



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

PDR  
WASTE WM-24

DEC 1 1979

Mr. Jim Rubingh, Resource Analyst  
Colorado Department of Agriculture  
406 State Services Building  
1525 Sherman Street  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Mr. Rubingh:

Your letter of November 9, 1979, transmitted guidelines for determining the impacts associated with major actions upon the agricultural sector within the state of Colorado.

We appreciate the receipt of these guidelines for their application to such proposed projects as the Cyprus Mines Corporation's Hansen Project near Canon City, Colorado. However, the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act (UMTRCA) of 1978 was recently amended by Congress to provide clarification to Sections 204(e) and 204(h). This clarification provides that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) shall no longer have direct licensing authority over the disposal of uranium mill tailings produced in Agreement States. As a result, the NRC withdrew its intent to prepare a DEIS for the Hansen Project. A copy of the Federal Register Notice (44 FR 64131, November 6, 1979) describing this action is provided as an enclosure. Since the state of Colorado now has sole licensing authority over the Hansen Project, your agency's guidelines should be provided to Mr. James L. Montgomery, Radiation and Hazardous Wastes Control Division, Colorado Department of Health, 4210 East 11th Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80220. As a courtesy, a copy of your letter with the enclosure and this reply are being forwarded to Mr. Montgomery.

As a result of the amendment to the UMTRCA, the NRC will provide technical assistance to the state. This assistance will include the performance of a tailings management evaluation, including alternatives, and a radiological assessment. Our conclusions and recommendations will be transmitted to the state and then be used in their licensing decisions and actions.

Please contact Ms. Madonna Krug of my staff (301/427-4103) if you require any further information regarding the Hansen Project and NRC's role in its review.

Sincerely,

Hubert J. Miller  
Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch  
Division of Waste Management

Enclosure: As stated

cc: James L. Montgomery w/ ltr  
fm Mr. Rubingh

1765 270

8001180 253

A record from this system of records may be disclosed to officers and employees of the General Services Administration in connection with administrative services provided to this agency under agreement with GSA.

[FR Doc. 79-34297 Filed 11-5-79; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6820-AC-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-348]

### Alabama Power Co.; Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 14 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-2 issued to Alabama Power Company (the licensee), which revised Technical Specifications for operation of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1 (the facility) located in Houston County, Alabama. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

The amendment modifies the Technical Specification negative flux-rate setpoint and the rate-lag circuit time constant to ensure that a reactor trip will occur for any dropped control rod.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment was not required since this amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of this amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to 10 CFR § 51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with issuance of this amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated June 20, 1979, (2) Amendment No. 14 to License No. NPF-2, and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. and at the George S. Houston Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Dothan, Alabama 36303. A copy of items

(2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Operating Reactors.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 18th day of September, 1979.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

A. Schwencer,

*Chief, Operating Reactors Branch #1,  
Division of Operating Reactors.*

[FR Doc. 79-34239 Filed 11-5-79; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 40-8748]

### Cyprus Mines Corp.; Withdrawal of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement Concerning issuance of a Byproduct Material License for the Hansen Project To Be Located in Fremont County, Colo.

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Withdrawal of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Cancellation of Scoping Meeting.

SUMMARY: As noticed in 44 FR 82087, October 29, 1979, the Commission intended to prepare a draft Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed uranium mine and mill facility at the Hansen Project site for public review and comment in March 1980, and conduct a scoping meeting in Canon City, Colorado, on November 6, 1979. The intent to prepare DEIS is withdrawn and the scheduled scoping meeting is cancelled.

BACKGROUND: Legislation passed the U.S. House of Representatives on October 26, 1979, and the U.S. Senate on October 29, 1979, to amend the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act (UMTRCA) of 1978. This amendment (which was approved as part of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978) provides clarification to Sections 204(h) and 204(e) of the UMTRCA of 1978. This clarification provides that the Commission shall no longer have direct licensing authority over byproduct material (i.e., uranium mill tailings) produced in Agreement States. In accordance with this legislation, the Commission will not have licensing authority to issue a Byproduct Material License for the Hansen Project, and will not be taking any major Federal action requiring compliance with Council of Environmental Quality's regulations (43 FR 83978-86007) for the procedural implementation of the National

Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. Accordingly, the DEIS and scoping meeting are no longer appropriate. In the event this legislation is not signed by the President, the scoping meeting will be rescheduled.

Questions regarding the withdrawal of the intent to prepare a DEIS or cancellation of the scoping meeting should be directed to M. E. Krug, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Division of Waste Management, Mail Stop 483-SS, Washington, D.C. 20555, phone (301) 427-4103.

Dated at Silver Spring, Maryland, this 31st day of October, 1979.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
Ross A. Scarano,  
*Chief, Uranium Recovery Licensing Branch,  
Division of Waste Management.*

[FR Doc. 79-34230 Filed 11-5-79; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-416 and 50-417]

### Mississippi Power & Light Co. and Middle South Energy, Inc.; Order Extending Construction Completion Dates

Mississippi Power & Light Company and Middle South Energy, Inc. are the holders of Construction Permits Nos. CPPR-118 and CPPR-119 issued by the Atomic Energy Commission<sup>1</sup> on September 4, 1974 for the construction of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, presently under construction at the site of Middle South Energy, Inc. in Claiborne County, Mississippi.

By letters dated April 28, 1979, August 31, 1979 and September 25, 1979, Mississippi Power & Light Company, on behalf of itself and as agent for Middle South Energy, Inc., requested an extension of the construction completion dates for the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The extension was requested because construction had been delayed due, to, among other things, (1) later than expected receipt of a Limited Work Authorization (2) adverse weather conditions (3) a labor strike (4) a number of design modifications (5) lower than expected bulk commodity installation rates and (6) financial and power generation requirements.

This action involves no significant hazards consideration; good cause has been shown for the delays; and the requested extension is for a reasonable period, the basis for which are set forth

<sup>1</sup> Effective January 20, 1975, the Atomic Energy Commission became the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Permits in effect on that day were continued under the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

POOR ORIGINAL

1765 271

STATE OF COLORADO



Richard D. Lamm  
Governor

Morgan Smith  
Commissioner

Donald L. Svedman  
Deputy Commissioner

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

406 STATE SERVICES BUILDING  
1525 SHERMAN STREET  
DENVER, COLORADO 80203

Agricultural Commission

William A. Stephens, Gypsum  
Chairman

Ben Eastman, Hotchkiss  
Vice-Chairman

Henry Christensen, Roggen  
John L. Malloy, Denver  
Elton Miller, Ft. Lupton  
Don Moschetti, Center  
William H. Webster, Greeley  
Ciede Widener, Granada  
Kenneth G. Willmore, Denver

November 9, 1979

Mr. M. E. Krug  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Division of Waste Management  
Mail Stop 483-SS  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Krug:

I wish to thank you for the opportunity to participate in the scoping process for the DEIS on the Cyprus Mines' Uranium Operation.

Enclosed you will find the guidelines which our agency feels should be used in order to determine the impacts of major actions upon the agricultural sector within the state. If you have any questions regarding these guidelines, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jim Rubingh  
Resource Analyst

JR:ew  
Enc.

1765 272

## I. IMPACTS UPON AGRICULTURAL LANDS

- A. Locate agricultural lands affected by the proposed project on an appropriate map. In particular, the following should be identified separately:
  1. prime farmland;
  2. unique farmland (such as orchards, seed-producing areas, etc.);
  3. other irrigated land;
  4. noncropland with prime cropland potential;
  5. critical livestock areas (feedlots, lambing areas, winter range, stock-drive trails, etc.).
- B. Superimpose the proposed project location and facilities of the proposed project upon the map(s) developed in A.
- C. Summarize in tabular form the direct land requirements and impacts of the proposed project for the agricultural land categories listed in A.
- D. Describe the indirect effects of the proposed action upon agricultural land, using both maps and tables, including:
  1. indirect effects caused by industrial and commercial development induced by the proposed project;
  2. indirect effects caused by residential requirements of increased population induced by the proposed project.
- E. Include land use maps showing land uses within the area once the project is completed and the land is reclaimed.
- F. Describe the likelihood and severity of soil erosion and possible subsidence caused by direct and indirect effects of the proposed project.
- G. Describe the expected changes in the relationship between agricultural land and air quality that are induced by the proposed project, including:
  1. the effects of air quality changes upon agricultural land;

air quality.

## II. IMPACTS UPON IRRIGATION

- A. Describe the direct project water requirements and expected sources of project water, including expected amounts of project water to come from irrigation.
- B. Describe the water requirements of additional industrial, commercial, and residential activity induced by the proposed action, identifying sources to meet this additional demand for water, including expected amounts to come from irrigation.
- C. Describe the agricultural impacts of converting irrigation water to meet these direct and indirect demands for additional water induced by the proposed action.
- D. If the proposed action will result in converting more than 3,000 acre-feet of irrigation water to a nonagricultural use, investigate whether conventional irrigation practices would have to be modified in order to maintain current production levels. Discuss the technical feasibility of making such changes in irrigation practices, and estimate the costs to agricultural producers to make such changes.

## III. IMPACTS UPON AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY

- A. Describe the effects of the proposed project upon the availability of agricultural labor, both year round and seasonal, particularly if the project will increase the overall economic affluence of the surrounding area.
- B. Describe the effects of the proposed project upon cultivation practices, including spraying and the use of herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers.
- C. Describe the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project upon the farm supply sector, and the agricultural marketing, processing and distribution sectors.

1765 274



sector.

- E. Describe the effects of the proposed project upon the transportation and movement of livestock, produce, and farm equipment.
- F. Describe the effect of the proposed action upon agricultural land values, and the effects of changed land values upon agricultural activity.
- G. Describe the effects of the proposed action upon attitudes of the general population in the surrounding area toward agriculture as a vocation.