(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 occupation 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.