methodology's capability to discern an individual's identity. Unlike the photograph identification badge, hand geometry is nontransferable. During the initial access authorization or registration process, hand measurements are recorded and the template is stored for subsequent use in the identity verification process required for entry into the protected area. Authorized individuals insert their access authorization card into the card reader and the biometrics system records an image of the hand geometry. The unique features of the newly recorded image are then compared to the template previously stored in the database. Access is ultimately granted based on the degree to which the characteristics of the image match those of the ''signature'' template.

Since both the badge and hand geometry would be necessary for access into the protected area, the proposed system would provide for a positive verification process. Potential loss of a badge by an individual, as a result of taking the badge offsite, would not enable an unauthorized entry into protected areas.

The access process will continue to be under the observation of security personnel. The system of identification/access control badges will continue to be used for all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escorts. Badges will continue to be displayed by all individuals while inside the protected area. Addition of a hand geometry biometrics system will provide a significant contribution to effective implementation of the security plan at each site.

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 area 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.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded 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 proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternate 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 Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 dated September 1981.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 24, 1995, the NRC staff consulted with the Louisiana State official, Dr. Stan Shaw, Assistant Administrator of the Louisiana Radiation Protection Division, Department of Environmental Quality, 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 proposed action, see the request for exemption dated October 24, 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 local public document room located at the University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, Louisiana 70122.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Chandu P. Patel,

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

[FR Doc. 95–19765 Filed 8–9–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket Nos. 50–277 and 50–278]

Peco Energy Co., Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Delmarva Power & Light Co., Atlantic City Electric Co., Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–44 and DPR–56, issued to PECO Energy Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Units 2 and 3 located in York County, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would extend the allowed-out-of-service-times (AOTs) for the PBAPS Energy Diesel Generators (EDGs) based on the availability of an alternate AC (AAC) power source. The AAC is a direct tie line between the PBAPS and the Conowingo Hydroelectric Station located approximately 9 miles down the Susquehanna River from PBAPS. Currently, the AOT for a single inoperable EDG is 7 days. The amendments would allow the AOT for a single EDG inoperable to be a maximum of 14 days provided the Conowingo line is verified to be available. However, under no circumstances will the AOT be more than 7 days without the Conowingo line being available.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendments dated April 7, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated June 2, 1994, September 6, 1994, June 16, 1995 and July 13, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action will provide increased flexibility in scheduling and performing maintenance activities on the EDGs. The licensee currently faces significant challenges to complete periodic maintenance and modification activities within the existing TS 7-day AOT. Expiration of the AOT for EDGs without restoring all EDGs to an operable status requires shutting down both Peach Bottom units in accordance with the existing TS. In addition, the 7-day maximum EDG AOT in the current TS precludes the performance of certain major beneficial maintenance activities and modifications without shutting down both Peach Bottom units.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and based on the information presented in the licensee's application, concludes that the proposed extension of the EDG's AOT in conjunction with the availability of the Conowingo line, will not increase the probability of initiating events leading to a design basis accident. The additional reliability of the offsite source afforded by the Conowingo line would improve the potential for mitigating loss-of-offsite power events. Consequently, the consequences of accidents would not be significantly increased, nor would the post-accident radiological releases be greater than previously determined.

The proposed action would not otherwise affect radiological plant effluents. 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 (extending EDG AOTs) 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 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 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 Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, dated April 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 24, 1995, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Stan Maingi, of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, 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 letter dated April 7, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated June 2, and September 6, 1994, and June 16, and July 13, 1995, 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 Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (Regional Depository) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 4th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stolz,

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

[FR Doc. 95–19764 Filed 8–9–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–219]

GPU Nuclear Corporation, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station; Issuance of Partial Director's Decision Under 10 CFR § 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has denied in part a Petition, dated September 19, 1994, and supplemented December 13, 1994, submitted by Oyster Creek Nuclear Watch, Reactor Watchdog Project, and Nuclear Information and Resource Service (Petitioners). The Petition requested that the NRC take action regarding the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station (OCNGS) pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.206.

The September 19, 1994, Petition requests that the NRC (1) immediately suspend the OCNGS operating license until the Licensee inspects and repairs or replaces all safety-class reactor internal component parts subject to embrittlement and cracking, (2) immediately suspend the OCNGS operating license until the Licensee submits an analysis regarding the synergistic effects of through-wall cracking of multiple safety-class components, (3) immediately suspend the OCNGS operating license until the Licensee has analyzed and mitigated any areas of noncompliance with regard to irradiated fuel pool cooling as a single-unit boiling-water reactor (BWR), and (4) issue a generic letter requiring other licensees of single-unit BWRs to submit information regarding fuel pool boiling in order to verify compliance with regulatory requirements, and to promptly take appropriate mitigative action if the units are not in compliance.

The December 13, 1994, supplemental Petition requests that the NRC: (1) suspend the license of the OCNGS until the Petitioners' concerns regarding cracking are addressed, including inspection of all reactor vessel internal components and other safety-related systems susceptible to intergranular stress corrosion cracking (IGSCC) and completion of any and all necessary repairs and modifications; (2) explain discrepancies between the response of the NRC staff dated October 27, 1994, to the Petition of September 19, 1994, and the time-to-boil calculations for the FitzPatrick plant; (3) require the GPU Nuclear Corporation to produce documents for evaluation of the time-to-boil calculation for the OCNGS irradiated fuel pool; (4) identify redundant components that may be powered from onsite power supplies to be used for spent fuel pool cooling as qualified Class 1E systems; (5) hold a public meeting in Toms River, New Jersey, to permit presentation of additional information related to the Petition; and (6) treat the Petitioners' letter of December 13, 1994, as a formal appeal of the denial of the Petitioners' request of September 19, 1994, to immediately suspend the OCNGS operating license.

The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has denied Requests (1) and (2) of the September 19, 1994, Petition and Request (1) of the December 13, 1994, supplemental Petition to suspend the operating license of the OCNGS until the Licensee inspects and repairs, modified, or replaces all safety-class reactor internal component parts subject to embrittlement and intergranular stress corrosion cracking. The reasons for this denial are explained in the ''Partial Director's Decision Under 10 CFR § 2.206'' (DD–95–18), the complete text of which follows this notice, and 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