Literal compliance with the FSAR update schedule of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) would result in an FSAR update which would be incomplete and not adequately reflect the actual design of the facility.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action to allow the licensee an additional 6 months to update the IP3 FSAR is administrative in nature. The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the probability or consequences of accidents will not increase, 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 action is administrative in nature and involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. 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. However, as an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action considered are the same.

*Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the ''Final Environmental Statement for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Station Unit No. 3,'' dated February 1975.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on August 17, 1995, the staff consulted with the New York State official, Jack Spath of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, 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 letter dated June 20, 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 White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of September 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ledyard B. Marsh,

*Director, Project Directorate I–1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95–23177 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

## Application for a License To Export a Utilization Facility

Pursuant to 10 CFR 110.70(b) ''Public notice of receipt of an application'', please take notice that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has received the following application for an export license. Copies of the application are on file in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Public Document Room located at 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC.

A request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene may be filed within 30 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register. Any request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene shall be served by the requestor or petitioner upon the applicant, the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555; the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and the Executive Secretary, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

In its review of the application for a license to export a utilization facility as defined in 10 CFR Part 110 and noticed herein, the Commission does not evaluate the health, safety or environmental effects in the recipient nation of the facility to be exported. The information concerning this application follows:

| Name of applicant | ABB Combustion Engineering., Inc. | Description of facility | End use |
|---|---|---|---|
| Date of Application | 10 August 1995 | 2 (Two) Nuclear Power Reactors/ 1000 MWe (ea) pressurized water reactors/Ulchin units 5 & 6. | Commercial Generation of Electricity. |
| Date Received | 15 August 1995 | | |
| Application Number | XR 163 | | |
| Country of Destination | Republic of Korea | | |

Dated this 7th day of September 1995 at Rockville, Maryland.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ronald D. Hauber,

*Director, Division of Nonproliferation, Exports and Multilateral Relations, Office of International Programs.*

[FR Doc. 95–23180 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–M**

## Generic Letter 88–20, Supplement 5, Individual Plant Examination of External Events for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of issuance.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued Generic Letter 88–20, Supplement 5 to (1) notify all holders of operating licenses (except those licenses that have been amended to possession-only status) or construction permits for nuclear power reactors of modifications in the recommended scope of seismic reviews that are performed as part of individual plant examinations of external events (IPEEE) for the focused-scope and full-

scope plants and (2) provide guidance to licensees who wish to voluntarily modify their previously committed seismic IPEEE programs. This generic letter will be made available in the NRC Public Document Room. The information that was sent to the Committee to Review Generic Requirements, including the resolution of public comments received on this generic letter, will be made available in the NRC Public Document Room. This generic letter is also discussed in Commission information paper SECY–95–213 which will made available in the NRC Public Document Room.

**DATES:** The generic letter was issued on September 8, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Not Applicable.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John T. Chen (301) 415–6549.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** None.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 11th day of September, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Alfred E. Chaffee,

*Chief, Events Assessment and Generic Communications Branch, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95–23175 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–M**

---

**[Docket No. 50–278]**

## PECO Energy Co.; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–56, issued to PECO Energy Company, et al., (the licensee), for operation of the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 3, located in York County, Pennsylvania.

The proposed amendment would delete License Condition 2.C(5) from Facility Operating License DPR–56 which restricts power levels to no less than seventy percent in the coastdown condition.

The amendment is being proposed on a exigent basis in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6). On August 29, 1995, the licensee discovered that it was operating at sixty-two percent power in the coastdown condition in violation of License Condition 2.C(5). On August 30, 1995, in order to avoid an unwarranted plant shutdown, the licensee requested enforcement condition for this violation until such time as the staff could process a permanent change to the facility operating license that would delete License Condition 2.C(5). The NRC staff authorized enforcement discretion verbally on August 30, 1995 and in writing on September 1, 1995, by letter to Mr. George Hunger, PECO Energy Company. The amendment is being considered on an exigent basis in order to minimize the length of time the licensee is operating in violation of License Condition 2.C(5).

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6) for amendments to be granted under exigent circumstances, the NRC staff must determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

Deletion of License Condition 2.C(5) is an administrative change that will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated. This license condition is more appropriately controlled by other licensing bases documents, which include the NRC approved GESTAR II analyses and the cycle specific reload licensing reports, and should not be part of the FOL. Accidentally, this FOL change will not alter any safety limits which ensure the integrity of fuel barriers, and will not result in any increase to onsite or offsite dose.

No physical changes are being made to the plant, nor are there any changes being made in the operation of the plant as a result of this change which could involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated. Additionally, this change will not alter the operation of equipment assumed to be available for the mitigation of accidents or transients.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Deletion of License Condition 2.C(5) is an administrative change that will not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any previously evaluated. Deletion of License Condition 2.C(5) is an administrative change that will not involve any changes to plant systems, structures or components (SCCs) which could act as new accident initiators. This change will not impact the manner in which SSCs are tested such that a new or different type of accident from any previously evaluated could be created.

3. The proposed change does not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

No margins of safety are reduced as a result of the proposed deletion of License Condition 2.C(5). No safety limits will be changed as a result of this change. The proposed change does not involve a reduction in the margin of safety because this change is an administrative change which will not impact core limits or any other parameters that are used in the mitigation of a UFSAR design basis accident or transient. The change to the FOL does not introduce any hardware changes, and will not alter the intended operation of plant structures, systems or components utilized in the mitigation of UFSAR design basis accidents or transients. Additionally, this change will not introduce any new failure modes of plant equipment not previously evaluated.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 15 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 15-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period, such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 15-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of