notice or order issued in the matter. After said date, the application(s) and/or declaration(s), as filed or as amended, may be granted and/or permitted to become effective.

Energy Initiatives, Inc., et al. (70–7727)

Energy Initiatives, Inc. (''EII''), One Upper Pond Road, Parsippany, New Jersey 07054, a nonutility subsidiary of General Public Utilities Corporation (''GPU''), a registered holding company, and GPU (both, ''Applicants''), 100 Interpace Parkway, Parsippany, New Jersey 07054, have filed a post-effective amendment under sections 6(a), 7, 9(a), 10 and 12(b) of the Act and rules 45, 52, 53 and 54 thereunder to their application-declaration filed under sections 6(a), 7, 9(a), 10, 12(b), 12(c) and 13(b) of the Act and rules 45, 50, 51, 90 and 91 thereunder.

By orders dated June 26, 1990, December 18, 1992, September 12, 1994, December 28, 1994 and June 14, 1995 (HCAR Nos. 25108, 25715, 26123, 26205 and 26307, respectively) (collectively, ''Orders''), EII was authorized to engage in preliminary project development and administrative activities (''Project Activities'') in connection with its investments in: (i) qualifying cogeneration facilities (''QFs''), as defined in the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, as amended (''PURPA''), located anywhere in the United States, (ii) small power production facilities (also ''QFs''), as defined by PURPA, (iii) exempt wholesale generators (''EWG''), and (iv) foreign utility companies (''FUCOs'').

The Orders also authorized GPU from time to time through December 31, 1997 to: (i) make capital contributions to EII; (ii) enter into letter of credit reimbursement agreements (''Reimbursement Agreements'') and guarantees or similar obligations (''Guarantees'') to secure EII's agreement with any person (including without limitation project lenders) in connection with EII's Project Activities and the acquisition of ownership or participation interests in projects; (iii) guarantee the securities or other obligations of EWGs and FUCOs; and (iv) assume liabilities of EWGs and FUCOs. The aggregate amount which GPU was authorized to contribute to EII, together with the outstanding face or principal amount of the Reimbursement Agreement and Guarantee obligations, and liabilities assumed, could not exceed $200 million (''Contribution Cap''). The Orders also authorized EII to enter into Reimbursement Agreements and Guarantees, and to assume liabilities of EWGs and FUCOs, in an aggregate amount of up to $30 million from time to time through December 31, 1997 (''EII Guarantee Cap'').

The Orders further authorized EII to issue, sell and renew from time to time through December 31, 1997 its promissory notes evidencing short-term borrowings from commercial banks and other financial institutions, in an aggregate principal amount at any time outstanding (together with the aggregate amount of obligations outstanding under Reimbursement Agreements and Guarantees entered into, and liabilities assumed, by EII) not exceeding the EII Guarantee Cap. In addition, the Orders authorized GPU to guarantee such promissory notes (''Note Guarantees'').

As of June 30, 1995, GPU made cash capital contributions to EII, and had outstanding Reimbursement Agreement and Guarantee obligations, and liabilities assumed, of approximately $29 million, pursuant to the December 28, 1994 Order. As of such date EII had not entered into any Reimbursement Agreements or Guarantees or assumed any liabilities pursuant to the Orders.

GPU and EII now propose to: (i) increase the Contribution Cap to $500