

(3R7) which would coincide with the completion of the first 10-year ISI interval.

The licensee has requested a schedular exemption from 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.1.(a) in regards to "approximately equal time intervals." Specifically, the proposed exemption would allow APS to delay the Unit 3 second Type A test until the sixth refueling outage (3R6). The Type A test would tentatively be scheduled for April of 1997, and would increase the interval between the first and second Type A test from 54 months to 71 months. The third Type A test is not being altered by this exemption request and is scheduled to be performed during the seventh refueling outage (3R7) which would coincide with the completion of the first 10-year ISI interval. This exemption request proposes an increase to the interval between the first and second Type A test but does not alter the frequency of testing (three Type A tests performed in a ten year period) during the first 10 year ISI interval. The visual inspection of the containment is not included in the proposed exemption and will be performed as originally planned during the fifth refueling outage (3R5).

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed one-time exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the results of previous Type A tests performed at the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 3. The licensee has provided an acceptable basis for concluding that the proposed one-time extension of the Type A test interval would maintain the containment leakage rates within acceptable limits. Accordingly, the Commission has concluded that the one-time extension does not result in a significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released nor does it result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption only involves Type A testing on the containment. 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 exemption.

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 not result in any change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

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 exemption.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in the "Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3," dated February 1982.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 17, 1995, the staff consulted with the Arizona State official, Mr. William Wright of the Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency, 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 exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated June 21, 1995, 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 Phoenix

Public Library, 1221 N. Central, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Charles R. Thomas,

Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-20113 Filed 8-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278]

Peco Energy Company Public Service Electric and Gas Company; Delmarva Power and Light Company; Atlantic City Electric Company; 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 an amendment 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 the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Units 2 and 3, located at the licensee's site in York County, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed amendment will replace the existing PBAPS Technical Specifications (TS) in their entirety with Improved Technical Specifications (ITS). The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated September 29, 1994 as supplemented by letters dated March 3, March 30, May 4 (two letters), May 8, May 9, May 16, May 24, May 25, May 26, June 7, July 7, July 13 and July 21, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

It has been recognized that nuclear safety in all plants would benefit from improvement and standardization of TS. The "NRC Interim Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors," (52 FR 3788, February 6, 1987) and later the Final Policy Statement (58 FR 39132, July 22, 1993), formalized this need. To facilitate the development of individual ITS, each reactor vendor owners group (OG) and the NRC staff developed standard TS (STS). For General Electric (GE) plants, the STS are NUREG-1433 for BWR/4 reactor facilities and NUREG-1434 for BWR/6 facilities.

NUREG-1433 formed the basis of the PBAPS ITS. The NRC Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR) reviewed the STS and made note of the safety merits of the STS and indicated its support of conversion to the STS by operating plants.

Description of the Proposed Change

The proposed revision to the TS is based on NUREG-1433 and on guidance provided in the Policy Statement. Its objective is to completely rewrite, reformat, and streamline the existing TS. Emphasis is placed on human factors principles to improve clarity and understanding. The Bases section has been significantly expanded to clarify and better explain the purpose and foundation of each specification. In addition to NUREG-1433, portions of the existing TS were also used as the basis for the ITS. Plant-specific issues (unique design features, requirements, and operating practices) were discussed at length with the licensee, and generic matters with the OGS.

The proposed changes from the existing TS can be grouped into four general categories, as follows:

1. Non-technical (administrative) changes, which were intended to make the ITS easier to use for plant operations personnel. They are purely editorial in nature or involve the movement or reformatting of requirements without affecting technical content. Every section of the PBAPS TS has undergone these types of changes. In order to ensure consistency, the NRC staff and the licensee have used NUREG-1433 as guidance to reformat and make other administrative changes.

2. Relocation of requirements, which includes items that were in the existing PBAPS TS but did not meet the criteria set forth in the Policy Statement for inclusion in the TS. In general, the proposed relocation of items in the PBAPS TS to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), appropriate plant-specific programs, procedures and ITS Bases follows the guidance of the BWR/4 STS, NUREG-1433. Once these items have been relocated by removing them from the TS to other licensee-controlled documents, the licensee may revise them under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC staff-approved control mechanisms which provide appropriate procedural means to control changes.

3. More restrictive requirements, which consist of proposed PBAPS ITS items that are either more conservative than corresponding requirements in the existing PBAPS TS, or are additional restrictions which are not in the existing PBAPS TS but are contained in

NUREG-1433. Examples of more restrictive requirements include: placing a Limiting Condition of Operation (LCO) on plant equipment that is not required by the present TS to be operable; more restrictive requirements to restore inoperable equipment; and more restrictive surveillance requirements.

4. Less restrictive requirements, which are relaxations of corresponding requirements in the existing PBAPS TS which provided little or no safety benefit and placed unnecessary burden on the licensee. These relaxations were the result of generic NRC action or other analyses. They have been justified on a case-by-case basis for PBAPS as described in the staff's draft Safety Evaluation which was issued on July 20, 1995. The staff will issue a final Safety Evaluation with the license amendment, which will be noticed in the **Federal Register**.

In addition to the changes described above, the licensee proposed certain changes to the existing technical specifications that deviated from the standard technical specifications in NUREG-1433. Each of these additional proposed changes is described in the licensee's application and in the staff's Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing (60 FR 26905). These changes have been justified on a case-by-case basis for PBAPS as described in the staff's draft Safety Evaluation which was issued on July 20, 1995. The staff will issue a final Safety Evaluation with the license amendment, which will be noticed in the **Federal Register**.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the TS. Changes that are administrative in nature have been found to have no effect on technical content of the TS, and are acceptable. The increased clarity and understanding these changes bring to the TS are expected to improve the operator's control of the plant in normal and accident conditions.

Relocation of requirements to other licensee-controlled documents does not change the requirements themselves. Future changes to these requirements may be made by the licensee under 10 CFR 50.59 or other NRC-approved control mechanisms, which ensures continued maintenance of adequate requirements. All such relocations have been found to be in conformance with the guidelines of NUREG-1433 and the Policy Statement, and, therefore, to be acceptable.

Changes involving more restrictive requirements have been found to be acceptable.

Changes involving less restrictive requirements have been reviewed individually. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit or to place unnecessary burden on the licensee, their removal from the TS was justified. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of a generic NRC action, or of agreements reached during discussions with the OG and found to be acceptable for PBAPS. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1433 as well as proposed deviations from NUREG-1433 have also been reviewed by the NRC staff and have been found to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposed revision to the TS was found to provide control of plant operations such that reasonable assurance will be provided that the health and safety of the public will be adequately protected.

These TS changes will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluent that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed TS amendment.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed amendment involves features located entirely within the restricted areas as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed amendment, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the amendment would be to deny the amendment request. Such action would not enhance the protection of the environment.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not considered previously 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 April 19, 1995, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. Stan Maingi of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, Bureau of Radiation Protection, 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 amendment.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated September 29, 1994 and supplemental letters dated March 3, March 30, May 4 (two letters), May 8, May 9, May 16, May 24, May 25, May 26, June 7, July 7, July 13 and July 21, 1995. These letters are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555, 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 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 8th 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. 95-20120 Filed 8-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-287 and 50-388]

Pennsylvania Power & Light Company; Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of no Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections II.H.4, III.C.2, and III.C.3, for Facility Operating Licenses No. NPF-14 and NPF-22 respectively, issued to Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Susquehanna Steam Electric

Station (SSES), Units 1 and 2, located in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant an exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections II.H.4, III.C.2, and III.C.3 for SSES, Units 1 and 2, in conjunction with the removal of the main steam isolation valve (MSIV) leakage control system (LCS) and the proposed use of an alternative pathway.

Appendix J, Sections II.H.4 and III.C.2 of 10 CFR Part 50, require leak rate testing of MSIVs at the calculated peak containment pressure related to the design basis accident, and Section III.C.3 of Appendix J requires that the measured MSIV leak rates be included in the combined local leak rate test results. The proposed deletion of the MSIV LCS and proposed use of an alternate leakage pathway affects the description of an existing exemption (NUREG-0776) which allows the leak rate testing of the MSIVs at a reduced pressure and allows the exclusion of the measured MSIV leakage from the combined local leak rate test results.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated February 21, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption is similar to the current exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections II.H.4, III.C.2. The exemption is needed since the design of the MSIVs is such that testing in the reverse direction tends to unseat the MSIV and would result in a meaningless test. The total observed MSIV leak rate resulting from a leakage test where two MSIVs on one steam line are tested utilizing a reduced pressure (22.5 psig) will continue to be assigned to the penetration. The proposed exemption is also similar to the current exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.C.3. The licensee proposes that the MSIV leakage rate will continue to be accounted for separately in the radiological site analysis in accordance with the existing exemption. However, the existing exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.C.3 will not be applicable when the MSIV LCS is replaced with an Alternate Treatment Path (ATP) (Main steam lines and condenser).

The proposed action regarding the TS amendment will reduce the need for repairs of the MSIVs, resolve concerns associated with the current LCS performance capability at high MSIV leakage rates, and provide an effective method for dealing with a potential

MSIV leakage during a postulated loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). Many boiling water reactors have difficulty meeting their MSIV leakage rate limits. Extensive repair, rework, and retesting efforts have negative effects on the outage costs and schedules, as well as significant impact on the licensee's as low as it is reasonable achievable (ALARA) radiological exposure programs. The alternatives proposed by the licensee to deal with the MSIV leakage make use of components (main steam lines and condenser) that are expected to remain intact and serviceable following a design basis LOCA.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that this 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 offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Regarding the exemption, the MSIV leakage, along with the containment leakage is used to calculate the maximum radiological consequences of a design basis accident. Section 15.6.5 of the SSES Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) identifies that standard and conservative assumptions have been used to calculate the offsite and control room doses, including the doses due to MSIV leakage, which could potentially result from a postulated LOCA. Further, the control room and offsite doses resulting from a postulated LOCA have recently been recalculated using currently accepted assumptions and methods. These analyses have demonstrated that the total leakage rate of 300 scfh results in dose exposures for the control room and offsite that remain within the requirements of 10 CFR Part 100 for offsite doses and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, for the control room doses.

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