

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY
LIMERICK GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-352 AND 50-353
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. NPF-39 and NPF-85, issued to Philadelphia Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of the Limerick Generating Station (LGS), Units 1 and 2, located in Montgomery and Chester Counties, Pennsylvania.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Identification of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action would revise Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85 and the Technical Specifications (TSs) and the Environmental Protection Plans (EPPs) appended to Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85 for LGS, Units 1 and 2. Specifically, the proposed action would amend the licenses to reflect the change in the licensee's name from Philadelphia Electric Company to PECO Energy Company.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated February 25, 1997, as supplemented September 8 and November 18, 1997, and January 8 and July 2, 1998.

The Need for the Proposed Action:

The proposed action is needed to have the licenses accurately reflect the legal name of the licensee, which changed on January 1, 1994.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed changes to the licenses, and EPPs. By letter dated December 21, 1993, the Philadelphia Electric Company informed the NRC that effective January 1, 1994, it was changing its name to PECO Energy Company. PECO Energy Company was not to be a new corporation, or a successor corporation to Philadelphia Electric Company, but it was to remain and continue to be the same company with a different name. As a result, contracts, agreements, obligations, licenses, and permits relating to Philadelphia Electric Company would continue to be legal, valid, and binding with respect to PECO Energy Company. This proposed change should have no effect or impact on the regulatory obligations of the licensee under the laws and regulations administered by the Commission, or the licensee's qualifications to hold the license, and should not change in any way the business of the licensee with the Commission. There should be no change in the safety and security of the public from the name change and the applicable antitrust condition will continue to apply.

The proposed name change is administrative in nature, and will not affect plant operations. Thus, the proposed action 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 name change is administrative in nature and does not involve any physical features of the plant. Thus, 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 (no-action alternative). 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 LGS, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted:

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 23, 1998, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. David Ney, of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, 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 letters dated February 25, 1997, as supplemented September 8 and November 18, 1997, and January 8 and July 2, 1998, 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 Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of October 1998.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Bartholomew C. Buckley
Bartholomew C. Buckley, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects - VII
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation