

August 8, 1995

Mr. George A. Hunger, Jr.
Director-Licensing, MC 62A-1
PECO Energy Company
Nuclear Group Headquarters
Correspondence Control Desk
P.O. Box No. 195
Wayne, PA 19087-0195

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT,
RELATED TO IMPROVED TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS, PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC
POWER STATION, UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3 (TAC NOS. M90746 AND M90747)

Dear Mr. Hunger:

An environmental assessment was prepared in response to your application for license amendment 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 proposed amendment adopts improved technical specifications (TS) for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, based on NUREG-1433 and the existing Peach Bottom TS.

We have enclosed a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for this proposed amendment which is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,
/s/

Joseph W. Shea, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-277
and 50-278

Enclosure: Environmental Assessment

cc w/enclosure: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File	JStolz	ACRS(4)
PUBLIC	JShea	NGilles
PDI-2 Reading	MO'Brien	CGrimes
SVarga	OGC	CAnderson, RGN-I

* Previous Concurrence

OFFICE	PDI-2/IA	PDI-2/PM	OTSB *	OGC	PDI-2/D
NAME	MO'Brien	JShea	CGrimes	APH	JStolz
DATE	8/1/95	8/1/95	07/31/95	8/07/95	8/18/95

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\SHEA\PEACH\PBITSAMD.EA

9508290135 950808
PDR ADDOCK 05000277
P PDR

MRC FILE CENTER COPY

CP-1
DFO-1



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

August 8, 1995

Mr. George A. Hunger, Jr.
Director-Licensing, MC 62A-1
PECO Energy Company
Nuclear Group Headquarters
Correspondence Control Desk
P.O. Box No. 195
Wayne, PA 19087-0195

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT,
RELATED TO IMPROVED TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS, PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC
POWER STATION, UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3 (TAC NOS. M90746 AND M90747)

Dear Mr. Hunger:

An environmental assessment was prepared in response to your application for license amendment 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 proposed amendment adopts improved technical specifications (TS) for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, based on NUREG-1433 and the existing Peach Bottom TS.

We have enclosed a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for this proposed amendment which is being forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph W. Shea".

Joseph W. Shea, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-277
and 50-278

Enclosure: Environmental Assessment

cc w/enclosure: See next page

Mr. George A. Hunger, Jr.
PECO Energy Company

Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station,
Units 2 and 3

cc:

J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire
Sr. V.P. & General Counsel
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S26-1
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Mr. Rich R. Janati, Chief
Division of Nuclear Safety
Pennsylvania Department of
Environmental Resources
P. O. Box 8469
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-8469

PECO Energy Company
ATTN: Mr. G. R. Rainey, Vice President
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
Route 1, Box 208
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

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

PECO Energy Company
ATTN: Regulatory Engineer, A4-5S
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
Route 1, Box 208
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Public Service Commission of Maryland
Engineering Division
Chief Engineer
6 St. Paul Centre
Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
P.O. Box 399
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Mr. Richard McLean
Power Plant and Environmental
Review Division
Department of Natural Resources
B-3, Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Dr. Judith Johnsrud
National Energy Committee
Sierra Club
433 Orlando Avenue
State College, PA 16803

Mr. Roland Fletcher
Department of Environment
201 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

A. F. Kirby, III
External Operations - Nuclear
Delmarva Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 231
Wilmington, DE 19899

Roy Denmark (5 copies)
Environmental Review Coordinator
841 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
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
DOCKET NOS. 50-277 AND 50-278
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