DCR 016

Dockets Nos. 50-277
and 50-278

February 24, 1984

Distribution

Docket File	RDigggs
NRC PDR	GGears
L PDR	RIngram
ORB#4 Rdg	Gray Files +4
AEOD	KEccleston
LHarmon-2	WJohnston
ACRS-10	ASLB
TBarnhart-8	
LSchneider	
OGC	
OPA	
DBrinkman	

Mr. Edward G. Bauer, Jr.
Vice President and General
Counsel
Philadelphia Electric Company
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Dear Mr. Bauer

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendments Nos. 92 and 94 to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56 for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3. These amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications in partial response to your application transmitted by letter dated February 14, 1983, and subsequent discussions between the NRC staff and your staff. These changes have been discussed with and agreed to by members of your staff.

These amendments delete certain Appendix B Environmental Technical Specifications (ETS) which pertain to noise monitoring requirements and nonradiological water quality-related requirements, as required by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. Those requested changes to the ETS relating to radiological requirements are currently under review by the NRC staff. We expect short-term action on these requests.

Your basis for the requested deletion of water quality limits and monitoring programs is that these aquatic requirements are now under the jurisdiction of the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as established by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. Therefore, water quality conditions in existing reactor operating licenses should be removed as a matter of law where the licensee holds, as you do, an effective National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

Except for the requirements relating to thermal discharges, we concur in the deletion of the aquatic requirements and will rely on the NPDES permit system which is administered by EPA for the regulation and protection of the aquatic environment. Action with respect to changes in technical specifications relating to thermal discharges is held in abeyance pending the NPDES 316 proceeding and litigation.

8403070137 840224
PDR ADOCK 05000277
P PDR

The NRC staff wishes to remain informed about any changes in your NPDES permit and any violations of this permit. Accordingly, as discussed with your staff, you have agreed to provide NRC with a copy of any changes to the NPDES discharge permit and any permit violations requiring notification to the permitting agency at the time this information is reported to or received from the permitting agency. This information is to be submitted to the appropriate Regional Administrator with a copy to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. Please confirm this commitment in writing within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

We have determined that the deletion of the water quality requirements is a ministerial action required as a matter of law and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that this action is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4) that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this action.

We have also found that the proposed changes to ETS Sections 2.3 and 3.3 involving noise monitoring will not result in significant environmental impact nor will they result in impacts not evaluated by the NRC staff in the Final Environmental Statement for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3. An Environmental Impact Appraisal addressing these proposed ETS deletions is also enclosed.

Since the amendments apply only to deletion of noise monitoring and water quality requirements, we have concluded that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's Monthly Notice.

Sincerely,

original signed by

John F. Stolz, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 4
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 92 to DPR-44
2. Amendment No. 94 to DPR-56
3. Environmental Impact Appraisal

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

ORB#4:DL	ORB#4:DL	ORB#4:DL
RIngram	GGearsdef	JStolz
01/13/84	01/26/84	01/26/84

ORB#2:DL	OELD	AD:NOE:DE	AD:OR:DL
KEccleston	J. GRAY	WJohnston	GLainas
01/27/84	01/8/84	01/6/84	01/29/84

with noted changes to Notice & Negative Declaration

Philadelphia Electric Company

cc w/enclosure(s):

Eugene J. Bradley
Philadelphia Electric Company
Assistant General Counsel
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Troy B. Conner, Jr.
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Regional Radiation Representative
EPA Region III
Curtis Building (Sixth Floor)
6th and Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

M. J. Cooney, Superintendent
Generation Division - Nuclear
Philadelphia Electric Company
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Thomas A. Deming, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
Department of Natural Resources
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Philadelphia Electric Company
ATTN: Mr. W. T. Ullrich
Peach Bottom Atomic
Power Station
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Albert R. Steel, Chairman
Board of Supervisors
Peach Bottom Township
R. D. #1
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Mr. R. A. Heiss, Coordinator
Pennsylvania State Clearinghouse
Governor's Office of State Planning
and Development
P. O. Box 1323
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Allen R. Blough
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
P. O. Box 399
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Mr. Ronald C. Haynes, Regional Administrator
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region I
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-277

PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 92
License No. DPR-44

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Philadelphia Electric Company, et al., (the licensee) submitted by letter dated February 14, 1983, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-44 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   Technical Specifications

   The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 92, are hereby incorporated in the license. PECO shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

8403070141 840224
PDR ADOCK 05000277
P PDR

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

John F. Stolz

John F. Stolz, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #4
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: February 24, 1984

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 92

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR- 44

DOCKET NO. 50-277

Replace the following pages of the Appendix "B" Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the area of change.

Remove	Insert
i	i
5c	5c
6	-
7	-
8	-
9	-
10	-
11	11
12	-
14	14
15	-
29	-
30	-
34	-
35	-
36	-
37	-
38	-
39	-
40	-
41	41

TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page No.
1.0	Definitions, Abbreviations and Symbols			1
1.1	Definitions			1
1.2	Abbreviations			2
1.3	Symbols			3
2.0	(Deleted)	3.0	Monitoring Requirements	5
2.1	Thermal		3.1	5
2.2	(Deleted)		3.2 (Deleted)	
2.2.1	(Deleted)		3.2.1 (Deleted)	
2.2.2	(Deleted)		3.2.2 (Deleted)	
2.2.3	(Deleted)		3.2.3 (Deleted)	
2.2.4	(Deleted)		3.2.4 (Deleted)	
2.3	(Deleted)		3.3 (Deleted)	
4.0	Report Levels	5.0	Monitoring Requirements	11
4.1	(Deleted)		5.1 (Deleted)	
4.2	(Deleted)		5.2 (Deleted)	
4.3	Radiological		5.3	13
6.0	Environmental Surveillance and Special Study Programs			14
6.1	(Deleted)			
6.2	(Deleted)			
6.3	(Deleted)			
6.4	Radiological Study Program			41
7.0	Administrative Controls			48
7.1	Organization, Review and Audit			48
7.1.1	Organization			48
7.1.2	Review and Audit			48

PROTECTION LIMITS		MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	
2.2	(Deleted)	3.2	(Deleted)
2.2.1	(Deleted)	3.2.1	(Deleted)
2.2.2	(Deleted)	3.2.2	(Deleted)
2.2.3	(Deleted)	3.2.3	(Deleted)
2.2.4	(Deleted)	3.2.4	(Deleted)
2.3	(Deleted)	3.3	(Deleted)

Note: Pages 6-10
have been deleted.
The next page is 11.

4.0	Report Levels	5.0	Monitoring Requirements
4.1	(Deleted)	5.1	(Deleted)
4.2	(Deleted)	5.2	(Deleted)

Note: Page 12 has been deleted. The next page is 13.

6.0 Environmental Surveillance and Special Study Programs

Studies described in this section will be terminated upon agreement by Philadelphia Electric Company and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that the intended purpose of the study has been satisfied.

6.1 (Deleted)

6.2 (Deleted)

6.3 (Deleted)

Note: Pages 15-40 have been deleted. The next page is 41.

6.4 Radiological Study Program

Objective

An environmental monitoring program shall be conducted to evaluate the effects of station operation on the environs and to verify the effectiveness of the source controls on radioactive materials.

Specification

The environmental radiation monitoring program shall be conducted as specified in Table 6.4-1. Milk will be analyzed for I-131 such that at the level of 0.5 picocuries per liter of milk at the time of sampling, or as close to this sensitivity as can be achieved using proven commercial techniques, the overall one sigma counting error is equal to or less than 25 percent of the activity measure.

Bases

In connection with the high temperature gas-cooled reactor (HTGR) located at the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, a pre-operational environmental radiation survey was conducted between March 1960 and February 1966, at which time this reactor first achieved criticality. The objective of the program was to acquire quantitative data on the concentration of radioactivity in environmental media in the vicinity of the reactor site prior to the operation of the HTGR facility.

The environmental radiation monitoring program carried out prior to February 1966 has continued, with minor modifications from time to time in order to acquire similar data after the initial operation of Unit No. 1. A similar program will continue after initial operation of Units 2 and 3 in order to monitor environmental radioactivity levels in the Peach Bottom area.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-278

PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 94
License No. DPR-56

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Philadelphia Electric Company, et al., (the licensee) submitted by letter dated February 14, 1983, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-56 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   Technical Specifications

   The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 94, are hereby incorporated in the license. PECO shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

John F. Stolz, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #4
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: February 24, 1984

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 94

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-56

DOCKET NO. 50-278

Replace the following pages of the Appendix "B" Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the area of change.

Remove	Insert
i	i
5c	5c
6	-
7	-
8	-
9	-
10	-
11	11
12	-
14	14
15	-
29	-
30	-
34	-
35	-
36	-
37	-
38	-
39	-
40	-
41	41

PBAPS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page No.
1.0	Definitions, Abbreviations and Symbols			1
1.1	Definitions			1
1.2	Abbreviations			2
1.3	Symbols			3
2.0	(Deleted)	3.0	Monitoring Requirements	5
2.1	(Thermal)		3.1	5
2.2	(Deleted)		3.2 (Deleted)	
2.2.1	(Deleted)		3.2.1 (Deleted)	
2.2.2	(Deleted)		3.2.2 (Deleted)	
2.2.3	(Deleted)		3.2.3 (Deleted)	
2.2.4	(Deleted)		3.2.4 (Deleted)	
2.3	(Deleted)		3.3 (Deleted)	
4.0	Report Levels	5.0	Monitoring Requirements	11
4.1	(Deleted)		5.1 (Deleted)	
4.2	(Deleted)		5.2 (Deleted)	
4.3	Radiological		5.3	13
6.0	Environmental Surveillance and Special Study Programs			14
6.1	(Deleted)			
6.2	(Deleted)			
6.3	(Deleted)			
6.4	Radiological Study Program			41
7.0	Administrative Controls			48
7.1	Organization, Review and Audit			48
7.1.1	Organization			48
7.1.2	Review and Audit			48

Amendment No. 57, 94

PROTECTION LIMITS		MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	
2.2	(Deleted)	3.2	(Deleted)
2.2.1	(Deleted)	3.2.1	(Deleted)
2.2.2	(Deleted)	3.2.2	(Deleted)
2.2.3	(Deleted)	3.2.3	(Deleted)
2.2.4	(Deleted)	3.2.4	(Deleted)
2.3	(Deleted)	3.3	(Deleted)

Note: Pages 6-10
have been deleted.
The next page is 11.

4.0	Report Levels	5.0	Monitoring Requirements
4.1	(Deleted)	5.1	(Deleted)
4.2	(Deleted)	5.2	(Deleted)

Note: Page 12 has been deleted. The next page is 13.

6.0 Environmental Surveillance and Special Study Programs

Studies described in this section will be terminated upon agreement by Philadelphia Electric Company and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that the intended purpose of the study has been satisfied.

6.1 (Deleted)

6.2 (Deleted)

6.3 (Deleted)

Note: Pages 15-40 have been deleted. The next page is 41.

6.4 Radiological Study Program

Objective

An environmental monitoring program shall be conducted to evaluate the effects of station operation on the environs and to verify the effectiveness of the source controls on radioactive materials.

Specification

The environmental radiation monitoring program shall be conducted as specified in Table 6.4-1. Milk will be analyzed for I-131 such that at the level of 0.5 picocuries per liter of milk at the time of sampling, or as close to this sensitivity as can be achieved using proven commercial techniques, the overall one sigma counting error is equal to or less than 25 percent of the activity measure.

Bases

In connection with the high temperature gas-cooled reactor (HTGR) located at the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, a pre-operational environmental radiation survey was conducted between March 1960 and February 1966, at which time this reactor first achieved criticality. The objective of the program was to acquire quantitative data on the concentration of radioactivity in environmental media in the vicinity of the reactor site prior to the operation of the HTGR facility.

The environmental radiation monitoring program carried out prior to February 1966 has continued, with minor modifications from time to time in order to acquire similar data after the initial operation of Unit No. 1. A similar program will continue after initial operation of Units 2 and 3 in order to monitor environmental radioactivity levels in the Peach Bottom area.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NOS. 92 AND 94 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. DPR-44 AND DPR-56

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION UNITS NOS. 2 AND 3

DOCKETS NOS. 50-277 AND 50-278

I. Description of the Proposed Action

Philadelphia Electric Company (PECo) has requested changes to the Environmental Technical Specifications (ETS) for its Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3 (PECo, 1983). The licensee proposes the deletion of the sections of the ETS that require the performance of environmental noise measurements in the site vicinity. The basis for the licensee's requests are that the required measurements have been conducted and that examination of the results indicates that no unacceptable environmental impacts have occurred due to noise from the units during their operation. Those Unit 2 and Unit 3 ETS sections covered by this appraisal are Environmental Protection Limit 2.3 Noise and Monitoring Requirement 3.3 Noise.

Sections 2.3 require that noise levels at the southeast land site boundary not exceed 45dBA while three cooling towers are in operation and that the noise level at the northwest site boundary not exceed 60dBA due to the operation of the transformers in the north substation. Sections 3.3 require the licensee to conduct noise measurements four times a year during the first year of one unit operation and twice a year for the first year of two unit operation. Noise measurements are to be taken at locations on the land site boundary specified in the licensee's noise impact assessment in the ER-OL (PECo, 1972).

8403070144 840224
PDR ADOCK 05000277
P PDR

II. Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

ER-OL and FES Assessment of Impacts

In the licensee's Environmental Report, Operating License stage (PECO, 1972) noise levels from the station transformers and the station cooling towers at the site boundaries and at locations across the Susquehanna River were estimated, based on their manufacturer's specified noise rating (Section 4.2.1). These noise levels were compared with the acceptability criteria contained in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Criteria Guideline for Non-Aircraft Noise (HUD, 1971). The estimated noise levels were all found to be within the range specified by HUD to be "Clearly Acceptable" or "Normally Acceptable". The noise sensitive land uses identified by the licensee near the site consisted of private and company owned residences. No schools or hospitals were identified in the site vicinity.

The Final Environmental Statement related to operation (FES-OL) of Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3 (USAEC, 1973) discussed the potential impacts offsite due to noise generated by the station during operation (Section V.A). In addition to summarizing the relationship between the HUD criteria and the licensee's predicted offsite noise levels, it was concluded that:

a. Noise levels from the station transformers and the three cooling towers are typically on the order of 65dBA to 75dBA at a distance of 30m (100 ft) from the tower base or transformer location.

b. These noise levels may affect the enjoyment of fishing near the plant site.

c. Noise from the cooling towers during their operation may be objectionable to people in nearby boats (PBAPS FES-OL Conclusion 3).

Evaluation of Observed Impacts

The licensee has conducted six surveys to determine the noise levels from operation of the station cooling towers and transformers. These surveys, designated Surveillance Test ST 7.8.1 Noise Level Measurements, were conducted quarterly beginning on July 25, 1974 and concluding on October 27, 1975 (PECo, 1983a). In all, six surveys were conducted. Each survey involved the measurement and recording of the "A" weighted noise level at each of three specified locations; the comparison of the measured levels with limits given in the ETS; and the reporting of the results to the licensee's Shift Supervisor. Prerequisites for the conduct all of the tests included the following:

a. calibration of the sound level meter,

b. notation of which cooling towers are in service, and

c. notation that the north substation (with transformers) is operating normally.

The surveys were conducted using a sound level meter that meets the requirements of American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standard S.14-1971 "Sound Level Meters".

The noise level measurement locations in the surveys were as follows:

A1 - 1800 feet south of "C" cooling tower, between the discharge structure and "C" cooling tower.

A2 - South of "C" cooling tower, near the discharge structure.

B - North-west of North substation, 500 feet west of #3 startup transformer.

Examination of the noise level survey data sheets indicates that three station cooling towers were in operation for all but the last survey (only one tower was in service during the last survey) and the north substation was in operation during all of the six of the surveys. Station power level varied from survey to survey, but this factor would not be expected to influence the results because the cooling towers and the transformer at the north substation constitute the major noise generators from the standpoint of offsite audibility. The noise survey results are shown on the attached table. The values shown present the broadland noise at the locations shown.

The measured noise levels at points A1 and A2 did not exceed the maximum allowable value set by the ETS. The values recorded also did not vary significantly between surveys when three cooling

towers were in service. This would be expected for measurement locations where the cooling tower noise represent the major component of the noise measured, because of the constant nature of the noise generated by continually operating power plant cooling towers. Measurement of broadband noise (as done by the licensee for the cooling tower noise monitoring locations) is acceptable because cooling towers typically lack tonal components in their noise spectra. Subsequent to the establishment of these ETS, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published "identified levels" of environmental noise that would not cause harm to public health and welfare, which would not cause speech, sleep or activity interference and which would be expected to cause little if any annoyance (EPA, 1974). For outside residential and farm space, this identified level has been established at 55dBA, expressed as a day-night equivalent sound level L_{dn}.* (Subsequent to the publication of these identified noise levels, HUD revised its criteria for exterior environmental noise levels at Federally funded residential projects to adopt the EPA sponsored values as a goal (24 CFR Part 51)).

---

* The day-night equivalent sound level is the value of constant and continuous noise that would deliver the same sound energy to a specified receptor location over a twenty four hour period that the actually experienced time varying noise would deliver to that location, with a ten decibel penalty added to the noise level for the 10pm to 7am time period.

Assuming constant and continuous operation of the station cooling towers at the highest recorded noise level of the licensee's surveys (i.e., 45dBA), the L_{dn} for receptor location A1 or A2 would be about 51.4 dBA. Adverse impacts offsite in the vicinity of these receptor locations due to this level of cooling tower noise would, therefore, not be expected, using the EPA identified level as a criterion.

The results of broadband noise measurement surveys at location B, near the transformer in the north substation, show noise levels consistently below the ETS limit of 60dBA. However, conversion of the recorded broadband data to day-night equivalent sound levels on bases similar to that used for the cooling towers provided mixed results with respect to the EPA identified level of 55dBA; three of the survey readings yield values above this level, with the remaining three survey readings yielding values at or below the identified level. The higher noise levels at location B were recorded during the late autumn and winter time periods, when tree foliage is at a minimum. Offsite outdoor activity at residences near this portion of the site could also be expected to be at a minimum during these times as well.

Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Noise Level Survey Results

Measurement Pt.	Measured Noise Level, dBA during Surveys dated: 7/24	10/74	2/75	4/75	7/75	10/75	ETS Limit, dBA
A1	45	<45	45	44	43	40	45
A2	43	<45	45	42	45	37	45
B	45	56.6	52	49	41	53	60

Source: PECo, 1983

Conclusion

The noise surveys conducted by the licensee met the specifications of the ETS. The noise levels recorded indicate that cooling tower noise would not be expected to cause activity interference or annoyance and that noise levels near the site boundary in the vicinity of the north substation and transformer similarly indicate no adverse effect during the time of year when foliage is present. Other analyses useful in assessing the likelihood for noise related adverse impacts on the offsite environment include measurement of ambient broadband offsite noise levels for comparison with the operational noise levels and measurement of octave band noise levels for the ambient and operational offsite environment in the vicinity of the switchyard and transformer (these latter measurements would permit the identification of tonal components of transformer noise which have a greater potential for annoyance). While these specific measurements were not required by the ETS and, therefore, were not performed, the effects on the nearby offsite environment of the noise from operation of the station are indicated in the licensee's statement that there have been no complaints made to the station by members of the public since Units 2 and 3 have begun commercial operation (PECo, 1983a).

III. Conclusion and Basis for Negative Declaration

On the basis of the foregoing analysis, the staff concludes that there will be no environmental impact attributable to the proposed action. The changes assessed herein are to the environmental

monitoring programs and do not involve any change in station design or operation or involve an increase in effluent types or quantities. The impact of the overall station operation has already been predicted and described in the Commission's FES for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Units 2 and 3. This environmental impact appraisal has not revealed impacts greater than those previously anticipated. On this basis and in accordance with CFR Title 10, Part 51.5, the Commission concludes that no environmental impact statement for the proposed action need be prepared and that a negative declaration to this effect is appropriate.

Dated: February 24, 1984

The following NRC personnel contributed to this Environmental Impact Appraisal: John Lehr.

References

Letter dated February 14, 1983 from E. J. Bradley, Philadelphia Electric Company; to H. R. Denton, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, USNRC; 1 page plus application for ammendment of Facility Operating License DPR-44 and DPR-56.

Philadelphia Electric Company; Applicant's Environmental Report - Operating License State Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Units 2 and 3 Supplement No. 3; June, 1972.

U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Circular 1390.2; Noise Abatement and Control: Department Policy, Implementation Responsibilities and Standards Change 1; August, 1971.

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission; Final Environmental Statement related to operation of Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Units 2 and 3; Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278; April, 1973.

Letter dated July 8, 1983a from W. M. Alden, Engineer-in-Charge Licensing Section Nuclear Generation Division, Philadelphia Electric Company; to Gerald E. Gears, Project Manager, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; 1 page plus data sheets from Six noise Level Measurement Surviellance Tests, dated July 25, 1974, October 29, 1974, February 24, 1975, April 30, 1975, July 22, 1975 and October 27, 1975.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency; Information On Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety; Report No. 550/9-74; March, 1974.