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 7day maximum EDG AOT in the current TS precludes the performance of certain major beneficial maintenance activities