property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1–(800) 248–5100 (in Missouri 1–(800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Frederick J. Hebdon: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to General Council, Tennessee Valley Authority, ET 11H, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 6, 1995, which was superseded by the application dated August 7, 1995, 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 local public document room located at the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1101 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David E. LaBarge,

Sr. Project Manager, Project Directorate II–3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–20119 Filed 8–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. STN 50–530]

Arizona Public Service Company, et al.; Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of no Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), Type A Tests, to the Arizona Public Service Company, et al. (APS or the licensee), for operation of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (PVNGS), Unit No. 3, located in Maricopa County, Arizona.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), on a one-time schedular extension which would permit rescheduling the second containment integrated leak rate test (ILRT) in the first 10-year service period from the fifth refueling outage (3R5) currently scheduled for November 1995 to the sixth refueling outage (3R6) planned for April 1997.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated June 21, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The current ILRT requirements for PVNGS, Unit 3, as set forth in Appendix J, are that, after the pre-operational leak rate test, a set of three Type A tests must be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year period. Also, the third test of each set must be conducted when the plant is shut down for the 10-year plant inservice inspection (ISI). The first periodic Type A test was performed in May of 1991 during the second refueling outage in Unit 3 (3R2), 40 months from the date of Unit 3 commercial operation. The second periodic test is currently scheduled to be performed in November of 1995 during the fifth refueling outage (3R5), corresponding to an interval of 54 months. The third Type A test is currently planned to be performed during the seventh refueling outage

(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.