

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**Phillip F. McKee,**  
*Director, Project Directorate I-3, Division of  
Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear  
Reactor Regulation.*  
[FR Doc. 95-13977 Filed 6-6-95; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323]:

**Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power 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 amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82, issued to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in San Luis Obispo County, California.

**Environmental Assessment**

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would allow the storage of fuel in new and spent fuel racks with enrichments up to and including 5.0 weight percent U-235, would clarify that substitution of fuel rods with filler rods is acceptable for fuel designs that have been analyzed with applicable NRC-approved codes and methods, and would allow the use of ZIRLO fuel cladding in the future in addition to Zircaloy-4. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated February 6, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated March 23, and May 22, 1995.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed so that the licensee can use higher fuel enrichment to provide the flexibility of extending the fuel irradiation and to permit future operation with longer fuel cycles.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revisions to the technical specifications. The proposed revisions would permit storage of fuel enriched to a nominal 5.0 weight percent Uranium 235. The safety considerations associated with storing new and spent fuel of a higher enrichment have been evaluated by the NRC staff. The staff has concluded that such changes would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed changes have no adverse effect on the probability of

any accident. No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment fuel and extended irradiation (an enveloping case for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant since burnup remains unchanged) were published and discussed in the staff assessment entitled, "NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation," dated July 7, 1988, and published in the **Federal Register** (53 FR 30355) on August 11, 1988, as corrected on August 24, 1988 (53 FR 32322) in connection with Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of the proposed increase in the fuel enrichment and irradiation limits are either unchanged or may, in fact, be reduced from those summarized in Table S-4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c). Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environment impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts of reactor operation with higher enrichment, the proposed action involves 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.

*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 Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 22, 1995, the staff consulted with the California State official, Mr. Steve Hsu of the Department of Health Services, 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 February 6, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated March 23, and May 22, 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 the California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**William H. Bateman,**

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

[FR Doc. 95-13976 Filed 6-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

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

**PECO Energy Company; Notice of  
Consideration of Issuance of  
Amendment to Facility Operating  
License and Opportunity for a Hearing**

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 (the licensee) for operation of the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, located at York County, Pennsylvania.

The proposed amendment would revise the technical specification (TS) limiting condition for operation (LCO) for the Peach Bottom emergency diesel generators (EDGs). The LCOs will be revised to allow a single EDG to be out of service for a period of 30 days