MAR 5 1985

Docket No.: STN 50-454

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar
Director of Nuclear Licensing
Commonwealth Edison Company
Post Office Box 767
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Mr. Farrar:

Subject: Federal Register Monthly Notices - Byron Station, Unit 1

A copy of the NRC's Monthly Notice for applications and amendments to operating licenses involving no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 1985 is enclosed for your use. Page 8024 of this publication contains the notice of issuance of Amendment No. 1 to License NPF-37.

Sincerely,

/s/

B. J. Youngblood, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: See next page

CONCURRENCES:

DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1
MRushbrook:es	LOlshan	BJYoungblood
3/5/85	3/5/85	3/5/85

DIST:
Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
PRC System
NSIC
LB#1 Rdg
MRushbrook
LOLshan
OELD, Attorney
ACRS (16)
JPartlow
BGrimes
EJordan

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

MAR 5 1985

Docket No.: STN 50-454

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar
Director of Nuclear Licensing
Commonwealth Edison Company
Post Office Box 767
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Mr. Farrar:

Subject: Federal Register Monthly Notices - Byron Station, Unit 1

A copy of the NRC's Monthly Notice for applications and amendments to operating licenses involving no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 1985 is enclosed for your use. Page 8024 of this publication contains the notice of issuance of Amendment No. 1 to License NPF-37.

Sincerely,

B. J. Youngblood, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 1
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: See next page

BYRON

Mr. Dennis L. Farrar
Director of Nuclear Licensing
Commonwealth Edison Company
Post Office Box 767
Chicago, Illinois 60690

cc: Mr. William Kortier
Atomic Power Distribution
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Post Office Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Michael Miller
Isham, Lincoln & Beale
One First National Plaza
42nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Mrs. Phillip B. Johnson
1907 Stratford Lane
Rockford, Illinois 61107

Dr. Bruce von Zellen
Department of Biological Sciences
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 61107

Mr. Edward R. Crass
Nuclear Safeguards & Licensing
Sargent & Lundy Engineers
55 East Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Mr. Julian Hinds
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Byron/Resident Inspectors Offices
4448 German Church Road
Byron, Illinois 61010

Mr. Gary N. Wright, Manager
Nuclear Facility Safety
Illinois Department of
Nuclear Safety
1035 Outer Park Drive
5th Floor
Springfield, Illinois 62704

Ms. Diane Chavez
528 Gregory Street
Rockford, Illinois 61108

Regional Administrator
U. S. NRC Region III
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Joseph Gallo, Esq.
Isham, Lincoln & Beale
Suite 840
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Douglass Cassel, Esq.
109 N. Dearborn Street
Suite 1300
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Ms. Pat Morrison
5568 Thunderidge Drive
Rockford, Illinois 61107

Ms. Lorraine Creek
Rt. 1, Box 182
Manteno, Illinois 60950

Conditions, copies of which may be requested from the NSF Forms and Publications Unit.

Because of the nature of some precollege projects, proposers may wish to familiarize themselves with NSF policy in two particular areas:

- Where educational materials are outcomes, the GSER should be consulted with respect to inventions, software, and copyrights.
- Where precollege students are to be involved in research or in the development of materials, awards are subject to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1869 (a) and (b) ("Myers Amendment" and "Dornan Amendment"). These provisions of law require appropriate grantee coordination with parents, guardians, and school district officials.

The awardee is wholly responsible for the conduct of the project, including the research and development of materials and the preparation of project results for publication. The Foundation does not assume responsibility for such findings or their interpretation, but expects an acknowledgement of its support in all published materials resulting from funding projects.

VI. Inquiries

Questions not addressed in this publication may be directed to the NSF staff by writing to:

Division of Materials Development and Research, Directorate for Science and Engineering Education, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Dated: February 22, 1985.

Alan I. Leshner,

Acting Division Director, Materials Development and Research.

[FR Doc. 85-4751 Filed 2-26-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Monthly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law (Pub. L.) 97-415, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is publishing its regular monthly notice. Pub. L. 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This monthly notice includes all amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, since the date of publication of the last monthly notice which was published on January 23, 1985 (50 FR 3047) through February 15, 1985.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve 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 amendments 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. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination. The Commission will not normally make a final determination unless it receives a request for a hearing.

Comments should be addressed to the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch.

By March 29, 1985, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's 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 fifteen (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 fifteen (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, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. 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.

If the final determination is that the amendment involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-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 30-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 before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

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, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (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 (800) 325–6000 (in Missouri (800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to *(Branch Chief):* 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 Executive Legal Director, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to the 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 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petitioner has made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be 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 which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50–293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth, Massachusetts

Date of amendment request: December 6, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications to reduce the permitted oxygen concentration level in the primary containment from a maximum of 5% to a maximum of 4%.

On May 8, 1984, NRC issued Generic Letter 84–09 which concluded that recombiner capability is not required in BWR plants with Mark I containment for which notices on the construction permits were published before November 5, 1970, if certain criteria were met. The criteria enumerated were as follows: (1) The plant has Technical Specifications (limiting conditions for operation, LCO) requiring that the containment atmosphere be less than four percent oxygen when the containment is required to be inerted, and (2) the plant has only nitrogen or recycled containment atmosphere for use in all pneumatic control systems within containment, and (3) there are no potential sources of oxygen in containment other than that resulting from radiolysis of the reactor coolant.

The present Technical Specifications for Pilgrim Station provide that the oxygen concentration level be less than 5% oxygen by volume in containment during reactor power operation. In order to comply with the criteria in the Generic Letter, the LCO for this Technical Specification must be changed to a maximum of 4% oxygen by volume.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether license amendments involve significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of those not likely to involve such considerations is Example (ii) which is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: For example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The proposed change of the Technical Specifications LCO to reduce the allowable oxygen concentration level in primary containment constitutes an additional limitation on plant operation, that is consistent with Example (ii).

Since the amendment involves a proposed change that is similar to an example for which no significant hazards considerations are likely to exist, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Attorney for licensee: W. S. Stowe, Esq., Boston Edison Company, 800 Boylston Street, 36th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02199.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Carolina Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50–261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2, Darlington, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: September 19, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications from requiring the equalizing charge to be performed monthly to performing the change annually. Changing the battery charging requirements is consistent with the manufacturer's recommended interval, reduces unnecessary overcharging of cells and does not degrade the overall operation of the batteries. The decreased frequency for charging of the batteries improves the reliability of voltage sensitive equipment on the same bus in that this equipment (NBFD relays in reactor protection system) will be subjected to the voltage changes seen during charging less often.

The battery parameters will continue to be measured on a monthly basis. This provides adequate indication of battery status and the ability to identify any deterioration long before failure, as discussed in the current basis.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of its standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92 for no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples published in the Federal Register on April 6, 1983 (48

FR 14870). One of the examples of an amendment which will likely be found to not involve significant hazards considerations is a change which may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria. The attached proposed change falls within the Commission's example (vi) of a change not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration because the change is in accordance with the manufacture's recommendations, reduces unnecessary overcharging and may improve the reliability of voltage sensitive equipment on the same bus.

Therefore, on these bases, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Hartsville Memorial Library, Home and Fifth Avenues, Hartsville, South Carolina 29535.

Attorney for licensee: Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Carolina Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2, Darlington, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: December 10, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Section 6, Administrative Controls, of the Technical Specifications to: (1) Change the position of Manager-Operations and Maintenance from a single position to two positions; Manager-Operations and Manager-Maintenance; Reporting to the General Manager as prior to change; and (2) reinsert page 6.5-7 approved by Amendment 84 but inadvertently deleted by Amendment 85.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). The proposed change to station organization and the replacement of a previously approved organizational change that was deleted by error during a subsequent amendment are covered by example (i) since they are administrative in nature. The staff, therefore, proposes to determine that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Hartsville Memorial Library, Home and Fifth Avenues, Hartsville, South Carolina 29535.

Attorney for licensee: Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: February 17, 1983, as supplemented August 23, 1984.

Description of amendment request: This submittal supplements the request for amendment dated February 17, 1983 which was noticed in the Federal Register on September 21, 1983 (49 FR 43132). The changes proposed by the licensee reflected both organizational changes and changes necessitated by revisions to 10 CFR. Sections 50.54 and 50.72 of 10 CFR and a new § 50.73, revised the minimum operator staffing requirements, immediate notification requirements and the Licensee Event Reporting system, respectively.

The proposed amendment would incorporate numerous miscellaneous changes to section 6, Administrative Controls, of the Technical Specifications. This section of the Technical Specifications contains, among other things, information and descriptions concerning the licensee's management organization. The licensee proposed to modify these specifications in several places to reflect the current licensee organizations at corporate headquarters and at the station. These changes are changes in title for existing positions and the addition of a new position, Director of Nuclear Safety. In addition, specifications in response to an NRC requests are proposed to require procedures for the control of overtime for certain job classifications at the station. The licensee also proposed to clarify the applicability of the requirement to conduct retraining at two-year intervals as a result of a concern identified during an informal licensee audit. The licensee also proposed changes to specify that emergency procedure drills shall be conducted at the frequency specified in the Generating Station Emergency Plan, and to require audits of the Facility Emergency Plan and Facility Security Plan at lease once per twelve months. These changes are in response to NRC requests. Finally, a proposed change would clarify job qualification requirements for the position of radiation/chemical technician.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). These examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: (1) A purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications, correction of an error or a change in nomenclature; (2) a change that consititutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications; and (3) a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations in keeping with the regulations.

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by these examples in the following ways:

(1) Changes to the Technical Specifications have been proposed by the licensee to reflect the current licensee organization by changing the titles for certain positions. These changes do not reflect a significant change in the authority of the position, and are changes in nomenclature and are similar to example (1) above.

(2) Another change proposed which reflects the current organization is the definition and description of a newly created position, Director of Nuclear Safety. This new position has defined powers and authority that exert additional control not presently in the Technical Specifications and is thus similar to example (2) above.

(3) Another change is proposed that defines the qualificatrions and capabilities required for the position of radiation/chemical technician. These qualifications and capabilities were not previously defined in the Technical Specifications, so the change constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included therein and is thus similar to example (2) above.

(4) Other changes are proposed that clarify the requirement to conduct retraining at two-year intervals, that specify that emergency procedure drills shall be conducted at the frequency called out in the Generating Station's Emergency Plan, and that require audits of the Facility Emergency Plan and Facility Security Plan at least once per 12 months. These changes constitute additional limitations, restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications, and are thereby similar to example (2) above.

(5) Changes to requirements for minimum operator staffing, and immediate notification requirements,

and changes to the Licensee Event Reporting system are similar to example (3) above, since these are changes to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, with minor changes to facility operations.

Since each of the changes requested by the licensee can be shown to be similar to an example of a kind of change which will be considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration, the staff proposes to determine that this proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Moline Public Library, 504—17th Street, Moline, Illinois 61265.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Robert G. Fitzgibbons, Jr., Isham, Lincoln, & Beale, Three First National Plaza, Suite 5200, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50–254 and 50–265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: October 2, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The submittal requests changes in the Technical Specifications for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 to permit the use of hafnium neutron absorber material in the control rod assemblies. This change will allow NRC-approved state-of-the-art control rod designs, using other than boron carbide neutron absorber material, to be used in these units.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee's submittal of October 2, 1984 contained an evaluation of the proposed action and a basis for a proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The licensee's proposed determination is based on the following considerations.

The proposed Technical Specification changes do not represent significant changes in acceptance criteria or safety margins and all changes have been previously accepted by the NRC for other similar units, including Dresden 3.

Previous control blades used at Quad Cities and Dresden Unit 2 utilized boron carbide as the absorber material. The use of hafnium in place of, or in addition to, boron is desired to provide comparable neutron absorption characteristics while eliminating or reducing the production of helium gas. This will reduce the source of internal pressure in the control blade structure, thereby reducing material stresses and the likelihood of stress corrosion cracking. The reactivity of the hafnium-bearing control rods is sufficiently matched to ensure that their safety function (scram reactivity) is not reduced or compromised, nor will the probabilities or consequences of previously evaluated accidents be increased.

Based on the preceding discussion and review of similar approved changes at another Commonwealth Edison Unit, Dresden Unit 3, the licensee concludes that the proposed amendments will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, because the use of hafnium metal in place of boron carbide powder is to reduce the potential for corrosion and mechanical stress that would give rise to such accidents.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated; the kinds of accidents which can result from control rod malfunction have instead been reduced by the use of hafnium absorber material in place of boron carbide powder.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety; the hafnium absorber will provide neutron absorption characteristics that do not differ significantly from the provided by the boron carbide powder currently used.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's significant hazards consideration determination. The staff finds that the criteria for a no significant hazards consideration as set forth in 10 CFR 50.90 are met. The staff has, therefore, made a proposed determination that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Moline Public Library, 504—17th Street, Illinois 61265.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Robert G. Fitzgibbons, Jr., Isham, Lincoln, & Beale, Three First National Plaza, Suite 5200, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50–254 and 50–265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of amendment requests: November 27, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specification to: (1) Raise the drywell high pressure trip setpoint from 2.0 psig to 2.5 psig and (2) remove the requirement for bi-weekly main steam line isolation valve (MSIV) partial closure test.

The proposed drywell trip setpoint change would reduce the probability of spurious actuation due to instrument drift. Deletion of the bi-weekly MSIV partial closure test requirement would allow the closure to be tested monthly, consistent with the Standard Technical Specification requirement.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee's submittal of November 27, 1984 contained an evaluation of the proposed action and a basis for a proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The licensee's proposed determination is based on the following considerations.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: (vi) A change which either results in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan.

This example encompasses both of the requested changes. An increase of the high drywell pressure to 2.5 psig and deletion of the bi-weekly MSIV testing is a relaxation of the current Technical Specification limits and therefore, may be considered as a reduction of an existing safety margin. However, both proposed revisions still comply with the staff's general guidance on the drywell pressure set point and MSIV testing as described below.

In the case of the proposed 2.5 psig set point, the increase is requested in order to reduce inadvertent ECCS operation. The new operating margin between normal drywell pressure and the trip point is still within the original plant accident analysis and falls within the staff's guidance on set point margin for resolution of TMI Item II.E.4.2.5.

In the case of the deletion of the bi-weekly MSIV test, the provisions remaining in the Technical Specifications for testing the MSIVs are consistent with the BWR Standard Technical Specification as endorsed by Chapter 16 of the Standard Review Plan. Therefore, although some relaxation in surveillance frequency will occur, the remaining provisions will meet the staff's guidelines for testing of the MSIVs.

Since the application for amendment involves a proposed change that is similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists,

the licesee proposes a determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and, based on this review, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Moline Public Library, 504—17th Street Illinois 61265.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Robert G. Fitzgibbons, Jr., Isham, Lincoln, & Beale, Three First National Plaza, Suite 5200, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of amendment requests: January 3, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would change the calibration and functional test frequencies for certain specific instruments that are being modified into analog trip systems. These modifications are being made to achieve full compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.49 (Enninronmental Qualification of Electrical Equipment).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee has evaluated the proposed Technical Specification change and has determined that the change does not represent a significant hazards consideration. The licensee's proposed determination is based on the following considerations.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for making no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations include: "(vi) A change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan: for example, a change resulting from the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculational model or design method."

The licensee's proposed amendment would change the calibration and functional test frequencies for certain specific instruments that are being modified into analog trip systems. The use of analog trip units, and the acceptable intervals for their calibration and testing, has been reviewed and accepted by the NRC in their review and acceptance of General Electric Topical Report NEDO-21617-A, "Analog Transmitter/Trip Units Systems for Engineered Safeguard Sensor Trip Inputs," dated December 1978. The analog sensor transmitter channel calibration interval is less stringent than the current requirements on the existing equipment, but the proposed calibration interval falls within the interval specified in the NRC-approved Topical Report for this equipment, and is consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications as endorsed by Chapter 16, of the Standard Review Plan. Since the requested amendment is encompassed by the example (vi) of the guidance, for which no significant hazards consideration is likely to exist, the licensee has made a proposed determination that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and, based on this review, the staff has made a proposed determination that the proposed application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Moline Public Library, 504—17th Street, Moline, Illinois 61265.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Robert G. Fitzgibbons, Jr., Isham, Lincoln, & Beale, Three First National Plaza, Suite 5200, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: December 6, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed request would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to modify the control rod Power Dependent Rod Insertion Limit (PDIL) curves for the portion from 1473 to 1825 MWt.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: This change would relax slightly the restrictions on control rod positions. This change is being requested to allow greater flexibility of plant operations associated with reducing power level from full power and subsequent increasing the power level to full power. With the current curve, in particular towards the end of core life, reducing power requires boration. In returning to full power, reduction of primary system boration is required. The reduction in boration requires processing of a significant amount of primary system water. The proposed change is expected to alleviate this method of operation.

The licensee evaluated the effect of the proposed change on power distributions (DNB and LOCA kW/ft limits), shutdown margin, and ejected rod worth. Based on this evaluation the licensee concluded that all pertinent criteria are met for Cycle 13 with the revised PDIL. Specifically: (1) The steady-state minimum DNBRs in the power level range from 1473 to 1825 MWt are bounded by the results at 1825 MWt, (2) the axial offset limits are not affected by the change in the PDIL and continue to limit the allowable peak linear heat generation rate, (3) the shutdown margin was verified to be greater than 1.9% delta k/k for all points along the PDIL, (4) the revised section of the PDIL does not affect 3-loop operation since 3-loop operation is restricted to less than 65% power, and (5) the revised PDIL does not affect the maximum calculated ejected rod worths at hot zero or hot full power.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations [example (vi)] relates to a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan: For example, a change resulting from the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculational model or design method. Because the licensee's evaluation shows that all pertinent criteria are met for Cycle 13 with the revised PDIL, the proposed change falls within the category of example (vi). Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve a no significant hazards consideration determination in that it: (1) Does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident; (2) does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated; and (3) does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Local Public Document Room location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06547.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Garfield, Esquire, Day, Berry and Howard, Counselors at Law, City Place, Hartford, Connecticut 06103–3499.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Docket No. 50–247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: December 14, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed Technical Specification revision incorporates the requirements to perform augmented inservice inspection of the IP–2 reactor vessel during the second ten year inspection interval. The augmented inspection is required as a result of a flaw indication reported on the IP–2 reactor vessel during the cycle 6/7 refueling outage. It ws determined that the flaw size was within the limits of Section XI of the ASME Code requiring augmented inservice inspection. Therefore, restart of IP–2 following the refueling outrage was conditioned upon Consolidated Edison's commitment to perform augmented inservice inspection on the reactor vessel. The inspection will be performed at a frequency of three times over the next ten years.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). Such examples include changes that constitute additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The staff proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration because it consists of additional requirements not currently in the Technical Specifications.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York, 10610.

Attorney for licensee: Thomas J. Farrelly, Esq., 4 Irving Place, New York, New York 10003.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Docket No. 50–247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: December 21, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed Technical Specification revision incorporates the requirements pursuant to the Commission's Generic Letter 83–37 dated November 1, 1983 which requested all pressurized water reactor licensees to submit proposed Technical Specifications for NUREG–0737 items listed in enclosure 1 of the letter. Specifically the proposed amendment would change the IP–2 Technical Specifications to incorporate new requirements for the following: (1) Post accident sampling system, (2) noble gas effluents monitor, (3) containment high range radiation monitor, (4) containment pressure monitor, (5) containment hydrogen monitor, (6) control room habitability, and (7) containment samplying and analysis of plant effluents.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). Such examples include changes that constitute additional limitations not presently found in Technical Specifications and that make the license conform to changes in the regulations. The staff proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it consists of additional requirements not in the Technical Specifications and is submitted to conform Indian Point Unit 2 to current NRC requirements.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10610.

Attorney for licensee: Thomas J. Farrelly, Esq., 4 Irving Place, New York, New York 10003.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50–155, Big Rock Point Plant, Charlevoix County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: November 8, 1984, which supersedes previous submittals dated October 27, 1981, December 15, 1981, and December 16, 1983.

Description of amendment request: In the submittals listed above, Consumers Power Company [CPCo.] (the licensee) requested Technical Specification (TS) changes that would incorporate a description of and operating requirements for the new Stack Gas Monitoring System. This system has been installed and made operational to meet the guidance of NUREG–0737 Item II.F.1(1) "Noble Gas Effluent Monitor" and Item II.F.1(2) "Sampling and Analysis of Plant Effluents". The system provides the capability to monitor effluent release rates several orders of magnitude above normal rates for accident situations. A Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination for this proposed license amendment was published in the **Federal Register** on March 1, 1984 (49 FR 7671). However, the TSs covered by this notice were not acceptable to the NRC. On November 8, 1984, the licensee submitted revised proposed TSs which superseded the earlier submittals. The revised proposed TSs of November 8, 1984 are now under consideration by the NRC.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has made a proposed determination 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 of 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.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations relates to changes that constitute an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the TSs. The Stack Gas Monitoring System is a new system at Big Rock Point which will replace and upgrade the present effluent monitoring system. The proposed changes incorporate a description of the system and operating requirements for the system into the Big Rock Points TSs and constitute an additional limitation, thus they fall within the above example. On this basis, the staff proposes to conclude that the requested action would involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: North Central Michigan

College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski, Chief.

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50-155, Big Rock Point Plant, Charlevoix County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: November 14, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The plant modification to change the Reactor Enclosure Treated Waste Line Valve from a hand-switch operated valve to an automatic closure valve was made to resolve Systematic Evaluation Program Topic VI-4, Containment Isolation System. The change has been evaluated by the NRC staff in the Intergrated Plant Assessment Report (NUREG-0828) for Big Rock Point, section 4.20.4, published in May 1984. The proposed license amendment would require that this automatic valve be periodically tested for proper manual and automatic operation and leak tightness.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The addition of the proposed operability and leak test requirements to the Technical Specifications constitutes such an additional restriction.

Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve a no significant hazards consideration determination in that it: (1) Does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident, (2) does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated, and (3) does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Local Public Document Room location: North Central Michigan College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski, Chief.

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50-155, Big Rock Point Plant, Charlevoix County, Michigan

Date of amendments requested: January 10, 1985, which supersedes previous submittals dated May 10, 1984 and June 20, 1984.

Description of amendment request: Currently, Consumers Power Company (CPCo.) has a byproduct material license (10 CFR Part 30 license) and a facility operating license (10 CFR Part 50 license) for Big Rock Point. The proposed amendment would incorporate the Big Rock Point Byporduct Material License into the Big Rock Point Facility Operating License.

The proposed amendment would also institute sealed source leak test requirements in the Big Rock Point Technical Specifications (TSs). The plant TSs do not currently include such tests.

Consumers Power Company originally proposed such changes in submittals dated May 10, 1984 and June 20, 1984. These changes were originally noticed in the **Federal Register** on August 22, 1984 (49 FR 33362). However, the TSs contained in the applications were not acceptable to the NRC. On January 10, 1985, CPCo. submitted revised proposed TSs which superseded the earlier submittals. The revised proposed TSs of January 10, 1985 are now under consideration by the NRC.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the Application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a purely administrative change to the TSs. The incorporation of the existing separate byproduct material license into the facility operating license is a purely administrative change. The NRC currently incorporates the byproduct license in the facility operating license for new nuclear power plants. Also, the NRC has encouraged the byproduct license incorporation for operating nuclear power plants.

Another example (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the TSs. The addition of the proposed sealed source leak test requirements to the TSs constitutes such an additional control.

Therefore, the staff proposed to determine that the requested action would involve a no significant hazards consideration determination in that it (1) does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident, (2) does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated, and (3) does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Local Public Document Room location: North Central Michigan College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski, Chief.

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: January 11, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications to reflect the second of several refueling stages involved in the continuing transition to the use of optimized fuel assemblies in McGuire Unit 1. The changes would also reflect a reduced reactor coolant system design flow rate. Changes in the Unit 1 specifications would be made to the time constants used in the overpower and overtemperature delta T setpoint equations to allow more flexibility in plant operations. Finally, some Unit 2 specifications would be administratively affected in that they would be combined into one specification applying to both McGuire Units 1 and 2, but there would be no change to the content of Unit 2 specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: On April 20, 1984, the Commission issued Amendment No. 32 to Facility Operating License NPF-9 to change the Technical Specifications to permit changes in operating limits related to the transition to the use of optimized fuel assemblies in McGuire Unit 1. Accordingly, since its first refueling for Cycle 2, Unit 1 has operated with the first stage of a transition core consisting of approximately ⅓ Westinghouse 17x17 Optimized Fuel Assemblies (OFAs) and ⅔ Westinghouse 17x17 low-parasitic fuel assemblies (STDs). During the next refueling for Cycle 3 the planned transition would replace approximately another ⅓ of the original

total STDs with OFAs. The transition is planned to continue until an all OFA fueled core is achieved.

The major differences between STDs and OFAs are the use of Zircaloy grids for the OFAs versus Inconel grids for STDs and a reduction in fuel rod diameter. The OFA fuel has similar design features compared to the STD fuel, which has had substantial operating experience in a number of nuclear plants. Major advantages for utilizing the OFAs are: (1) Increased efficiency of the core by reducing the amount of parasitic material and (2) reduced fuel cycle costs due to an optimization of water to uranium ratio.

The proposed amendments would provide for plant operation consistent with the design and safety evaluation conclusions in the licensee's McGuire Unit 1 Cycle 3 Reload Safety Evaluation (RSE). The changes to the Technical Specifications 3/4.2.1 and 3/4.2.2 would reflect appropriate adjustments in the limiting conditions and surveillance requirements for (1) axial flux difference and (2) heat flux hot channel factor, respectively. The thermal hydraulic safety analyses used in the Cycle 3 RSE are based on a reduced design flow rate (97,200 gpm per loop versus 98,400), but the proposed changes result in no significant variations in thermal margins. Changes to Specification Figures 2.1–1a and 3.2–3a and Table 2.2–1 (low reactor coolant flow trip setpoint and allowable values) would reflect the reduced reactor coolant system flow value. Changes to Specification Tables 2.2–1, 3.3–2 and 3.3–4 would reflect the changes to the time constants used in the overpower and overtemperature delta T setpoint equations.

The Commission proposes to 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.

The McGuire Unit 1/Cycle 3 RSE accompanying the licensee's amendment request of January 11, 1985, describes all of the accidents comprising the licensing bases which could potentially be affected by the fuel reload for the Unit 1 Cycle 3 design. The results of the analysis conclude that:

a. The Westinghouse OFA reload fuel assemblies for McGuire 1 and 2 are mechanically compatible with the STD design, control rods, and reactor internals interfaces. Both fuel assemblies satisfy the current design bases for the McGuire units.

b. Changes in the nuclear characteristics due to the transition from STD to OFA fuel will be within the range normally seem from cycle to cycle due to fuel management effects.

c. The reload OFAs are hydraulically compatible with the current STD design.

d. The accident analyses for the OFA transition core were shown to provide acceptable results by meeting the applicable criteria, such as, minimum DNBR, peak pressure, and peak clad temperature, as required. The previously reviewed and licensed safety limits are met.

e. Plant operating limitations given in the Technical Specifications will be satisfied with the proposed changes.

From these evaluations, it is concluded that the Unit 1 Cycle 3 design does not cause the previously acceptable safety limits to be exceeded.

The effect of the time constant changes has been evaluated by reanalyzing the limiting events that rely on overpower and overtemperature delta T protection. The limiting Rod Cluster Control Assembly Withdrawal at Power cases from the reload analyses have been reanalyzed with the increased time constants in the overtemperature delta T setpoint equation. The results show that the departure from nucleate boiling (DNB) design basis is met. The overpower delta T trip is not relied upon for protection in any of the FSAR accident analyses. However, a spectrum of steamline breaks was analyzed at various power levels to determine the limiting cases that are presented in the FSAR. Some of the small steamline breaks at power that were analyzed rely on overpower delta T for protection. Therefore, an analysis was performed that verifies that the DNB design basis is met for small breaks at full power with the increased time constants in the overpower delta T setpoint equation.

The Commission has provided examples of amendments likely to involve no significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One example of this type is (vi), "A change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the standard review plan: For example, a change resulting from the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculational model or design method". Because the evaluations previously discussed show that all of the accidents comprising the licensing bases which could potentially be affected by the fuel reload were reviewed for the Unit 1 Cycle 3 design and conclude that the reload design does not cause the previously acceptable safety limits to be exceeded, the above example can be applied to this situation. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that these changes for the Unit 1 Cycle 3 reload, including the changes in axial flux difference, heat flux hot channel factor, design flow, and time constants for the overpower and overtemperature delta T setpoint equations, do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Another example of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration, example (i), relates to a purely administrative change to technical specifications to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. The Commission proposes to find that the changes to Unit 2 specifications which do not change the content for Unit 2 but which preserve or eliminate the distinctions between units within the common document are administrative and involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, P.O. Box 33189, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

Duquesne Light Company, Docket No. 50-334, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: December 12, 1984.

Description of amendment request: This is an application for an amendment to Operating License DPR-66, revising the Technical Specifications to reduce the probability and consequences of an overpressurization event.

The proposed changes are currently in the form of plant procedures; issuance of an amendment would incorporate these procedures into the plant Technical Specifications. The changed specifications would provide additional protection from pressure transients at low temperatures by reducing the probability of initiation of such a

transient, and by limiting the resultant pressure of such a transient to below the limits set by 10 CFR 50 Appendix G. The proposed changes would also bring the Technical Specifications into compliance with General Design Criteria 15 and 31, which address operational requirements of the overpressure protection system.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of these, Example (ii), involving no significant hazards consideration is "A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications." As described above, the requested amendment matches this example and the staff, therefore, proposes to characterize it as involving no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: B.F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esquire, Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Dockets Nos. 50–321 and 50–366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: April 24, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The Technical Specification changes proposed by this submittal are a partial revision to the changes requested in the licensees' July 9, 1982, October 24, 1983, and December 20, 1983, amendment requests which are previously noticed in the **Federal Register** on January 26, 1984 (49 FR 3347). The additional changes proposed in this April 24, 1984, submittal include: (1) The expansion of organizational charts to show more positions and to reflect organizational changes, (2) changes in titles and responsibilities of senior management, (3) changes that allow approval of certain plant procedures at managment levels other than that of the General Manager—Plant Hatch, and (4) modify the Plant Review Board quorum requirements.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870).

An example of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is an amendment involving a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications (Example (i)). The expansion of the organization charts and the change of position titles are such changes.

Another example of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is an amendment which may reduce in some way a margin of safety, but where the results of the change are clearly within acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan (Example (vi)). Changes in the responsibilities of senior management in the approval level for procedures and in the Plant Review Board quorum requirements fit this example.

On these bases, the Commission proposes to determine that these actions involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Attorney for licensee: G. F. Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Dockets Nos. 50–321 and 50–366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: May 2, 1984, as superseded November 19, 1984.

Description of amendment request: By letter dated October 27, 1983, as supplemented December 20, 1983, Georgia Power Company requested amendments to the operating licenses for Hatch Units 1 and 2.

The requested amendments would modify the Technical Specification Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs) and surveillance requirements for snubbers for these units. These requested amendments were noticed in the **Federal Register** on February 24, 1984 (49 FR 7037). By letter dated May 5, 1984, as superseded by letter dated November 19, 1984, Georgia Power Company has revised the previously noticed submittals to provide additional requirements concerning the selection of the sample for the functional tests, to provide additional functional test requirements and to replace the table listing snubbers with an LCO description of the snubbers that are required to be operable.

These revisions were provided in response to Commission requests stemming from the staff review of the earlier submittals and in response to Generic Letter 84–13, "Technical Specifications for Snubbers", dated May 3, 1984.

Bases for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). Examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration are amendments that involve a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications [Example (ii)] and amendments involving a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications [Example (i)]. The proposed additional requirements concerning the sample selection and tests are similar to Example (ii).

The replacement of the table listing snubbers with an LCO describing which snubbers was made in response to Generic Letter 84–13. It will provide a means of describing all of the snubbers required to be operable in general terms, thereby eliminating the need to list each snubber or to request amendments if snubbers are added or removed. It is an administrative change and is similar to example (i).

On the basis of the above, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the application for amendments involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50–219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: May 1 and 25, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests approval for changes to the Appendix B Technical Specifications to reflect the change in the location for three marine woodborer exposure panels and for revisions to the procedure for calibration of environmental monitoring instrumentation. These changes would be to section 3.0, Special Monitoring and Study Activities, Woodborer Monitoring

Program, of Appendix B of the Oyster Creek Technical Specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed changes to Appendix B, Environmental Technical Specifications, will: (1) Update Table 3.1 of the plant Technical Specifications which describes the locations of the woodborer exposure panels and (2) decrease the frequency of calibration of environmental water quality monitoring instrumentation for measuring salinity, dissolved oxygen, water temperature and pH.

These proposed changes may affect the measurement of the impact of plant operation on the environment. They do not affect the operation of the plant. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action involves no significant hazards consideration in that the proposed action does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of an accident from any previously evaluated and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Local Public Document Room location: Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

GPU Nuclear Corporation Docket No. 50–219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: June 8, 1984, superseding the December 11, 1979, request.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests approval of administrative revisions to Inservice Inspection (ISI) and Inservice Testing (IST) requirements in section 4.3, Reactor Coolant, of the Oyster Creek Appendix A Technical Specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: On February 27, 1976, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission revised the inservice inspection testing requirements for ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components for nuclear power plants in 10 CFR 50.55a. The revised regulations require inservice inspection and testing set forth in Section XI of the ASME, Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, and Addenda. A review by the Commission of 1974 edition ASME section XI indicated that conflicts may occur between the ASME code requirements and the plant Technical Specifications. To avoid such conflicts, the Commission requested that the licensee, in accordance with § 50.55a(g)(5)(ii), apply for an amendment to the plant technical specifications to replace such conflicting technical specifications with a reference to 10 CFR 50.55a. The licensee proposed by an amendment request dated June 8, 1984 to incorporate the requirements of the revised regulations on inservice inspection and testing in the plant technical specifications.

The licensee previously, by an amendment request dated December 11, 1979, proposed to delete nondestructive examination requirements for the reactor coolant system from § 4.3 of the technical specifications because that requirement was contained in the Oyster Creek Inservice Inspection Program for the second 10-year interval and also proposed to renumber technical specifications, pages and tables in § 4.3 as needed to accommodate the proposed changes.

The proposed amendment would: (1) Incorporate into the technical specifications requirements in the revised regulations and (2) delete a required inspection from the technical specifications which is also contained in the Oyster Creek Inservice Inspection Program. The Commission has provided examples of license amendments that are not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). Examples of amendments not likely to involve significant hazards considerations include: (vii) Changes to conform the license to the regulations where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations; and (i) purely administrative changes to the technical specifications. The proposed amendment incorporating into the technical specifications the revised regulations fall within example (vii). The deletion from the technical specifications of redundant requirements falls within example (i). Because these amendments fall within examples of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A Zwolinski.

GPU Nuclear Corporation Docket No. 50–219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: September 18, 1984.

Description of amendment request: Requests approval of Appendix A Technical Specification changes to incorporate conductivity and chloride limits given in Regulatory Guide 1.56 into section 3.3.E, Reactor Coolant Quality.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: During the integrated assessment of Oyster Creek in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Systematic Evaluation Program (SEP), the Commission reviewed the water purity of BWR primary coolant. This is § 4.20, page 4–27, of NUREG–0822, Integrated Plant Safety Assessment Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, dated September 1982, under SEP Topic V–12A, Water Purity of BWR Primary Coolant. 10 CFR Part 50 (Appendix A, General Design Criterion 14), as implemented by guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.56, requires that the reactor coolant pressure boundary have minimal probability of rapidly propagating failure. This includes corrosion-induced failures from impurities in the reactor coolant system.

The licensee, at the request of the Commission, is proposing to revise the technical specifications in section 3.3.E, Reactor Coolant Quality, in the Appendix A Technical Specifications for Oyster Creek. The licensee proposes to increase the requirements on reactor coolant water quality.

The licensee is also proposing to add text to the Bases for section 3.3.E. This is to: (1) Explain the effect of chlorides in the reactor coolant and the reasons to keep chloride levels consistent with guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.56, Rev. 1, and (2) refer to the reactor coolant temperature of 212°F instead of to the reactor condition, cold shutdown, in the Bases for measurement of conductivity of the reactor coolant.

The proposed changes would constitute an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications, that is, a more stringent limiting condition for operation and are, therefore, consistent with example (ii) of the Commission guidance (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983) as a type of action which would not involve a significant hazards consideration. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the

requested action would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW. Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50–219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: June 1, 1979, revised October 22, 1984.

Description of amendment request: Requests approval of Appendix A Technical Specification changes pertaining to definitions listed in section I, definitions, that were previously approved by the Commission but were not and should be listed in the Table of Contents; the new reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73; the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications (RETS) required by Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50; and the radioactivity limits and surveillance on the reactor coolant. These are proposed changes to section 1, Definitions; section 2, Limiting Conditions for Operations; section 3, Surveillance Requirements; and section 6, Administrative Controls of the Oyster Creek Technical Specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee has submitted a new Table of Contents for the Appendix A Technical Specifications. This page includes the definitions 1.26 to 1.29 which were approved by the Commission in Amendment 75 dated August 27, 1984 to the license. However, in that amendment, the new definitions were not added to the Table of Contents. This proposed change is a purely administrative change to the technical specifications to correct an error. Therefore, the change is consistent with example (i) of the Commission's guidance (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983) as a type of action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration.

In Generic Letter 83–43, dated December 19, 1983, the Commission stated that § 50.72 of Title 10 of the Code of the Federal Regulations was revised and a new § 50.73 was added, effective January 1, 1984. Section 50.72 revises the immediate notification requirement for operating nuclear power reactors and § 50.73 provides for a revised Licensee Event Report System.

The Commission requested licensees to propose revisions to the "Administrative Controls" and "Definitions" sections of their plant's technical specifications to implement the 50.72 and 50.73 regulation changes. The Commission also stated that there may be other chanes to the technical specifications required to reflect the revised reporting requirements (e.g., technical specifications requiring a Licensee Event Report instead of a Special Report).

The licensee's proposed changes pertaining to the new reporting requirements in 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 constitute a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. These changes are consistent with example (vii) of the Commission's guidance (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983) as a type of action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration.

The licensee has proposed extensive changes to the Appendix A Technical Specifications to implement the requirements of Appendix I, Numerical Guides for Design Objectives and Limiting Conditions for Operation to Meet the Criterion "As Low as is Reasonably achievable" for Radioactive Material . . . , to 10 CFR Part 50. These technical specifications are definitions, limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements on the Oyster Creek radioactive waste system and the radioactive effluents from the plant including liquid radwaste, gaseous radwaste and solid radwaste.

On June 1, 1979, Jersey Central Power and Light submitted their proposed Technical Specification Change Request No. 69 to incorporate the requirements of Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50. This submittal was discussed with the staff on September 13, 1979, and the licensee agreed that revisions to this submittal were needed. The licensee has since then submitted letters dated February 15, 1980, and October 22, 1984, requesting changes to the Technical Specifications pertaining to Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50.

By letter dated February 15, 1980, Jersey Central Power and Light submitted Technical Specification Change Request No. 79 which incorporated the 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix I design objectives for gaseous effluent releases. This submittal was issued as Amendment 49 to the Oyster Creek Technical Specifications and was designed to be a temporary change, to be replaced after the complete RETS are issued for Oyster Creek and the Augmented Offgas System.

The licensee's proposed changes to implement Appendix I in the October 22, 1984, submittal are the following: (1) To add new definitions; (2) to revise the protective instrumentation requirements in Table 3.1.1 on the Offgas system isolation on high radiation; (3) to revise and expand section 3.6 on radioactive effluents, to add new sections and limiting conditions for operation on Solid Radioactive Waste, section 3.14, and on Radioactive Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation, section 3.15; (4) to add surveillance requirements in Table 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 on high radiation isolation on the air ejector off-gas; (5) to revise and expand section 4.6 on Radioactive Effluents; (6) to add new sections and surveillance requirements on Solid Radioactive Waste, section 4.14, on Radioactive Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation Applicability, section 4.15, and on Radiological Environmental Surveillance, section 4.16, and (7) to add new requirements and to revise section 6.9.3, Unique Reporting Requirements, of the Administrative Controls. These changes constitute an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the technical specifications and revisions to the technical specifications to conform to changes in the regulations where the license change results in very minor changes to the facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. Therefore, these changes are consistent with examples (ii) and (vii) of the Commission's guidance (48 FR 14879, April 6, 1983) as types of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration.

The licensee also proposed limits on the radioactivity in the reactor coolant to revise the existing requirements in section 3.6.D and 4.6.C of the technical specifications. During the integarted assessment of Oyster Creek in the Commission's Systematic Evalution Program (SEP), the Commission reviewed the radiological consequences of the failure of small lines carrying reactor coolant outside containment. This is section 4.36, page 4–44, of NUREG–0822, Integrated Plant Safety Assessment Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, dated September 1982, under SEP Topic XV–16 of the same title. The Commission stated that the reactor coolant radioactivity for Oyster Creek should be maintained within the limits imposed on new operating reactors which are the limits of the Commission's Standard Technical Specifications on General Electric Boiling Water Reactors (NUREG–0123).

The licensee has proposed new requirements which are more restrictive than the existing technical specifications on reactor coolant radioactivity. Therefore, these changes are consistent with example (ii) of the Commission's guidance (48 FE 14870, April 6, 1983) as a type of action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration.

Therefore, based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that all of the requested actions discussed above do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document room location: Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50–219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: October 22, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests approval for changes to the Appendix A Technical Specifications realted to the Reactor Coolant System Leakage in sections 1., 3.3 and 4.3 of the Technical Specifications by: (1) The addition of reactor coolant leak rate detection requirements and surveillance, (2) the incorporation of requirements for identified and unidentified leakage, (3) the addition of definitions for identified and unidentified leakage, and (4) the correction of the Bases to section 3.3, Reactor Coolant, to reflect the actual plant configuration.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: This Technical Specification Change Request by the licensee will provide additional requirements in the Technical Specifications on leakage from the reactor coolant system and additional surveillance requirements for the reactor coolant leakage detection systems. These changes constitute additional requirements, limitations and controls not presently included in the Oyster Creek Technical Specifications on reactor coolant leakage.

This change will also incorporate a more restrictive Technical Specification requirement for unidentified leakage and will correct the Bases for section 3.3, Reactor Coolant, of the Technical Specifications to have the Bases reflect the actual plant configuration.

This change would constitute an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications and is, therefore, consistent with example (ii) of the Commission's guidance (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983) as a type of action which would not involve a significant hazards consideration. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW. Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50–219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: October 24 and December 24, 1984.

Description of amendment request: Request approval of Appendix A Technical Specification changes pertaining to Fire Protection and Quality Assurance which: (1) Will decrease the frequency of required audits on the plant Fire Protection Program and Operational Quality Assurance Plan, and (2) delete the reference to sprinkler system #13 as fire detection instrumentation and as a spray/sprinkler system.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: In the licensee's letter dated October 24, 1984, the licensee requested a change to section 6.5.3.1 of the Appendix A Technical Specifications to add the requirement that the Oyster Creek Fire Protection Program, and its implementing procedures, and the activities required by the Oyster Creek Operational Quality Assurance Plan to meet Appendix B, 10 CFR Part 50, be audited under the cognizance of the Vice President Nuclear Assurance at least once per 24 months. Currently these programs are audited at least once per 12 months under the requirement in § 6.5.3.1(a) on audits for conformance of facility operations to provisions contained within the Technical Specifications. The licensee proposes to decrease the frequency at which audits are required on the plant programs to at least once per 24 months.

The licensee's proposed change to halve the frequency of auditing the Fire Protection Program is in response to the Commission's Generic Letter 82–21, dated October 6, 1982, "Technical Specifications for Fire Protection Audits." This generic letter provides guidance for a biennial audit of the Fire Protection Program which would be consistent with the overall requirements on the plant Fire Protection Program in 10 CFR 50.48 and guideline positions in the staff's Branch Technical Positions on the plant Fire Protection Program.

The licensee stated in the proposed change to halve the frequency of auditing the activities associated with the plant Operational Quality Assurance Program that it is based on the guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.33 (February 1978), Quality Assurance Programs Requirements, of draft (issued for comment) Regulatory Guide 1.144 (January 1979), Auditing of Quality Assurance Programs for Nuclear Power Plants, and ANSI/ASME N45.2.12–1977. The requirements that are in ANSI/ASME N45.2.12–1977 for auditing quality assurance programs for nuclear power plants are acceptable to the staff and provide an adequate basis for complying with the pertinent quality assurance requirements of Appendix B to 10 CFR 50 subject to the guidelines in Regulatory Guide 1.144. For internal audits of the operational phase activities of the quality assurance program the guidelines of Regulatory Guide 1.33 should be followed.

In his letter dated December 24, 1984, the licensee has proposed to delete Sprinkler System #13 from Tables 3.12.1 and 3.12.2 of the Appendix A Technical Specifications. The Laundry Room in the office building on the 35'–0" elevation is being converted to a count room containing electronic equipment. Sprinkler System #13 was originally installed to protect cables passing through the laundry area to the Reactor Building from the combustible loading due to accumulated clothing in the laundry facility.

With the conversion of the laundry facility, the combustible loading due to accumulated clothing will no longer exist since Sprinkler System #13 was specifically designed to protect from a fire originating in the laundry bins which are now gone. This removal is desired because electronic test equipment is being brought to the area and there is the potential of accidently wetting this equipment from inadvertent initiation of the sprinkler system.

These changes do not affect plant operation. The changes are minor changes to licensee administrative activities clearly in keeping with the regulations and with changes to the fire protection areas/zones within the plant. The staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes would not involve a significant hazards consideration determination in that they: (1) Do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a

previously evaluated accident; (2) do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; and (3) do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Local Public Document Room location: Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: November 24, 1983, as revised and supplemented June 5, 1984 and December 3, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would incorporate Technical Specification (TS) changes needed to complete Multiplant Action (MPA) B-24, containment purge and vent.

The proposed change on primary coolant activity (TS 3.1.4 and Table 4.1-3) was previously noticed in the **Federal Register** on May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21830), and the Commission's staff proposed that the changes on primary coolant activity do not involve a significant hazards consideration. The staff's position remains unchanged.

The proposed change in vent/purge valve operability and surveillance requirements (TS 3.6, 4.4.1.2.5, and 4.4.1.7) would provide operability requirements for large purge valves so that if one valve is inoperable, the companion valve in-line would be closed or the reactor shut down. If, however, the problem is seal leakage, both valves in-line would be shut to prevent leakage or the reactor would be shut down. The proposed TSs also would limit the opening of purge valves to 30 degrees during power operation, would identify activities for which purging is permitted and would require instances of purging to be limited. The changes in section 4 would provide surveillance requirements for purge valves.

The TSs on surveillance of the hydrogen purge system (TS 4.4.3) would be eliminated because hydrogen recombiners are available per Amendment 87. Additionally, the reactor building purge air treatment system TSs (TSs 3.15.2 and 4.12.2) would be revised to be compatible with the system's safety function which would no longer include mitigation of an operating accident, namely hydrogen purging.

The proposed revision to the surveillance of fire hose stations (TS 4.18.6) would permit deferring inspections when the stations are inaccessible because purging is not permitted.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed TS changes on primary coolant activity and on vent/purge valve operability and surveillance are in the same category as Example (ii), 48 FR 14870, which cites changes that constitute additional limitations, restrictions or controls not presently included in the TSs as changes not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. The proposed TSs would be substantially more restrictive on primary coolant activity limits and would require more sampling. The limits on plant operation with inoperable purge/vent valves would be more restrictive and the amount of time purging would be permitted would be reduced.

The elimination of the TSs on hydrogen purging and the modification of the TSs on reactor building purge air treatment system are proposed because the available hydrogen recombiners eliminate the need for purging of hydrogen as an accident mitigation function. These changes are in the same category as Example (vi), 48 FR 14870, i.e., changes which may result in some increase in the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident but which are clearly within the acceptance criteria of the Standard Review Plan (SRP), because the SRP permits the use of hydrogen recombiners in lieu of hydrogen purging.

The proposed change in surveillance of the fire hose stations is also considered to be an Example (vi) type of action which, again, is clearly within the acceptance criteria of the SRP because the change does not alter the SRP surveillance requirements, but only extends the surveillance intervals which are not specified in the SRP.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Streets, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: December 17, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications to update the offsite organization chart, and organization and responsibilities of the Plant Nuclear Safety Review Committee (PNSRC) and the Nuclear Safety and Design Review Committee (NSDRC), to update the reporting requirements addressed by the recent revision to 10 CFR 50.73, to revise the containment isolation valve listing, to correct an error in one reference to the battery electrolyte temperature for surveillance, and to make a number of editorial changes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (i) of an action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a purely administrative change to technical specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. The proposed amendment is directly related to this example with the exception of the change to the reporting requirements and the revision to the listing of the containment penetration valves. Another example (vii) is a change to make a license confirm to changes in the regulations. Revisions to 10 CFR 50.73 make it necessary to revise the technical specifications on reporting requirements and definitions, therefore, the proposed change in reporting requirements is directly related to this example. Another example (vi) of an action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. The proposed change to revise the containment isolation valve list (on Unit No. 1) is directly related to this example. However, this change was approved for Unit 2 by License Amendment No. 64 and was established there as not

involving a significant hazards consideration. The Unit 1 changes are the same as made for Unit 2 and the valve configurations are alike for both Units in this regard. On the basis of the above, the Commission proposes to conclude that the proposed change to the Technical Specifications involves a no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Maude Reston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50–315 and 50–316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: December 28, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would make changes to the Technical Specifications for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, to require ice measurements and surveillance on boron concentration and on pH at 25 °C, and to change the restriction on ice accumulation on structures from 0.38 inches to ⅜ inches. The change to Unit 1 Technical Specifications would change ice condenser surveillance from 12 to 9 months, regroup the baskets under surveillance to be like Unit 2, require ice condenser doors be demonstrated at once per 9 months for 50% of the doors rather than at 6 months for 25% of the doors, and editorial changes needed for clarity.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (ii) of an action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specification. The changes to require ice measurements and surveillance on boron concentration and on pH at 25°C, to reduce the ice condenser surveillance from 12 months to 9 months, and to require ice condenser doors be demonstrated at once per 9 months for 50% of the doors rather than 6 months for 25% of the doors (more doors demonstrated more often over a period of time) are all changes directly related to this example. The changes to restrict the ice accumulation to ⅜ inch rather than 0.38 inch is like this example in that the new requirement is less than the 0.38 inche (⅜ inch is 0.375). Since the measurement techniques are not as precise for accumulation measurement, the latter change is also like the example (i) which is a purely administrative change to technical specifications. Editorial changes proposed by the licensee are directly related to example (i). Example (i) also involves changes to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications. This is essentially the reason to regroup the ice baskets on Unit 1 to make both Units Technical Specifications and the Westinghouse Standard Technical Specifications more alike. On the above basis, the staff proposes to conclude that the amendments involve a no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Maude Reston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company, Docket No. 50–316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: May 19, 1978, supplemented December 18, 1979, March 28, 1980, July 8, 1983, June 1 and December 7, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The request for amendment was initially noticed on September 21, 1983 (48 FR 43126). This amendment for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, would remove licensing condition 2C(3)(r) which required a seismic qualification review of the safety injection system front panel, hot shutdown panel, auxiliary relay panels and switchboard and switchgear components, relays and pressure switches as identified in the safety evaluation which was issued with the licensing condition. Amendment No. 6 issued on June 16, 1978, imposed license condition 2C(3)(r). The licensee's proposal would remove the license condition on the basis that the seismic qualification has been accomplished. The required information has been submitted to the NRC for review.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: One of the Commission examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to relief granted upon demonstration of acceptable operation from an operating restriction that was imposed because acceptable operation was not yet demonstrated. The proposed removal of the license condition is directly related to the example in that the licensee has performed a seismic qualification review, as required, and has fulfilled the requirements to the criterion previously found acceptable to the NRC. The license Amendment No. 6 issued on June 16, 1978, also concluded that the amendment involved no significant hazards consideration pending the final seismic qualification. Thus, if the NRC staff review confirms the licensee's conclusions concerning this requirement, the amendment involves no significant hazards considerations. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment request does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Maude Reston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Iowa Electric Light and Power Company, Docket No. 50–331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment request: December 5, 1984 and January 24, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment request would change the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) Technical Specifications related to the instrumentation for core and containment cooling and containment isolation. The proposed changes consist of two groups of changes. Group 1 consists of those changes which do not affect physical or operational characteristics of the plant, but clarify the testing and limiting conditions for operation for core and containment cooling instrumentation and surveillance tables, and Group 2 consists of changes related to additional restrictions and limitations imposed in the Technical Specifications to assure that four containment isolation valves converted from power operated valves to manual valves will be maintained in the closed position. The modification will therefore result in an increase in confidence that the containment will be isolated when required.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards (10 CFR 50.92(c)) for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. A proposed amendment to an operating

license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if 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.

The licensee has evaluated the proposed changes in accordance with the standards for a no significant hazards consideration finding in 10 CFR 50.92(c). The licensee states that the Group 1 changes involve clarifications, corrections of errors, and moving a referenced note to a page where it is cited. Such changes are administrative in nature and fully meet the above cited 10 CFR 50.92(c) standards for a finding of no significant hazards considerations. The Group 2 changes involve conversion of four power operated containment isolation valves to manual valves. Because the converted valves will be maintained in normally closed position, the containment isolation will be enhanced. The licensee has therefore made the finding that the Group 2 change entails additional limitations and restrictions in the Technical Specifications and meets the 10 CFR 50.92(c) standards for a no significant hazards consideration finding.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's evaluation against the three standards specified in 10 CFR 50.92(c) and agrees with the licensee's conclusions that the proposed request for amendment meets the standards for a no significant hazards considerations finding.

The staff has, therefore, made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, SE., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Esquire, Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Newman and Holtzinger, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Iowa Electric Light and Power Company, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment request: December 7, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) Technical Specifications regarding the spent and new fuel storage racks. The proposed revisions are intended to clarify the existing Technical Specifications and the bases related to Spent and New Fuel Storage.

The current fuel storage rack Technical Specifications for reactivity control are written in terms of effective multiplication factors (K_{eff}). In the past, because there has been a substantial margin between the maximum permissible reactivity and the fuel bundle reactivity, the compliance based on K_{eff} measure has not been of concern. However, as fuel designs are improved to permit longer fuel cycles, the available margins are reduced to a point where a simpler method for determining compliance with the Technical Specifications (than complex calculations of K_{eff}) is needed to readily determine compliance with the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes will specify fuel bundle $k_{infinity}$ values which correspond to the fuel rack Technical Specification K_{eff} limits. by using $k_{infinity}$ values, which are readily available, the process of checking compliance with the reactivity Technical Specifications is made simpler. For General Electric Company (GE) designed fuel racks, the equivalent bundle $k_{infinity}$ is 1.31 as described in the GE Standard Application for Reactor Fuels (NEDE-24011-P-A). The following specific changes are requested in the proposed amendment request:

(1) Add bundle $k_{infinity}$ limit to the new fuel rack specification;

(2) Replace current axial enrichment criteria with an equivalent bundle $k_{infinity}$ value in the spent fuel storage rack specification; and

(3) Add bases and references describing the basis for arriving at the storage rack specifications and methods for performing the compliance checks.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards (10 CFR 50.92(c)) for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if 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.

The licensee has evaluated the proposed Technical Specification changes against the three standards specified in 10 CFR 50.92(c), as follows:

(1) Revising the existing fuel storage rack Technical Specifications to use bundle reactivity limits ($k_{infinity}$) does not involve a physical plant change or mode of plant operation. The $k_{infinity}$ values being proposed represent fuel reactivity limits equivalent to the existing storage rack K_{eff} values. Therefore, since there is no change in the permissible reactivity limits or any physical characteristics of the plant, the license concludes that the proposed change does not involve any significant increase in the probability or consequences of any criticality accident.

(2) Since the proposed change is merely an alternative way of calculating compliance with unchanged standards, the change is not expected to introduce a possibility of a new or different accident or malfunction from any previously analyzed.

(3) Since the existing fuel rack reactivity limits are not changed by the proposed revision to the method of compliance the proposed change is not expected to reduce the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the above licensee's evaluation and agrees with the licensee's conclusions that the Commission's standards for a no significant hazards determination are met. The staff has, therefore, made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, SE., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Esquire, Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Newman and Holtzinger, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Iowa Electric Light and Power Company, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment request: December 7, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The Iowa Electric Light and Power Company (the licensee) proposes to change the Technical Specifications for Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) to permit loading of the General Electric Company's (GE) advanced fuel Lead Test Assemblies (LTAs) in the DAEC core.

The licensee has agreed to participate in GE's advanced fuel development program by accepting five LTAs for use in DAEC beginning with Cycle 8 operation. The design of the LTAs and

the demonstration of their conformance to all applicable thermal-mechanical performance criteria are documented in the GE report, "Generic Licensing of 1984 Lead Test Assemblies (Special Report MFN-068-84)." The NRC staff's conditional acceptance of the GE report is documented in our Safety Evaluation Report, "Acceptance of Referencing of Licensing Special Report MFN-068-84, Lead Test Assembly Licensing." For that report the use of the LTAs was found to be acceptable if the following conditions were satisfied:

1. The 1984 Lead Test Assemblies will not be the most limiting fuel assemblies in the core at any time during their residence in the core.

2. The user of these Lead Test Assemblies must verify that the fuel design criteria and specified fuel design limits are met for 1984 Lead Test Assemblies for the specific conditions in the reactor chosen for irradiation of these assemblies.

3. The user of the Lead Test Assemblies supplies the results of the transients and accident analyses for the test assemblies and modifies the plant Technical Specifications as necessary to reflect the use of the assemblies.

Based on the analyses of the DAEC, the licensee concludes that:

(1) The LTAs will be loaded into core locations such that they will not be the most limiting bundles with regard to operating margin to any fuel thermal limit when compared to the remaining fuel in the core. This has been analytically verified for Cycle 8 operation and will be strictly adhered to in actual operation during Cycle 8. For future cycles, this will be verified during the design of the core loading arrangements; and

(2) The results of the Loss-of-Coolant Accident (LOCA) and abnormal operating transient analyses verify that all applicable fuel design criteria and Specified Acceptable Fuel Design Limits (SAFDL) are met by the LTAs during Cycle 8 operation in the DAEC.

As a result of its evaluation, the licensee has proposed DAEC Technical Specification changes which will permit the loading of the GE's LTAs in the DAEC core in compliance of the criteria and SAFDL.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards (10 CFR 50.92(c)) for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if 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.

In accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.92, the licensee has provided the following evaluation to determine if the application involves no significant hazards considerations:

(1) The licensee states that, for the reasons stated below, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. GE has performed the LOCA analysis in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix K, to evaluate the design basis event for the LTA bundles being used in Cycle 8. The results of this analysis show that, with the proposed Maximum Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (MAPLHGR) changes to the Technical Specifications, the loading of the LTA bundles in the DAEC core complies with the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix K.

GE has also evaluated the transients for the LTA bundles, for use in Cycle 8, in accordance with the methods acceptable to the NRC. The results of the analyses presented in the licensee's application show that the LTA performance is within the limits specified in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), when revised Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) operating limits are incorporated in the Technical Specifications.

GE has evaluated the Linear Heat Generation Rate (LHGR) limits for both LOCA and Rod Withdrawal Error (RWE) events. The results of the GE analysis show that the LTA performance is within the limits specified in the UFSAR.

(2) The above summary of the licensee's evaluation shows that the thermal-mechanical performance will be met by the LTA fuel bundles and all the fuel design criteria and SAFDLs will be satisfied (as stated in the introduction). Therefore, the addition of LTA bundles to DAEC will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

(3) Since the LTA bundles are being subjected to proposed additional operating limits (to be incorporated in the Technical Specifications), and since thermal-mechanical performance of the LTA meets the NRC fuel design criteria and SAFDLs, the operation of DAEC with LTA fuel bundles will not reduce any margins of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's evaluation per 10 CFR 50.92 and concurs with its conclusions that the Commission standards for a no significant hazards determination are met. The staff has, therefore, made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, SE., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Esquire, Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Newman and Holtzinger, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Iowa Electric Light and Power Company, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment request: December 7, 1984.

Description of amendment request: This submittal by the Iowa Electric Light and Power Company (the licensee) requests changes to the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) Technical Specifications to: (1) Permit reactor operation with one recirculation loop out of service, (2) to include General Electric Company's (GE) Service Information Letter (SIL) 380, Revision 1 recommendations regarding thermal-hydraulic stability for dual loop and single loop operations, and (3) to incorporate administrative changes dealing with updating references and deletion of blank pages. Presently, the DAEC operating license requires a unit to be in cold shutdown within the succeeding 24 hours if an idle recirculation loop can not be returned to service within 24 hours. The licensee previously requested authorization for unlimited single loop operation of DAEC. Subsequently, Tennessee Valley Authority's operation of Browns Ferry Unit 1 (a boiling water reactor similar in design to DAEC) in the single loop mode of operation at 59% power lead to concerns related to thermal-hydraulic instability. GE, in SIL #380, Revision 1, addressed these concerns by providing the boiling water reactor licensees generic guidance to obviate thermal-hydraulic stability induced neutron flux oscillations. The licensee has proposed Technical Specifications in accordance with the guidance provided by GE in SIL-380, Revision 1.

Specifically, the proposed changes requested by the licensee consist of: (1) Deletion of the license condition restricting the single loop operation and,

for single and dual loop operation, incorporating requirements in the Technical Specifications to detect thermal-hydraulic instabilities induced by neutron oscillations and specifying operator response to the detected instabilities, (2) revision of the Technical Specifications to provide Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) flux scram trip and rod block settings, an increase in the safety limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) value, and a revision to the allowable Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (APLHGR) values, and (3) updating of some references and deletion of some blank pages.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards (10 CFR 50.92(c) for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if 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.

We have evaluated the licensee's request for the proposed Technical Specifications for compliance with the above cited standards.

(1) Consideration of Probability and Consequences of Accidents

Our evaluation of the proposed changes indicates that the principal accident associated with a single recirculation loop operating would be an inadvertent startup of the idle recirculation loop pump causing a transient. However, such a transient was evaluated in the DAEC Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) and found to satisfy the Commission's regulations. In addition, the licensee has proposed more restrictive Technical Specification changes related to MCPR limits, flow-biased scram and rod block setpoints, and reduced MAPLHGR operating limits, to ensure that the probabilities and the consequences of accidents with single recirculation loop operation will not be significantly increased. We have also evaluated the implication of thermal-hydraulic stability for both single and dual loop operations after the licensee's proposed Technical Specification changes based on the GE recommendations in SIL 380, Revision 1 are incorporated. Our evaluation shows that the proposed changes would alleviate the concerns related to the thermal-hydraulic instability by adding surveillance requirements for detecting thermal-hydraulic instabilities and specifying the remedial operator actions for responding to them. Such operator actions will also assure that there will be no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident. Based on the above discussion, we find that the proposed changes are not expected to significantly increase the probability or consequences of previously evaluated accidents.

(2) Consideration of Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident

The DAEC operation with one recirculation loop is not expected to create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed, as all abnormal operating transients which could be initiated with single loop operation, such as an inadvertent startup of an idle recirculation pump or pump trip have already been analyzed in the FSAR, and reviewed and accepted by the staff.

For single and dual loop operation, the addition of the surveillance requirements and remedial actions for thermal-hydraulic instability detection and response involve normal plant operating practices and, therefore, are not expected to create a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed in the FSAR.

(3) Consideration of Reduction in a Margin of Safety

The licensee has proposed the revised operating limits, setpoints, and procedures for the proposed single and dual loop operation. Our evaluation of the licensee's proposal indicates that the proposed changes will ensure that the FSAR margins of safety will not be reduced during normal operation and with one recirculation pump not operating. Our conclusions are based on our review of the evaluations by GE in support of the DAEC single loop operation presented in the GE report NEDO–24272.

For single and dual loop operation, the additional surveillance requirements and remedial actions required of the operator for detection of and response to thermal-hydraulic instability will increase the present margin of safety.

The updating of several references and deletion of some blank pages entail administrative changes and clearly satisfy the Commission standards for a "no significant hazards involved" finding.

Based on the above considerations the staff concludes that the proposed amendment meets the Commission's standards in 10 CFR 50.92(c).

Therefore, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, SE., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Esquire, Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Newman and Holtzinger, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Mississippi Power & Light Company, Middle South Energy, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, Docket No. 50–416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of amendment request: January 30, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would permit a reorganization to make plant quality personnel more independent of plant operations personnel. The Technical Specification changes would be: (1) Change the title of Manager, Supplier QA to Manager, Audits QA, on the Offsite Organization chart; (2) delete the Nuclear Plant Quality Superintendent from the Unit Operating Organization chart; (3) change the composition of the Plant Safety Review Committee by substituting the Manager, Nuclear Site QA for the Quality Superintendent.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no signficant hazards considerations. One of the examples is a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications. Change (1) is similar to this example since it is simply a change of title to more accurately reflect the primary responsibility of the position, while the lines of responsibility and communication are not changed. In Change (2), the Nuclear Plant Quality Superintendent will be moved from the Unit Operating Organization and placed under the Manager Nuclear Site QA in the Offsite Organization in order to minimize possible conflicts of interest in the management of the plant operation. The Nuclear Plant Quality Superintendent will spend more time on his primary responsibility of quality inspection since the majority of other QA functions he has been performing, including review of procedures and procurement documents will be

delegated to othe QA positions. This change is an improvement in the quality assurance functions of the plant since the Unit Operating Organization Management will not have line responsibility for the quality inspection functions. In Change (3), substituting the Manager, Nuclear Site QA for the Quality Superintendent in the Plant Safety Review Committee will maintain the level of review from a quality assurance standpoint, since the Quality Superintendent reports to the Manager Nuclear Site QA. Proposed changes (2) and (3) improve safety in that they allow QA activities to focus entirely on quality requirements and to be independent of plant production activities. Because proposed changes (2) and (3) would not affect plant equipment design, safety criteria or safety analyses and will result in an improvement in plant safety by enhancing the independence of quality assurance from plant production, these changes do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or do they involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that these changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Hind Junior College, McLendon Library, Raymond, Mississippi 39154.

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esquire, Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell, and Reynolds, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: March 3, 1977, as supplemented and clarified by submittals dated November 1, 1983 and August 28, 1984.

Description of amendment request: This proposed action was initially noticed in the **Federal Register** (48 FR 38408) on August 23, 1983. This amendment would make changes to the Technical Specifications to modify the list of Reactor Coolant System Isolation Valves and Primary Containment Isolation Valves as well as other provisions of the license to achieve conformance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. The proposed change is in response to an NRC request dated August 7, 1975 that asked the license to review their containment leakage program and provide a plan for achieving compliance with Appendix J.

Basis for proposed no signficant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: ". . . (ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement" and "(vii) A change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations."

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by the above examples in that: (1) The adding of additional valves to be local leak rate tested is an additional restriction and is, therefore, similar to example (ii) above, and (2) other changes proposed as necessary because the licensee is currently required by the regulations to limit primary containment leakage and is to make the license conform to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, are considered minor with regard to facility operation thus clearly keeping with the regulation, and, therefore, are similar to example (vii) above.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves a proposed change that is similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: State University College at Oswego, Penfield Library—Documents, Oswego, New York 13126.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esquire, Conner & Wetterhahn, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic V. Vassallo.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit NO. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: October 1, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment changes the section of the Technical Specifications pertaining to Limiting Conditions for Operations, surveillance requirements and supporting bases for the Emergency Ventilation System and the Control Room Air Treatment System and its associated instrumentation. The majority of the proposed changes are the result of modifications made to the Control Room Air Treatment System to resolve NUREG–0737, Item II.DS.3.4, "Control Room Habitability". The licensee's description of the proposed change is as follows:

Niagara Mohawk submittal dated March 28, 1983, described modifications to the Control Room Air Treatment System which would establish an acceptable degree of compliance with General Design Criterion 19. These modifications included installation of redundant radiation monitors on the air intake which will automatically initiate the emergency train of the system.

The changes described below reflect the change from the manual to automatic initiation of the Control Room Air Treatment System and add Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements to further increase the system's reliability.

The addition of item (j) to page 178a requires surveillance testing of the Control Room Air Treatment System at least once every operating cycle. This addition will help to ensure the reliability of the system. Changes to page 178b correct the test to reflect changes in the design basis of the system. Changes to page 188* indicate the additions of Tables 3.6.2m and 4.6.2m which increase the Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements of the Control Room Air Treatment System. The addition of item (13) to page 190 increases Limiting Conditions for Operation of Protective Instrumentation to include instrumentation which automatically initiates the emergency train of the Control Room Air Treatment System. Addition of page 232d provides the set point, minimum number of trip systems and minimum number of instrument channels that must be operable for each position of the reactor mode switch except the shutdown position. Addition of page 232e provides details of the Surveillance Requirements, including a sensor check, instrument channel test and instrument channel calibration.

In addition, we are requesting that the Technical Specifications governing the Emergency Ventilation System and the Control Room Air Treatment System be updated to reflect the current standards for testing the adsorber filiters. Currently, our specifications reference ANSI N.510–1975 for testing the adsorber filters (i.e: charcoal filters). ANSI N.510–1975 is also endorsed by Regulator Guide 1.52 (Rev. 2), but the current Standard Review Plan endorses ANSI N.510–1980. The salient difference between the two standards is the environmental conditions for testing. We believe the newer standard more realistically reflects the environmental conditions for which the charcoal filters are designed. Therefore, the proposed technical specifications submitted herein reference the ANSI N.510–1980.

The existing Page 173 references ANSI N.510–1975 for testing of the operability of the

inlet heater at rated power for the Emergency Ventilation System. The new standard, ANSI N.510–1980, requires the same testing procedure. This page is being revised to consistently reference the new standard throughout the Control Room Air Treatment and the Emergency Ventilation Technical Specifications.

The qualification requirements for the replacement charcoal (replacement is necessary when the charcoal fails its surveillance test) for the Emergency Ventilation System and the Control Room Air Treatment System are given on pages 176 and 177, and 178b and 178c, respectively. The current nuclear power air cleaning standard, ANSI 509–1980, will be referenced directly rather than Regulatory Guide 1.52, which references ANSI 509–1975. Similarly, the statements on these pages for HEPA filter design requirements are being updated.

Note.—Page 188 currently contains a typographical error which would be corrected with the approval of this submittal, namely, the first paragraphs of 3.6.1a and 4.6.2a should currently read, "* * * Tables 3.6.2a to 3.5.21." and "* * * Tables 4.6.2a to 4.6.21.", respectively.

Finally, our current Technical Specifications call for testing frequency of 18 months for both the Emergency Ventilation System and the Control Room Air Treatment System. Since we are now operating on a nominal 24 month refueling cycle, we request to have our Technical Specification reflect the current refueling cycle frequency.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee has presented its determination of significant hazards consideration as follows:

These proposed Technical Specification changes submitted herein involve no significant hazard considerations. Therefore, in accordance with the proposed amendment, the operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1 will 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.

Moreover, the changes reflecting the Control Room Ventilation System modifications increase the margin of safety at Nine Mile Point Unit 1. First, change from manual to automatic initiation decreases the response time capability of the system which will reduce the potential consequences during the event that this system is required. Second, addition of surveillance requirements will help to ensure the operability of the system and therefore, increase its reliablity. In addition, these changes are consistent with previously stated Nuclear Regulatory Commission positions. The change from manual to automatic initiation is consistent with Standard Review Plan section 6.4. The additional surveillance requirements to test the operability of the system is consistent with Standard Technical Specifications 4.7.2.

Furthermore, increases in surveillance requirements have been determined to involve no significant hazard consideration, as indicated in item ii of the section regarding examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazard considerations (**Federal Register**; April 6, 1983, p. 14870).

The proposed changes regarding testing of the charcoal filters do not involve a Significant Hazards Consideration as defined in 10 CFR 50.92. This change is similar to item vi of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (**Federal Register**; April 6, 1983, p. 14870). This change is similar in that the intent of acceptance criteria are met as specified in the Standard Review Plan section 6.5.1 with respect to charcoal filters.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's significant hazards consideration determinations and based on this review concurs with the licensee's determinations. The staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it is similar to the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration cited by the Commission.

Local Public Document Room location: State University College at Oswego, Penfield Library—Documents, Oswego, New York 13126.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esquire, Conner & Wetterhahn, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: May 1, 1984 as supplemented and clarified October 22, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment changes the section of the Technical Specifications pertaining to Limiting Conditions for Operations, Surveillance Requirements and supporting bases for the Remote Shutdown Panels. The Remote Shutdown Panels were added to the plant to facilitate plant shutdown from outside the control room. The modification was performed to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A. This amendment includes incorporation of the Remote Shutdown Panels into the Technical Specification.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the determination of significant hazards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. One of the examples (ii), relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The current Technical Specifications do not include requirements for the Remote Shutdown Panels. The proposed change adds the requirements for the Remote Shutdown Panels to the Technical Specifications. Therefore, since this change adds an additional control to the current Technical Specification limit, the change is similar to example (ii). The staff proposed to determine that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it is similar to the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration cited by the Commission.

Local Public Document Room location: State University College at Oswego, Penfield Library—Documents, Oswego, New York 13126.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esquire, Conner & Wetterhahn, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: June 29, 1984 as supplemented and clarified December 3, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment changes the section of the Technical Specifications pertaining to Limiting Conditions for Operations, Surveillance Requirements and supporting bases for the Emergency Cooling System and Accident Monitoring Instrumentation. The proposed changes to the technical specifications are in response to Generic Letter 83–36 "NUREG–0737 Technical Specifications" which was issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on November 1, 1983. The proposed changes are consistent with the intent of the model technical specifications included as an attachment to Generic Letter 83–36. In addition to the technical changes, the proposed technical specifications also revise the format of 3.6.11 "Accident Monitoring Instrumentation" and eliminates paragraph 3.1.3b which was intended to be a temporary amendment that is no longer effective.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the determination of significant hazards by providing certain

examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. Two of the examples (i) and (ii), relate to changes that are administrative and that constitute an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The majority of the changes contained within the amendment request impose additional restrictions or controls for modifications associated with TMI related issues. The balance of the change is administrative as described above. Therefore, the changes are similar to examples (i) and (ii). The staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it is similar to the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration cited by the Commission.

Local Public Document Room location: State University College at Oswego, Penfield Library-Documents, Oswego, New York 13126.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esquire, Conner & Wetterhahn, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: October 18, 1984. This application supersedes an earlier application for amendment dated March 21, 1978 and a supplement dated March 30, 1979.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would make changes to the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications that would bring them into compliance with Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 50. It would provide new Technical Specification sections defining limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; concentration, dose, and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, land use census, and an interlaboratory comparison program. The change would also incorporate into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. In addition, some changes would be made in administrative controls, specifically dealing with the process control program and the offsite dose calculation manual.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the technical specifications.

The Commission, in a revision to Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50, required licensees to improve and modify their radiological effluent systems in a manner that would keep releases of radioactive material to unrestricted areas during normal operations as low as reasonably achievable. In complying with this requirement it became necessary to add additional restrictions and controls to the Technical Specifications to assure compliance. This caused the proposed addition of Technical Specifications described above. The staff proposes to determine that the applications does not involve a significant hazards consideration since the change constitutes additional restrictions and controls that are not currently included in the Technical Specifications in order to meet the Commission mandated "as low as reasonably achievable" effluent objectives.

Local Public Document Room location: W. Dale Clark Library, 215 South 15th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102.

Attorney for licensee: Leboeuf, Lamb, Leiby, and MacRae, 1333 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: James R. Miller.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Dockets Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: October 9, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would add limiting conditions for operations (LCOs), surveillance requirements, and administrative requirements for the following NUREG-0737 required items: Post-accident sampling (II.B.2), high range noble gas monitors and radioactive iodine and particulate sampling systems (II.F.1.1 and II.F.1.2), containment high-range drywell radiation monitors (II.F.1.3), containment pressure monitors (II.F.1.4), containment water level monitors (II.F.1.5), containment hydrogen monitors (II.F.1.6) and control room emergency air filtration systems (III.D.3.4). These proposed Technical Specification (TS) changes submitted by the licensee are in response to the NRC Generic Letter 83-36 entitled "NUREG-0737 Technical Specifications" which was issued on November 1, 1983.

In addition, the licensee proposes the addition of a surveillance requirement to verify the automatic transfer feature of the Reactor Core Isolation Cooling System (RCIC) suction (II.K.3.13 and II.K.3.22). Also, a temporary amendment change for Unit 3 regarding continued power operation with an inoperable RCIC is proposed for deletion since it is now obsolute. This administrative change was covered in Amendment No. 102 (July 2, 1984). Two other NUREG-0737 items were also addressed by this application. Surveillance and operability requirements for II.F.2 (addition of two new reactor water level recorders) were first proposed in a TS application dated February 11, 1982. The licensee now propose to revise its application addressing LCO actions for reactor water level recorders by adding an LCO shutdown provision of 30 days for one inoperable channel, and 7 days for two inoperable channels. This represents a change from the current TSs which cover only one reactor water level indicator where plant shutdown is required within 7 days if one channel is inoperable and shutdown within 48 hours if both channels are inoperable. Finally, the licensee requests the addition of operability requirements for two new reactor pressure recorders as part of the requirements of NUREG-0737, Supplement 1 (SPDS).

Basis for proposed no signficant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided examples (48 FR 14870) of types of amendments not likely to involve signficant hazards consideration. One of the examples (ii) relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in Technical Specifications. The proposed TS changs involving the addition of LCO, surveillance and administrative requirements for the following NUREG-0737 items fall into this category: Post-accident sampling (II.B.2), high range noble gas monitors and radioactive iodine and particulate sampling systems (II.F1.1. and II.F.1.2), containment high-range drywell radiation monitors (II.F.1.3), containment pressure monitors (II.F.1.4), containment water level monitors (II.F.1.5), containment hydrogen monitors (II.F.1.6), control room emergency air filtration systems (III.D.3.4.), automatic transfer of RCIC suction (II.K.3.13 and II.K.3.22), and reactor pressure recorders proposed for

the Safety Parameter System (SPSD-NUREG–0737, Supplement 1). These proposed changes fall in the above category in that all the proposed changes involve additional limitations, restrictions, or control not presently included in the TSs. Therefore, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that the above proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The licensee also proposes surveillance and operability requirements covering the addition of two new reactor water level recorders as part of NUREG–0737 requirements (II.F.2). The request revises the licensee's original proposal covering these II.F.2 recorders dated February 11, 1982. The licensee's original proposal was noticed in the **Federal Register** on October 26, 1983 (48 FR 49591) but was not acted upon by the staff since it constituted an outstanding item. The licensee's revised request would change the present TS requirements for the narrow range reactor water level guage (Table 3.2.F) by increasing the LCO shutdown provisions for one inoperable channel from 7 days to 30 days, and for two inoperate channels from 48 hours to 7 days. However, to compensate for this change, the licensee proposed to strengthen the LCO action statements for the wide and fuel range reactor water level instruments. The licensee had originally proposed the following action statements covering the wide and fuel range monitors in its February 11, 1982 applications: with one channel inoperable, no shutdown required and with both channels inoperable, shutdown would be requird in 30 days. The licensee now proposes to strengthen these LCOs for the new monitors in the following ways: For one inoperable channel, shutdown would be required in 30 days if both narrow range monitors are operable and 7 days if one narrow range monitor is inoperable; for both channels being inoperable, shutdown would be required in 7 days if both narrow range monitors are operable and 48 hours if one narrow range monitor is inoperable.

The Commission's staff has reviewed the above amendment request concerning II.F.2 and has determined that should this request be implemented, it would not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because new safety-related reactor water level recorders will be added to the TS surveillance requirements providing additional indicators of reactor water levels and, therefore, additional surveillance measures for determining inadequate core cooling; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated because the proposed LCOs covering the three reactor water level instruments [narrow range, wide range (new) and fuel zone (new)] require, in effect, shutdown action intervals similar to those currently required in the Peach Botton TS; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed change would permit monitoring of rector water level by three diverse instrument systems and the combined surveillance requirements and LCOs meet the requirements currently specified in the Peach Bottom TSs. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a signficant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Streets, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Philadelphia Electric Compnay, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Dockets Nos. 50–277 and 50–278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: January 4, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would make the reporting requirements in the Technical Specifications (TSs) consistent with 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 in response to Generic Letter No. 83–43, "Reporting Requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, §§ 50.72 and 50.73 and Standard Technical Specifications", dated December 19, 1983.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee states that the proposed revisions and deletions to the TS Reporting Requirements reflect the revisions to § 50.72 and the addition of § 50.73 to the Commission's regulations, and these revisions conform to the Standard Technical Specifications enclosed in Generic Letter No. 83–43. The revisions would : (1) Add the definition of Reportable Events to the Definition section 1.0, (2) Delete the prompt and 30-day reporting specification since these requirements have been superseded by 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73, and (3) revise the nomenclature to conform with 10 CFR 50.73. In addition, the requirement to report failure of a primary coolant system safety or relief valve to close is proposed for deletion since the new rule (10 CFR 50.73) required reporting of relief valve failures if the condition could have prevented the fulfillment of a safety function and redundant equipment was not operable. The proposal also complies with the guidance of GL 83–43 which requests deletion of licensee event reporting requirement from the license.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (vii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The proposed changes to conform to 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 affect only reporting requirements and do not affect facility operations.

Therefore, since the changes make the license conform to changes in the regulations and do not affect plant operations, the proposed changes are encompassed by example (vii) of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations and on that basis the Commission's staff proposes to determine that the requested changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Streets, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Docket No. 50–278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit No. 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: January 7, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The requested amendment to the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 3, Operating license was submitted in support of the upcoming Cycle 7 core reload. The proposed changes would incorporate the maximum average

planar linear heat generation rate (MAPLHGR) versus planar average exposure curves for fuel Type BP8DRB299 and Type BP8DRB299H. The licensee states in the accompanying submittal that these new fuel assemblies are not significantly different from those previously found acceptable by the NRC for operation in Unit 3. In addition, a review of the licensee's application and accompanying evaluation indicates that there are no significant changes being proposed to the acceptance criteria for the Technical Specifications (TSs) and that the analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance with the TSs and regulations are not significantly changed from those previously found acceptable by the NRC for Unit 3.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for determining whether a proposed amendment involves a significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). An example of amendment that is not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is "(iii) * * *, a change resulting from a nuclear reactor core reloading, if no fuel assemblies significantly different from those found previously acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at the facility in question are involved. This assumes that no significant changes are made to the acceptance criteria for the technical specifications, that the analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance with the technical specifications and regulations are not significantly changed, and the NRC has previously found such methods acceptable".

The Commission's staff considers the proposed TSs change accompanying the Unit 3 reload to be similar to example (iii) since the fuel to be inserted into the core for Cycle 7 is similar to that used in previous Unit 3 reloads and that the nuclear design and analysis of the Cycle 7 reload has been performed with methods and techniques which have been used in previous reloads and found to be acceptable. Based upon the above, the staff proposes to determine that the requested changes involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Streets, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Attorney for Licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Portland General Electric Company, Docket No. 50-344, Trojan Nuclear Plant, Columbia County, Oregon

Date of amendment request: November 29, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The application for amendment requests modification of the Technical Specification contained in Appendix A to Operating License NPF-1 in order to revise the number of reactor coolant loops required to be in operation in Mode 3 (the reactor coolant system hot; reactor shut down). Specifically, the Trojan Technical Specifications currently require that a minimum of one reactor coolant loop be in operation during Mod 3. The amendment would require that an additional loop be in operation during Mode 3 if any control rod drive mechanisms are energized. The change would require operation consistent with the plant safety analysis for bank rod withdrawal from the subcritical condition, which assumes that two reactor coolant loops are in operation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing specific examples. The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: (ii) Changes that constitute an additional limitation or restriction or control not presently within the technical specification e.g., a more stringent surveillance requirement.

The changes proposed in this application for amendment are encompassed by this example because of the additional limitation and restriction that would be added by this Technical Specification amendment.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves a proposed change that is similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Multnomah County Library, 801 SW., 10th Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

Attorney for licensee: J. W. Durham, Senior Vice President, Portland General Electric Company, 121 SW., Salmon Street, Portland, Oregon 97204.

NRC Branch Chief: James R. Miller.

Portland General Electric Company et. al., Docket No. 50-344, Trojan Nuclear Plant, Columbia County, Oregon

Date of amendment request: January 14, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment request was submitted in response to NRC General Letter 83-37 which was sent to all licensees of pressurized water reactors to incorporate technical specifications for equipment added or modified as a result of post-TMI safety improvements approved by the Commission in NUREG-0737. Specifically, the amendment request provides new technical specifications for the containment high-range area radiation monitors (NUREG-0737 Item II.F.1.3); post-accident monitoring systems for noble gases and radioiodine for the containment, the auxiliary building, and the condenser air ejector, and noble gas radioactivity monitors for the main steam lines (NUREG-0737 Item II.F.1.1); the containment water level monitors (NUREG-0737 Item II.F.1.5); and the new sulfur dioxide detectors for the control room ventilation system (NUREG-0737 Item III.D.3.4).

The new technical specifications would require this new equipment to be operable and to be periodically tested.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for making a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of an action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is "(ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications: For example a more stringent surveillance requirement." The proposed technical specifications for the items discussed above match this example because they all represent new requirements for equipment operability and testing not currently included in the technical specifications.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission proposes to determine that the application for amendment does not involve significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Multnomah County Library, 801 SW. 10th Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

Attorney for licensee: J.W. Durham, Senior Vice President, Portland General Electric Company, 121 S.W. Salmon Street, Portland, Oregon 97204.

NRC Branch Chief: James R. Miller.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: January 16, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS), as necessary, to support the current Reload 6/Cycle 7 reactor refueling. The table entitled "MCPR Operating Limit for Incremental Cycle Core Average Exposure" in section 3.1 of Appendix A, and Figure 3.1-2, "Operating Limit MCPR Versus Tau for all Fuel Types," have been revised to reflect the transient analyses performed for the Reload 6/Cycle 7 core. In addition, Figure 3.5-11, "Maximum Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (MAPLHGR) Versus Planar Average Exposure," has been added to reflect the new fuel currently being loaded. Figures 3.5-6 through 3.5-8 are no longer necessary and have been deleted from Appendix A because the fuel types associated with these figures will be discharged from the core during the current reload.

The proposed amendment also includes several administrative changes relevant to the above-mentioned revisions. These changes (on pages vii, 123 and 130) eliminate references to the deleted figures and add references to the newly included figure.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: "(i) A purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: For example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature," and "(iii) for a nuclear power reactor, a change resulting from a nuclear reactor core reloading, if no fuel assemblies significantly different from those found previously acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at the facility in question are involved."

Use of a single new type of fuel (BPDRB299) is planned for the current reload. This fuel differs from the fuel types presently in use at FitzPatrick in two respects: (1) It is a Barrier type, and (2) it is fitted with eighty-mil thick fuel channels rather than the one hundred-mil channels previously used. The Barrier fuel design has a zirconium layer metallurgically bonded to the inside surface of the Zircalloy-2 fuel cladding. This feature is expected to reduce the probability of pellet-clad interaction fuel failures. The Barrier fuel design has been incorporated into the current revision of the General Electric Report, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel," (NEDE-24011-P-A-6, April 1983) and has been determined by the NRC to be acceptable. The change from one hundred-mil to eighty-mil channels represents a return to initial core channel dimensions. This change in channel thickness results in a slightly different fuel bundle response during a loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) in the high exposure range. Consequently, different MAPLHGR limits are applied to Reload 6 fuel.

Since eighty mil channels have been used successfully at FitzPatrick, and extensively on other plants similar in core and fuel design to FitzPatrick, this does not represent a significant change. Additionally, the analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance with the Technical Specifications and regulations are described in the above referenced General Electric Report which has been reviewed and approved by the NRC. These methods have not changed significantly from the methods used for previous reload submittals. The changes represented by addition of the new fuel assemblies to the core during the current reload are therefore encompassed by example (iii).

Those changes which eliminate references to deleted figures associated with fuel types being discharged from the core and add references to the newly included figure are clearly administrative in nature and are therefore encompassed by example (i).

Based on the foregoing, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Penfield Library, State University College of Oswego, Oswego, New York.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, Assistant General Counsel, Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-286, Indian Point Unit No. 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: November 24, 1981, as supplemented August 13, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment request was initially noticed on August 23, 1983 (48 FR 38419). This notice includes changes requested in a subsequent submittal dated August 13, 1984. The amendment would revise the testing requirements for hydraulic shock suppressors (snubbers). The proposed changes were made in reponse to an NRC request, dated November 20, 1980, to upgrade the testing requirement for all safety-related snubbers to ensure a higher degree of operability. The changes involve: Clarifying the frequency of visual inspections, stating the requirements for functional testing of snubbers which visually appear inoperable, including a formula for the selection of representative sample sizes, clarifying the testing acceptance criteria, and revising the method of snubber listing to incorporate more information.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional limitations or restrictions in the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes revise sections of the Technical Specifications related to hydraulic snubbers to clarify requirements, to include additional testing, and to incorporate operability requirements. Since the requested changes upgrade the requirements for hydraulic snubbers, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-286, Indian Point Unit No. 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: April 13, 1982, as supplemented August 31, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications related to degraded grid voltage conditions by: Adding relay set points, time delays, testing intervals and calibration intervals for the 480V Emergency Buses; increasing the setting limit for the 480V Bus Undervoltage Relay; and requiring

procedures to prevent an automatic fuse transfer of the 6.9 KV Buses. The proposed changes were made in response to an NRC request to provide protection for the degraded grid voltage condition.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the applications of these standards by providing examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional limitations or restrictions in the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes revise sections of the Technical Specifications that relate to the degraded grid voltage condition to clarify existing requirements and include additional requirements and testing. Since the requested changes upgrade the requirements for the degraded grid voltage condition, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Power Authority of the the State of New York, Docket No. 50-286, Indian Point Unit No. 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: December 29, 1983, as supplemented September 7, 1984

Description of amendment request: The amendment request was initially noticed on August 22, 1984 (49 FR 33369). This notice includes changes requested in a subsequent submittal dated September 7, 1984, that supplement and, in some cases, supersede the changes initially proposed. The purpose of this amendment is to upgrade the Technical Specifications to make them at least as stringent as the Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Pressurized Water Reactors (NUREG-0452). This change request is in response to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's letter dated July 7, 1980, which indicated over thirty (30) sections of the current Technical Specifications that need upgrading to be at least as stringent as the Standard Technical Specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: For example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration since they entail additional restrictions designed to make the Technical Specifications more stringent.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-286, Indian Point Unit No. 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: July 6, 1983, as supplemented December 3, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment proposes changes that provide for redundancy in decay heat removal capability in all modes of operation. The proposed changes were made in response to an NRC request that the licensee provide long-term assurance that redundancy be maintained. The changes provide that: At least two decay heat removal paths are available when the reactor coolant system Tavg is below 350 °F, at least one reactor coolant pump or RHR pump is operating when the reactor coolant system Tavg is below 350 °F but not in the refueling operation condition, and at least one reactor coolant pump is operating when the reactor coolant system Tavg is greater than 350 °F.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional limitations or restrictions in the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes revise sections of the Technical Specifications related to the redundancy of decay heat removal systems to clarify their operating procedures. Since the requested changes upgrade the requirements for decay heat removal procedures, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: September 21, 1984.

Description of amendment request: These proposed changes would add specifications for accident and radiation monitoring to provide assurance that the monitoring equipment installed at the facility is operated and maintained within acceptable limits. This proposed change is the result of a review of NUREG-0737 Technical Specifications guidance provided in NRC Generic Letter 83-37 and an additional request (Varga to Uderitz, dated November 17, 1983) for Technical Specifications for ICCI equipment. The Noble Gas Effluent Monitors and Containment high range Area Monitors are added to ensure that the monitors, installed in compliance with NUREG-0737 requirements, are operable in the appropriate MODES and receive proper surveillance attention.

Specifically the changes would add Noble Gas Effluent Monitors and Containment high range Area Monitors to Specification 3.3.3.6, Radiation Monitoring Instrumentation and Specification 3.3.3.9, Radioactive Gaseous Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation tables, as appropriate. Remove from Unit No. 1 only, item 2.a.3 Fixed Filter Iodine Monitor from Tables 3.3-6 and 4.3-6 and simplify, by cross references, these tables for both units.

The format and ACTION STATEMENTS of Technical Specification 3.3.3.7 Accident Monitoring Instrumentation, for Salem Unit No. 2 would be modified to agree with the format and Action Statements used on Unit No. 1. Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirement for the following accident monitoring instrumentation would be included in Tables 3.3-11a, 3.3-11b, and 4.3-11 for both units: Containment pressure—wide and narrow ranges, containment water level—wide range, and core exit thermocouples.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance

concerning the application of the standards for a No Significant Hazards determination by providing examples of actions not likely to involve a Significant Hazards Consideration in the **Federal Register** (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) relates to changes that constitute additional limitations, restrictions, or controls not presently included in the technical specifications. The new specifications requested constitute such an addition.

Based on the above, since the proposed changes involve actions that conform to the referenced example in 48 FR 14870, we have determined that this application for amendment involves no Significant Hazards Consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 122 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

Attorney for licensee: Conner and Wetterhann, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos. 50–272 and 50–311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: September 21, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would revise Technical Specification, section 3.6.4.1, Hydrogen Analyzers surveillance requirements. The existing Hydrogen Analyzers are being replaced with a type qualified for use in the containment. The new type requires a change is surveillance testing per manufacturer's specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The replacement of the existing Containment Hydrogen Monitoring System with one qualified for use in the containment assures the operator of a continuous indication of the hydrogen concentration in the containment as required by NUREG–0737. The license change in required to ensure that this equipment, installed to conform with the latest NRC requirements, is tested properly to demonstrate operability. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a No Significant Hazards determination by providing examples of actions not likely to involve a Significant Hazards Consideration in the **Federal Register** (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (vii) relates to changes that make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations.

Based on the above, and since the proposed change involves actions that conform to the referenced example in 48 FR 14870, we have determined that this application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 122 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

Attorney for licensee: Conner and Wetterhann, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos. 50–272 and 50–311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: October 26, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise section 6.0, Administrative Controls, to incorporate a change in Nuclear Department organization, Shift Complement clarification, Station Operation Review Committee (SORC) membership, quorum requirements, and responsibilities. Additionally, replace the Nuclear Review Board (NRB) with section 6.5.2, Nuclear Safety and Review, and add section 6.5.3, Technical Review and Control.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: This proposed change is administrative in nature in that it provides an improved organization, clarification of shift coverage, adds a new full-time safety review concept (which has the effect of improving the effectiveness of SORC Reviews and makes more efficient use of technical expertise available).

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a No Significant Hazards determination by providing examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration in the **Federal Register** (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (i) relates to purely administrative changes. This proposed change is basically a shifting of administrative responsibilities and improves the qualitative and quantitative effectiveness of the review function. Another example (ii) relates to changes that constitute an additional control not presently included in the technical specifications. This proposed change adds a Technical Review and Controls section that more clearly defines review responsibilities.

Based on the above, and since the proposed change involves actions that conform to referenced examples in 48 FR 14870, we have determined that this proposed application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 122 West Broadway, Salem New Jersey 08079.

Attorney for licensee: Conner and Wetterhann, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos. 50–272 and 50–311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: December 7, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment request would add to section 4.6.3.1.2 (Containment Systems), a surveillance requirement to reflect the 60° open limitation on the Containment Pressure-Vacuum Relief valves, VC5 and VC6 for both Salem Units and remove the footnote added by Amendment 12 to Salem Unit 2, page 3/4 6–15.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed amendment request is administrative in nature in that it constitutes an additional limitation or control (Surveillance Requirement) not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards determination by providing examples of actions not likely to involve a Significant Hazards Consideration in the **Federal Register** (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) relates to changes that constitute an additional control not presently included in the technical specifications.

Based on the above, and since the proposed change involves an action that conform to a referenced example in 48 FR 14870, we have determined that this proposed application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 122 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

Attorney for licensee: Conner and Wetterhann, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Data of amendments request: January 18, 1985.

Description of amendments request: The requirements of the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I rulemaking were implemented in license Amendment Nos. 59 and 28 for Salem Units 1 and 2, respectively. These amendments allowed 45 days for full implementation of the specifications. The 45 day period was erroneous in that it did not allow sufficient time to complete the significant technical, administrative and training efforts involved in the change-over of the large number of procedures related to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I requirements. This proposed amendment request would revise Amendment No. 59 to Facility Operating License DPR-70 and Amendment No. 28 to Facility Operating License DPR-75 to provide an additional 60 days for implementation such that Item 3 of these amendments is changed to read as follows: 3. This license amendment is effective on issuance and shall be implemented no later than 105 days after issuance.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The staff proposes to make a determination that the amendments 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 amendments 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.

The 10 CFR 50, Appendix I rulemaking specifically addressed the definition of a criterion of "As Low As Reasonably Achievable" (ALARA) and set effluent limits based on doses to the population surrounding nuclear power plants. Since the existing radiological technical specifications are at least as conservative, or more conservative than the Appendix I specifications contained in Amendment 59 Facility Operating License DPR-70 and Amendment 28 to Facility Operating License DPR-75, deferral of the implementation of these amendments would not involve a reduction in a margin of safety. Further, there are no procedural or physical plant changes involved in this proposed amendment; therefore, no increase in the probability or consequences of any previously evaluated accident, and no possibility of any new accident not previously evaluated. Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that this amendment request does not involve a signficant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 122 West Broadway, Salen, New Jersey 08079.

Attorney for licensee: Conner and Wetterhann, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Public Service Co. of Colorado, Docket No. 50-267, Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Generating Station, Platteville, Colorado

Date of amendment request: December 31, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change to the Technical Specifications provides clarification that only gamma radioactivity is monitored by the installed activity monitors. This clarification consists of inserting the word "gamma" prior to the words "activity monitors" in Specifications ELCO 8.1.2, ELCO 8.1.3, and ESR 8.1.2.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations include a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, a correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature.

The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications will not alter the equipment being used nor the operation of that equipment, and only serves to clarify the requirement for continuously monitoring the radioactivity of liquid effluent releases. Since the actual operations will not be affected by this change, the staff proposes to determine that this action involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Greeley Public Library, City Complex Building, Greeley, Colorado.

Attorney for licensee: Bryant O'Donnell, Public Service Company of Colorado, P.O. Box 840, Denver, Colorado 80201.

NRC Branch Chief: Eric H. Johnson.

Public Service Co. of Colorado, Docket No. 50-267, Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Generating Station, Platteville, Colorado

Date of amendment request: January 14, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change to the Administrative Controls Technical Specifications (TS) reflects recent organizational changes within the Public Service Company of Colorado. The TS changes involve revising position titles (e.g., "Radiation Protection Manager" to "Support Services Manager" and "Manager, Production, Fuels and Services Division" to "Manager, Production Services Division") the addition of a new position (Executive Staff Assistant) to the organizational chart and the corporate safety review committee membership, and changing the position to which the Training Supervisor reports.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations include a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: For example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. Based on an initial review of the application, the staff considers the proposed changes to be administrative changes of the type referred to above. Therefore, we propose to determine that this is an action which would involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Greeley Public Library, City Complex Building, Greeley, Colorado.

Attorney for licensee: Bryant O'Donnell, Public Service Company of Colorado, P.O. Box 840, Denver, Colorado 80201.

NRC Branch Chief: Eric H. Johnson.

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, Docket No. 50-244, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Wayne County, New York

Date of amendment request: December 5, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment to the Technical Specifications would delete the description of the battery charger configuration, because it superfluously describes originally installed equipment. Requirements for battery charging capacity and operability remain unchanged.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: By letter dated December 5, 1984, the licensee requested changes to the Ginna Technical Specifications to eliminate specific charging capacity values for individual chargers while retaining the 150-amp charging capacity for each battery to maintain the batteries in the full charged condition. The planned upgrading of the battery charging units during the 1985 Spring refueling outage provided an opportunity to delete the unwarranted description of the originally installed units rather than substitute similar arbitrary descriptive information for the new units. This is an administrative change to the Technical Specifications.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a purely administrative change to technical specifications: For example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. Because the change proposed here would merely delete unnecessary descriptive material and would not effect battery charging and operability requirements, the proposed change is administrative in nature and falls within example (i) of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. On that basis, the staff proposes to determine that the request involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14604.

Attorney for licensee: Harry H. Voigt, Esquire, LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby and MacRae, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A Zwolinski, Chief.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50–312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of amendment request: October 9, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would delete Facility Operating License Condition 2.C. (10) relating to the U.S./International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards program. Under this program, the Rancho Seco facility was subject to IAEA inspection of nuclear material accounting and nuclear material control. The amendment would not alter in any way the Rancho Seco safeguards provisions required by NRC regulations.

The termination provision of License Condition 2.C. (10) provides that the IAEA program be terminated as of the date of such a notice from the NRC. That notice was provided to the licensee in a letter dated June 1, 1984, and accordingly, the IAEA insepction program was terminated at that time. Therefore, the proposed amendment would delete a license condition that is no longer in effect.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed amendment would only delete a license condition that is no longer in effect and would not affect plant operation or design. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not: 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. Based on the foregoing, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Sacramento City-County Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California.

Attorney for licensee: Daivd S. Kaplan, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, P.O. Box 15830, Sacramento, California 95813.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50–312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of amendment request: June 27, 1984, amended on December 24, 1984.

Description of amendment request: In 1976, as a result of damage to reactor vessel surveillance capsule holder tubes near the reactor vessel wall at the Rancho Seco Nuclear Generation Station, the Rancho Seco reactor vessel surveillance capsules were installed in the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, surveillance capsule holders. Since the Davis-Besse reactor design is similar to the Rancho Seco reactor design, radiation damage to the Rancho Seco reactor vessel materials installed in the Davis-Besse reactor can be used to provide radiation damage information for the Rancho Seco reactor vessel.

The proposed amendment would modify the Rancho Seco Technical Specifications (TSs) by adding a revised removal schedule for the Rancho Seco material surveillance capsules from the Davis-Besse reactor vessel. TS Table 4.2.1 containing the current capsule removal schedule will be deleted. The amendment would also delete section 4.7.8 and revise the Bases section to delete redundant information and to provide a better description of the Reactor Vessel Surveilliance Program.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The withdrawal schedule in the proposed amendment was developed in accordance with the 1982 edition of ASTM E 185 and provides a better defined removal schedule for the surveillance capsules based on accumulated neutron fluence rather than on the basis of refueling cycle. Thus, any change in the nominal cycle time will not greatly influence the characterization of reactor vessel material condition as a function of accumulated neutron fluence. The original removal schedule was developed in accordance with the 1973 edition of ASTM E 185. Appendix H to 10 CFR Part 50 provides for the use of ASTM E 185–82 in the material surveillance program. The revised removal schedule will not reduce the effectiveness of the Reactor Vessel Surveillance Program.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). None of these examples are applicable to the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment relates only to a materials surveillance program and does not involve any change in the facility or its operation. Furthermore, neither the quantity nor the quality of the information obtained from the surveillance program is reduced. The change also is within all acceptable criteria with respect to the program specified in the Standard Review Plan. The proposed amendment, therefore, meets the requirements specified in 10 CFR 50.92(c) for an amendment which does not involve a significant hazards consideraiton.

Local Public Document Room location: Sacramento City-County Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California.

Attorney for licensee: David S. Kaplan, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, P.O. Box 15830, Sacramento, California 95813.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: November 29, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would add a note to the high containment radioactivity signal for containment purge and exhaust isolation in Technical Specification Table 3.3-3, "Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation." The note would state that "purge exhaust monitor not required when purge exhaust is closed."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: When the plant is operating in Modes 1 through 4, the six-inch mini-purge system is needed at times to increase containment pressure to comply with Technical Specification limits. This pressurization is accomplished by keeping closed the values in the mini-purge exhaust line and pumping air into containment through the mini-purge supply line. (Technical Specifications limit the total amount of time the isolation valves in the mini-purge system may be opened to less than 1000 hours per 365 days.) While in this pressurization mode, no open exhaust line leads out of containment to the outside environment. Because all exhaust lines are closed, one of the radiation monitors used to sample containment radiation is isolated.

The radiation monitor in question provides one of two (2) isolation signals to the mini-purge lines upon detection of high containment radioactivity. In the plant configuration described above, the valves in the exhaust line are closed. If during pressurization, leakage occurs through the closed valves, the radiation monitor could detect radioactivity and provide an isolation signal. Diversity in the parameters sensed for containment isolation continues to exist, including high containment pressure and the various other parameters sensed for safety injection system actuation.

The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. The request involved in this case does not match any of those examples. However, the staff has reviewed the licensee's request for the above amendment and has determined that should this request be implemented, it will not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the monitoring of open flow paths out of containment remains a requirement and the design basis continues to be met, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the physical plant design is not being changed and the amendment still allows for purge and exhaust isolation on high containment radioactivity in Modes 1 through 4. Also, it will not (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because of the minimal time required for containment pressurization during which the exhaust lines are closed and an alternate channel sensing high radiation inside containment which exists to provide a purge exhaust isolation signal. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, Garden and Washington Streets, Winnsboro, South Carolina 29180.

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: December 14, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Technical Specification 3/4.9.11 "Spent Fuel Pool Ventilation System." The revision would change the Technical Specification to require certain surveillance testing only when the system is being used in an engineered safety features function.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The spent fuel pool ventilation system at the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station has two (2) distinct functions. These functions consist of being an engineered safety feature (ESF) system to mitigate the offsite radiological consequences of a fuel handling accident and providing a filtration/ventilation system for the fuel handling building, hot machine shop and excess liquid radwaste area during normal plant operation. The usual operating function of providing filtration for the above listed areas represents a portion of the licensee's commitment to ALARA, and is not required to meet 10 CFR Part 100 criteria. The proposed change recognizes that during periods of normal plant operation, the testing requirements are most properly outlined by Regulatory Guide 1.140, "Design, Testing, and Maintenance Criteria for Normal Ventilation Exhaust System Air Filtration and Adsorption Units of Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Plants." The requested revision to the Technical Specifications does not decrease the protection of the public in the event of a design basis fuel handling accident because the Technical Specifications continue to ensure that the rigorous testing requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 2, March 1978, "Design, Testing and Maintenance Criteria for Post Accident Engineered-Safety-Feature Atmosphere Cleanup System Air Filtration and Adsorption Units of Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Plants," are completed prior to and during use of the system for its ESF function.

The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. The request involved in this case does not match any of those examples. However, the staff has reviewed the licensee's request for the above amendment and has determined that should this request be implemented, it will not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the system design will not change and will continue to be tested for operability before it is relied upon as an ESF system, (2) create the possibility of a new or differet kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the system will be tested to ensure that it continues to perform its ESF functions as originally intended, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the licensee will continue to demonstrate operability of the system by performing the required surveillance activities before allowing it to serve as an ESF system. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, Garden and Washington Streets, Winnsboro, South Carolina 29180.

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: November 16, 1983, as amended December 14, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Technical Specification 3/4.7.7 "Snubbers," and its bases to indicate that all snubbers on systems required for safe shutdown/accident mitigation shall be operable. The amendment would then delete Technical Specification Tables 3.7-4a, "Safety-Related Hydraulic Snubbers," and 3.7-4b, "Safety-Related Mechanical Snubbers."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The original request of November 16, 1983, was noticed in the **Federal Register** (49 FR 7042) on February 24, 1984. Responding to Generic Letter 84-13, "Technical Specifications for Snubbers," the licensee revised its original request by letter dated December 14, 1984. This revision was substantial enough to require renoticing the requested amendment.

As stated in Generic Letter 84-13, the snubber listing currently found in Technical Specifications is not necessary, provided Technical Specification 3/4.7.7 specifies which snubbers are required to be operable. Technical Specification 3/4.7.7 is, therefore, being revised to indicate that all snubbers on systems requred for safe shutdown/accident mitigation shall be operable. This includes safety and non-safety related snubbers on systems used to protect the code boundary and to ensure the structural integrity of these systems under dynamic loads.

Therefore, the requirement regarding snubbers found in Technical Specifications is not being changed and is consistent with the NRC guidance stated in Generic Letter 84-13.

The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. The request involved in this case does not match any of those examples. However, the staff has reviewed the licensee's request for the above amendment and has determined that should this request be implemented, it will not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the Technical Specification requirements regarding snubbers remain unchanged, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the physical plant design is not being changed. Also, it will not (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because all snubbers on systems required for safe shutdown/accident mitigation will be operable including safety and non-safety related snubbers on systems used to protect the code boundary and to ensure the structural integrity of these systems under dynamic loads. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, Garden and Washington Streets, Winnsboro, South Carlina 29180.

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: November 29, 1984, and supplemented January 8, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would add a new Technical Specification 3/4.8.4.3 regarding requirements for circuit breakers for non-Class 1E cable.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Operability and surveillance requirements for circuit breakers for non-Class 1E cables located in cable trays which do not have covers and which provide protection for cables that if faulted could cause failure in two or more adjacent, redundant Class 1E cables are being added to Technical Specifications. The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples (ii) relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in Technical Specifications. The amendment involved here is similar to this example in that it adds requirements for some non-Class 1E cable circuit breakers. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, Garden and Washington Streets, Winnsboro, South Carolina 29180.

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3, San Diego County, California

Date of Amendment Request: March 2 and April 2, (Reference PCN 131).

Description of Amendment Request: The proposed change revises Technical Specification 3/4.3.3.8 "Radioactive Liquid Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation." Technical Specification (T.S.) 3/4.3.3.8 defines operability requirements for instrumentation used to monitor releases of radioactive liquids, periodic testing required to verify operability and actions to be taken in the event that the minimum operability requirements cannot be met.

The proposed change revises T.S. 3/4.3.3.8 to:

1. Allow the use of pumps other than the circulating water pumps to provide dilution of radioactive liquid effluents.

2. Allow liquid effluents from certain release paths to be diverted to other portions of the liquid radwaste system when the associated liquid effluent monitor is inoperable as an alternative to the current requirement to analyze grab samples if releases are to continue.

3. Delete the current limitations on the period for which compensatory measures can be taken when radioactive liquid effluent monitoring instrumentation is inoperable, to eliminate an inconsistency in the technical specifications.

Basis for Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a proposed license amendment involves a significant hazards consideration by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. Example (i) relates to a purely administrative change to the technical specifications: For example a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. Example (vi) relates to a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analysed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but

where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the SRP. The changes itemized above are similar to example (i) or example (vi) of (48 FR 14870) and thus it is proposed that the changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration. The following is a more detailed description of each of the three items listed above and a description of how each is similar to the examples of (48 FR 14870).

Specific Changes Requested and Bases for Proposed No Significant Hazards Determination for each:

1. Allow use of pumps other than the circulating water pumps to liquid effluent dilution.

T.S. 3/4.3.3.8 currently requires that at least one circulating water pump must be operating and providing dilution to the circulating water system discharge structure whenever dilution is required to meet site radioactive effluent concentration. Liquid effluent concentration limits are specified by T.S. 3.11.1.1, "Liquid Effluents—Concentration." In addition to the circulating water pumps, which provide cooling water for the condenser when the plant is operating, there are other pumps (e.g., the saltwater cooling pumps) which are also capable of providing dilution of liquid effluents. The proposed change replaces the specific reference to circulating water pumps with "all pumps required to be providing dilution in order to meet site radioactive effluent concentration limits." This non-specific reference to all pumps will allow use of pumps other than the circulating water pumps (e.g., the saltwater cooling pumps) as long as the site effluent concentration limits specified by T.S. 3.11.1.1 are met.

This change is similar to example (vi) of (48 FR 14870) in that although it allows the use of pumps other than the circulating water pumps to provide liquid effluent dilution and this may result in an increase in the probability of a previously analysed accident, it nevertheless is still within all acceptable criteria in that the facility will still meet the requirements of 10 CFR 20, which are specified in T.S. 3.11.1.1.

2. Diversion of effluents to the liquid radwaste system in lieu of grab sampling.

Acting 29 of T.S. 3/4.3.3.8 specifies the actions to be taken if effluents are being released via the steam generator blowdown effluent release path or either of its bypass lines and the required radioactive liquid effluent monitors are inoperable. Action 30 provides the actions to be taken if effluents are being released via the turbine building sump effluent release path and the required radioactive liquid effluent monitors are inoperable. Both Actions 29 and 30 currently state that the release of radioactive effluents via a pathway with inoperable monitors may continue provided that grab samples are analyzed periodically for gross radioactivity.

The proposed change would revise Actions 29 and 30 of T.S. 3/4.3.3.8. to explicitly allow isolating the release pathway and diverting the radioactive effluent flow to the liquid radwaste treatment system for processing as liquid radwaste. This proposed change would explicity allow the steam generator blowdown and the turbine building sumps radioactive liquid effluents to be processed in the same way as liquid radwaste from other sources. The existing Actions 29 and 30 require grab samples if releases are continued. If releases are not continued, grab samples are not required. No releases are made via the affected pathways if radioactive effluent flow is diverted to the liquid radwaste system, so in this case grab samples would not be required. Since this action could be taken within the bounds of the existing Actions 29 and 30, the proposed change merely formalizes this alterntive in the technical specifications. Therefore, the proposed change is editorial and is similar to Example (i).

3. Deletion of Time Limits in Effluent Monitoring Action Statements.

The applicability of actions to be taken when radioactive liquid effluent monitoring instrumentation is inoperable is limited to a specified period (e.g., 30 days). If effluent release continues beyond this period, even while continuing to implement the compensatory measures specified by the action, because of the time limit, this action would be outside of the bounds of the T.S. and would therefore invoke Specification 3.0.3. T.S. 3.0.3. would require that action be taken to initiate a plant shutdown. T.S. 3/4.3.3.8 has an exception to Specification 3.0.3 in accordance with which, at the end of the existing action time limit, it would be interpreted that no additional action is required. The 3.0.3 exception conflicts with the time limits in the actions. The proposed change removes the time limits thereby eliminating the existing conflict. The proposed change will continue to require reporting of effluent monitoring instrumentation inoperabilities of greater than 30 days duration and continued implementation of the specified compensatory measures.

Because this change achieves consistency within the technical specifications, it is similar to example (i) of (48 FR 14870). On this basis, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Sam Clemente Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California.

Attorney for licensee: Charles R. Kocher, Esq., Southern California Edison Company, 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770 and Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, Attn: David R. Pigott, Esq., 600 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94111.

NRC Branch Chief: George W. Knighton.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50–259, 50–260 and 50–296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of amendment request: November 19, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would modify the Technical Specifications to delete the requirement for the condenser low vacuum scram function. Approval of the proposed amendment would eliminate the need to reduce power during periods of high river water temperature.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards by providing examples of actions that are not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One example of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change which either may result in some increase in the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptance criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan (SRP).

The basis for the turbine condenser low vacuum scram is to provide an anticipatory scram to reduce peak pressure in the reactor vessel caused only by a turbine trip on low condenser vacuum. Without the anticipatory scram at 23 inches of mercury vacuum on decreasing condenser vacuum, the main turbine would receive a trip at 21.8 inches of mercury vacuum. This trip signal would cause the turbine stop valves and control valves to close, initiating a scram in less than one second. While the reactor was scramming, there would also be an increase in reactor vessel pressure because of isolation of the main

condenser from the reactor. This pressure rise would normally be limited by automatic opening of the turbine bypass valves. For the purposes of conseratively analyzing turbine trip transients (ref: FSAR Chapter 13, "Plant Safety Analyses"), no credit was taken for either the condenser low vacuum scram or operation of the turbine bypass valves. Deletion or nonoperation of the condenser low vacuum switches may increase the reactor vessel peak pressure resulting from a turbine trip and thereby reduce a margin of safety. However, since no credit is taken for that scram function this change would meet the acceptance criteria of SRP section 7.2, "Reactor Trip System."

Therefore the proposed amendment is encompassed by an example for which no significant hazards are likely to exist, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Athens Public Library, South and Forrest, Athens, Alabama 35611.

Attorney for licensee: H.S. Sanger, Jr., Esquire, General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 Commerce Avenue, E 11B 33C, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50–259, 50–260 and 50–296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of amendment request: December 21, 1984,

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications as follows:

(1) The basis for Secifications 3.7.A and 4.7.A would be changed to indicate that the green position indicating lights for the drywell-suppression chamber vacuum breakers are lit when the valves are "less than 80 degrees" open. The existing figure of 30 degrees is a typographical error (Units 1 and 2 only).

(2) Specifications 3.8.C (LCO and basis) and 4.8.C would be revised to indicate that there is more than one mechanical vacuum pump; "pump" would be changed to "pumps", and "line" to "lines". (There are two half-size mechanical vacuum pumps for each unit as described in the FSAR section 11.4.) This change corrects an editorial error.

(3) Specification 6.3 would be expanded to include a new requirement for preparation of written procedures to limit shift overtime. This change would implement NUREG–0737 Item I.A.1.3.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples relates to: "(i) A purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: For example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature." Another example (ii) of actions involving no significant hazards consideration is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. Changes (1) and (2) correct typographical and editorial errors and are thus encompassed by example (i). Change 3 is an additional control and is thus encompassed by example (ii).

Since all of the changes to the Technical Specifications given in the three areas above are ecompassed by an example in the guidance provided by the Commisson of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Athens Public Library, South and Forrest, Athens, Alabama 35611.

Attorney for licensee: H.S. Sanger, Jr., Esquire, General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 Commerce Avenue, E 11B 33C, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

The Toledo Edison Company and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50–346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of amendment request: March 16, 1979 revised by letters dated December 23, 1982, July 13, 1983 (Item 2), August 18, 1983 (Item 6), March 15, 1984, and November 1, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment regarding Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications was the subject of previous notices published in the **Federal Register** November 22, 1983, at 48 FR 52836 and May 23, 1984, at 49 FR 21847. Subsequent to those notices, an error was noted in the proposed Technical Specifications relating to the action statement associated with the limiting condition for operation for explosive gas mixtures in the waste gas system. The licensee s letter of November 1, 1984, corrects proposed Act b in Specification 3.11.2.5. The corrected action statement requires immediate suspension of waste gas additions to the system and restoration of oxygen concentrations to within the limiting condition for operation. Action b is required whenever gas concentrations exceed both the limiting condition for operation and the concentrations applicable for Action a. Previously, the concentrations given for applicability for Action b were inconsistent with the limiting condition for operation.

The licensee's letter of November 1, 1984, does not affect any other part of the proposed amendment and does not change any of the description of the amendment published in the November 22, 1983, or May 23, 1984 notices.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The previous basis for the proposed amendment as corrected still applies (48 FR 52836 and 49 FR 21847).

Local Public Document Room location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

The Toledo Edison Company and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50–346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of amendment request: November 20, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add a requirement for operability of a reactor coolant system vent path from each reactor coolant system loop and from the pressurizer. In the event one or more of these paths become inoperable, the inoperable paths must be restored to operability or the unit shutdown specified time intervals. The proposed amendment includes a required surveillance at least once each 18 months. The proposed Technical Specifications would be applicable when the plant is in operational modes 1, 2, or 3. The application is in response to NRC Generic Letter 83–37 which requested that such Technical Specifications be proposed by all operators of pressurized water reactors.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The reactor coolant system high point vents have been installed in accordance with Item 11.B.1 of NUREG–0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements" and as required by Commission regulation 10 CFR

50.44(c)(3)(iii). These high point vents are installed to vent any noncondensible gas which might accumulate and inhibit core cooling under natural circulation or reactor coolant.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The high point vents are required to be installed by Commission regulation; therefore incorporation of the proposed technical specification requirements represent additional controls not presently included, and thus the proposed amendment fits this example. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: November 2, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) and Surveillance Requirements pertaining to degraded grid voltage protection to the Technical Specifications. Such restrictions do not now exist in the Technical Specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions which involve no significant hazards consideration include a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: For example, a more stringent surveillance requirement.

The changes proposed in this application for amendment are encompassed by this example because restrictions would be added pertaining to degraded grid voltage, and such restrictions are presently not addressed in the Vermont Yankee Technical Specifications.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

Attorney for licensee: John A. Ritscher, Esquire, Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: December 14, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests a revision to the Technical Specifications pertaining to the following TMI Action Plan Items set forth in NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements" and as requested by the staff's Generic Letter 83-36:

II.F.1.3—Containment High-Range Monitor
II.F.1.4—Containment Pressure Monitor
II.F.1.5—Containment Water Level Monitor
II.F.1.6—Containment Hydrogen Monitor
II.D.3.4—Control Room Habitability Requirements

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples relates to: "(ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: For example, a more stringent surveillance requirement."

Technical Specification changes proposed in response to TMI Action Plan Items II.F.1.3, II.F.1.4, II.F.1.4, II.F.1.6 and II.D.3.4 are as follows:

(a) II.F.1.3—Containment High-Range Monitor—The proposed changes define the instrumentation and calibration requirements for the containment high range monitor and actions required when these operational limits are not met.

(b) II.F.1.4—Containment Pressure Monitor—The proposed changes define the instrumentation and calibration requirements for the containment pressure monitor and also actions required when these operational limits are not met.

(c) II.F.1.5—Containment Water Level Monitor—The proposed changes define the instrumentation and calibration requirements for the containment water level monitor and also actions required when these operational limits are not met.

(d) II.F.1.6—Containment Hydrogen Monitor—The proposed changes provide limiting conditions for operation (LCO) and surveillance requirements for the Hydrogen/Oxygen Monitor.

(e) II.D.3.4—Control Room Habitability Requirements—The proposed changes provide limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for the Control Room Toxic Gas Monitoring System.

The modifications to Technical Specifications in response to the above TMI Action Items requirements constitute additional limitations, restrictions or controls not presently included in the Vermont Yankee Technical Specifications. Therefore, the proposed changes are similar to the Commission's example (ii) above. Therefore, we propose to determine that the requested changes will not involve significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

Attorney for licensee: John A. Ritscher, Esquire, Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: January 15, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests a change to the Administrative Controls section of the Technical Specifications to provide alternative requirements should the Operations Supervisor not possess a Senior Operator License for an interim time period.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards in 10

CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples is "(i) a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: For example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature." The proposed change would maintain the organization shown in Figure 6.1.2. The proposed change would allow the flexibility to permit the Assistant Operations Supervisor to provide instructions to the shift crews involving licensing activities should the Operations Supervisor not have a Senior Operator License. In this case, the Assistant Operations Supervisor would be a licensed Senior Operator and have qualification in accordance with ANSI N18.1–1971, "Selection and Training of Personnel for Nuclear Power Plants." Since the level of training and the requirement for a Senior Operator License for the Operations Supervisor function is fulfilled as described by the Assistant Operations Supervisor, the change is administrative since there is only a change in nomenclature when the Assistant Operations Supervisor assumes the Operations Supervisor fucntion in the Technical Specifications and, therefore, the change is similar to example (i). Therefore, we propose to determine that the requested changes will not involve significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

Attorney for licensee: John A. Ritscher, Esquire, Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–280 and 50–281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of amendment requests: November 30, 1984.

Description of amendment requests: By NRC Generic Letter 83–43 to all licensees, model Technical Specifications were forwarded which showed the revisions to reporting requirements as necessitated by §§ 50.72 and 50.73 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Section 50.72 revises the immediate notification requirements for operating nuclear power plants. Section 50.73 provides for a revised Licensee Event Report System.

By letter dated November 30, 1984, Virginia Electric and Power Company submitted proposed license amendments for NRC review and approval which reflects changes to reporting requirements. In addition, minor editorial and typograhical errors are corrected.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change to make the licenses conform to changes in the regulations where the change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The NRC initial review of the licensee's submittal related to reporting indicates that this is the case. Another example (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specification, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. The remaining changes fall into this category. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Michael W. Maupin, Hunton and Williams, Post Office Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23213.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–266 and 50–301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: June 4, 1976 as modified January 28, 1980 October 7, 1983 and December 20, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would permit operation after approval of changes to the plant's Technical Specifications (TS) that would bring them into compliance with Appendix I, 10 CFR Part 50, and 10 CFR 50.36a and 50.34a. These proposed TS are intended to ensure that releases of radioactive material to unrestricted areas during normal operation remain as low as is reasonably achievable. Specifically, the proposed TS define limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring. Additional environment sampling locations have been added to the present sampling locations. Additional managerial review responsibilities and reporting requirements would be added relating to radioactive releases.

The NRC staff has issued previously its proposed determination that the earlier versions of these amendment requests did not involve a significant hazards consideration (48 FR 38382 at 38430, August 23, 1983 and 48 FR 52804 at 52840, November 22, 1983).

This newest version of the proposed amendments addresses NRC staff comments on previous submittals. The staff's comments were transmitted to the licensee by letter dated July 18, 1984. The newest version of these proposed amendments submits the proposed Technical Specifications as a completely new section, adds several new specifications such as total dose and explosive gas mixture specifications and makes several other additions and revisions to address staff comments.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to additional limitations, restrictions or controls not presently included in the techncial specifications (ii). In the case of the proposed technical specifications, they constitute an additional requirement for monitoring and control of radioactive effluents not presently in the technical specifications and are intended to meet the intent of the Commission's regulations (10 CFR Part 50 Appendix I, 10 CFR 50.34a, and 10 CFR 50.36a) and related staff guidance (NUREG–0472). Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Joseph P. Mann Public Library, 1515 16th Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: James R. Miller.

Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–266 and 50–301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: October 26, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment request would delete a limiting condition for operation

concerning the auxiliary feedwater system. Specifically, the limiting condition for operation which allows temporarily shutting discharge valves of shared auxiliary feedwater pumps to a unit when necessary to supply auxiliary feedwater to the other unit for purposes of startup, shutdown or surveillance testing (provided that the other unit's turbine driven auxiliary feedwater pump was operable) would be deleted.

The amendment also would modify steam generator inservice inspection requirements under specification 15.4.2.A, "Steam Generator Tube Inspection Requirements". Item 2.a of this specification would be charged to indicate that selection of one steam generator for inspection is permissible. Item 3 of this specification would be rewritten to acknowledge that strict compliance with Appendix IV to section IX of the ASME Code would prohibit utilization of state-of-the-art inspection techniques not yet recongized by the Code. Item 7 of the specification would be revised to acknowledge that reporting be in accordance with 10 CFR 50.73.ii rather than the superseded LER reporting specification. The basis for this section would also be changed to make it consistent with the specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is example (v): "Upon satisfactory completion of construction in connection with an operating facility, a relief granted from an operating restriction that was imposed because the construction was not yet completed satisfactorily." The proposed amendment involving deleting a limiting condition for operation (LCO) concerning the auxiliary feedwater system meets this example. The LCO had been imposed as an interim safety measure until valve actuation modifications (automatic alignment upon receipt of a signal to start the auxiliary feedwater pumps) were completed. The valve actuation modifications have been completed and tested and the LCO is no longer needed.

Another example of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is example (i) a purely administrative change to the technical specifications. The changes involving steam generator inservice inspections meet this example. This specification has been clarified to indicate that selection of one steam generator for inspection is permissible. This specification has been rewritten to acknowledge that strict compliance with Appendix IV to section XI of the ASME Code would prohibit utilization of state-of-the-art inspection techniques not yet recognized by the Code. The specification has also been revised to acknowledge that reporting be in accordance with 10 CFR 50.73.ii rather than the superseded LER reporting specification. The basis for this section have also been rewritten to make it consistent with the specifications and our current practices. Item 3 of page 15.6.10–1 has also been changed to conform to present terminology. Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the amendments involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Joseph P. Mann Public Library, 1516 Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: James R. Miller.

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED NOTICES OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO OPERATING LICENSES AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

The following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this regular monthly notice. They are repeated here because the monthly notice lists all amendments proposed to be issued involving no significant hazards consideration.

For details, see the individual notice in the **Federal Register** on the day and page cited. This notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice.

Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50–302, Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of amendment request: December 14, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would modify Technical Specification Tables 4.3.2, 4.3.6, and 4.3.7, and Technical Specification 4.4.3.2.2 to permit waiver of certain 18-month calibration frequency requirements for Cycle V provided the surveillance is performed during Refuel V. The specific equipment covered by this request is as follows:

1. Low Steam Generation Pressure (Steam Line Rupture Matrix)
2. Pressurizer Level (Remote Shutdown)
3. Steam Generator Pressure (Remote Shutdown)
4. Pressurizer Level (Post-Accident)
5. Steam Generator Outlet Pressure (Post-Accident)
6. Startup Feedwater Flow
7. Power Operated Relief Valve

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** January 14, 1985, 50 FR 1949.

Expiration date of individual notice: February 13, 1985.

Local Public Document Room location: Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50–333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: December 6, 1984, as supplemented January 10, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: These revisions would permit refueling operations to proceed with the Reactor Protection System inoperable to facilitate installation of Analog Trip Transmitter System components during the upcoming 1985 refueling outage.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** February 4, 1985 50 FR 4929.

Expiration date of individual notice: March 6, 1985.

Local Public Document Room location: Penfield Library, State University College of Oswego, New York.

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, Docket No. 50–244, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Wayne County, New York

Date of amendment request: January 25, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would allow use of temporary closure plate in place of the equipment door (hatch).

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** February 5, 1985 (50 FR 5020).

Expiration date of individual notice: March 7, 1985.

Local Public Document Room location: Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14604.

Southern California Edison Company, et al., 50–361 and 50–362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3

Date of amendment request: July 2, August 7 and October 3, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: Changes to Technical Specifications 3/4.2.4, "DNBR Margin" and 3/4.3.1, "Reactor Protection Instrumentation," and their bases.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50845).

Expiration date of individual notice: January 30, 1985.

Local Public Document Room location: San Clemente Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92612.

Southern California Edison Company, et al., 50–361 and 50–362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3

Date of amendment request: February 29, April 2, September 11, October 1 and 3, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: Technical Specification changes relating to reactor protection instrumentation and electrical power sources.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50843).

Expiration date of individual notice: January 30, 1985.

Local Public Document Room location: San Clemente Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92612.

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

During the 30-day period since publication of the last monthly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated. No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following this notice.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commisison has prepared an environmental assesment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendments, (2) the amendments, and (3) the Commission's related letters, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessments as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

Alabama Power Company, Docket No. 50–348, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Houston County, Alabama

Date of application for amendment: February 10, 1984, supplemented June 18, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: Table 4.4–5, Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program—Withdrawal Schedule is revised to show a different withdrawal time schedule for the remaining capsules. The change is administrative in nature and conforms to the requirements in Appendix H to 10 CFR Part 50, which became effective July 26, 1983 (48 FR 24008 May 31, 1983). Other changes proposed to Tables 3.4–2 and 3.4–3 are not acted upon at this time.

Date of issuance: January 22, 1985.

Effective date: January 22, 1985.

Amendment No.: 48.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–2. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 25, 1984 (49 FR 17851) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 22, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments were received.

Local Public Document Room location: George S. Houston Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Dothan, Alabama 36303.

Arkansas Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50–368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendment: June 30, 1983, as superseded by letter dated May 19, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications pertaining to hydraulic snubbers and added new requirements for mechanical snubbers operability and testing.

Date of issuance: January 29, 1985.

Effective date: January 29, 1985

Amendment No.: 62

Facility Operating License No. NPF–6. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** August 22, 1984 (48 FR 33353 at 33356).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 29, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Arkansas Power & Light Company, Dockets Nos. 50–313 and 50–368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit Nos. 1 and Unit 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendments: March 16, 1984, supplemented August 22, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments provided Technical Specifications related to the following NUREG–0737 Items:

1. Reactor Coolant System Vents (II.B.1)
2. Postaccident Sampling (II.B.3)
3. Sampling and Analysis of Plant Effluents (II.F.1.2)
4. Containment High-Range Radiation Monitor (II.F.1.3)
5. Containment Pressure Monitor (II.F.1.4)
6. Containment Water Level Monitor (II.F.1.5)

Date of issuance: January 31, 1985.

Effective date: January 31, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 94 and 63.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–51 and NPF–6. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45941 at 45942).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a

Safety Evaluation dated January 31, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Baltimore Gas & Electric Company, Dockets Nos. 50–317 and 50–318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of application for amendments: October 11, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Unit 1 and Unit 2 Technical Specifications 4.6.1.2a to allow completion of the third containment Integrated Leak Rate Test (ILRT) prior to the 10-year Inservice Inspection (ISI) outage. This TS change would provide for a "one time only" schedule change for the third (10-year service interval) ILRT.

Date of issuance: February 14, 1985.

Effective date: February 14, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 98 and 80.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–53 and DPR–69. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50794 at 50798).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 14, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland.

Carolina Power & Light Company, Dockets Nos. 50–325 and 50–324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: October 2, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications by revising Table 4.3.5.9–1 to remove the requirement for control room alarm annunciation when the noble gas activity monitors of the main stack monitoring system, the reactor building ventilation monitoring system, or the turbine building ventilation monitoring system experience a high-voltage circuit failure. In addition, the requirement for control room alarm annunciation is removed for the condition when the noble gas activity monitor of the reactor building ventilation system is not set in the "operate mode."

Date of issuance: February 7, 1985.

Effective date: February 7, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 81 and 107.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–71 and DPR–62. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 49 FR 45943

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 7, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Southport, Brunswick County Library, 109 W. Moore Street, Southport, North Carolina 28461.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 50–237, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, Grundy County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment: September 11, 27 and 28, 1984 and October 2, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment authorizes changes to the Technical Specifications to support Cycle 10 operation of Dresden 2 with reload fuel supplied by and the associated analyses performed by Exxon Nuclear Company. The amendment also authorizes Dresden 2 to use General Electric hybrid design hafnium control rod assemblies, provides new limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for a newly modified scram system having improved reliability and changes the calibration and functional test frequencies for certain specific instruments that are being modified into analog trip systems. Specifically related to the operation with the reload fuel, the amendment authorizes extension of the MAPLHGR curves for 8×8 and 9×9 (LTA) fuel types and for GE P8DRB265H fuel type and deletes the MAPLHGR curve for GE fuel type P8DRB239 which has never been used at Dresden and is not expected to be in the future.

Date of Issuance: January 17, 1985.

Effective Date: January 17, 1985.

Amendment No. 84.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR–19. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial Notices in **Federal Register:** October 24, 1984 (49 FR 42815) and November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45944 and 45945). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 17, 1985. No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60451.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50–295 and 50–304, Zion Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Benton County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: October 29, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments add a specification for reactor coolant system vents and are consistent with the guidance provided in NRC Generic Letter 83–37.

Date of Issuance: February 5, 1985.

Effective Date: February 5, 1985.

Amendment Nos. 86 and 86.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–39 and DPR–48. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial Notices in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50801) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Zion Benton Library District, 2600 Emmaus Avenue, Zion, Illinois 60099.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50–213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: October 24, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to specify that the minimum shift crew composition for Normal Operating Conditions except cold shutdown includes two individuals holding a senior reactor operator license.

Date of Issuance: January 15, 1985.

Effective Date: January 15, 1985.

Amendment No. 61.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–61 Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial Notices in the **Federal Register:** December 27, 1983 (48 FR 57031). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a letter dated January 15, 1985. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Russell Library, 124 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–369 and 50–370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: August 31, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to implement the use of time overcurrent trips of the circuit breakers for emergency diesel generators.

Date of Issuance: February 1, 1985.

Effective date: February 1, 1985.

Amendment Nos. 38 and 19.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–9 and NPF–17. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50801) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 1, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223.

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–369 and 50–370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: November 16, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to delete the provision which allows the upper head injection accumulator system to be inoperable at less than or equal to 46% rated thermal power.

Date of issuance: February 6, 1985.

Effective date: February 6, 1985.

Amendment Nos. 39 and 20.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–9 and NPF–17. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50802) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 6, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223.

Duke Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50–269, 50–270 and 50–287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Unites Nos. 1, 2 and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendments: April 30, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: These amendments revise the Administrative Controls Section of the TSs to reflect the current regulations governing licensee event reports as required by the Commission.

Date of issuance: January 9, 1985.

Effective date: January 9, 1985.

Amendment Nos. 133, 133 and 130.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–38, DPR–47 and DPR–55. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the **Federal Register:** August 22, 1984, 49 FR 33363 The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Oconee County Library, 501 West Southbroad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

Duke Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50–269, 50–270, 50–287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendments: November 9, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise the common Technical Specifications (TSs) to permit Oconee Unit 2 a one-time extension of the interval for inspecting inaccessible hydraulic snubbers such that the inspection be performed during the 1985 Unit 2 refueling outage, provided that such outage begins no later than March 15, 1985. The inspection is currently required to be performed before February 14, 1985.

Date of issuance: February 6, 1985.

Effective date: February 6, 1985.

Amendments Nos. 134, 134, and 131.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–38, DPR–47 and DPR–55. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984, 49 FR 50803.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 6, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Oconee County Library, 501 West Southbroad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina

Duke Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50–269, 50–270, and 50–287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendments: August 8, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: These amendments revise the Technical Specifications to change the air lock testing frequency from quarterly to semiannually in conformance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, "Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing For Water-Cooled Power Reactors".

Date of issuance: February 11, 1985.

Effective date: February 11, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 135, 135, and 132.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–38, DPR–47 and DPR–55. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** October 24, 1984, 49 FR 42817.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 11, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Oconee County Library, 501 West Southbroad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

Duquesne Light Company, Docket No. 50–334, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of Application for amendment: June 28, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications for Beaver Valley Unit No. 1 as follows:

(1) Table 4.3–13 has been revised to indicate that the Noble Gas Activity Monitor and Radiation Monitor provide control room alarm communication only; they do not initiate any automatic actuation.

(2) Table 3.4–4 has been revised to specify the applicable time constant for the functional unit High Negative Steam Pressure Rate to be greater than or equal to 50 seconds.

(3) Tables 3.3–3, 3.3–4, 3.3–5 and 4.3–2 have been revised to add a list of signals that initiate the start of the Auxiliary Feedwater System.

Date of issuance: January 25, 1985.

Effective date: January 25, 1985.

Amendment No. 90.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–66. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38398).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 25, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50–302, Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of Application for amendment: December 14, 1984, as supplemented on January 31, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment permits waiver of certain 18-month calibration frequency requirements for Cycle V provided the surveillance is performed during Refuel V.

Date of issuance: February 14, 1985.

Effective date: February 14, 1985.

Amendment No.: 73.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–72. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 14, 1985, (50 FR 1949) Subsequent to this initial notice, by letter of January 31, 1985, the licensee submitted additional information relating to its application for amendment which did not alter the substance of the licensee's request.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 14, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50–366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: July 12, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the TSs for Hatch Unit 2 to add a requirement to reduce the power below a specified limit whenever the plant is temporarily operating with only one recirculation loop.

Date of issuance: January 24, 1985.

Effective date: January 24, 1985.

Amendment No.: 42.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–5. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** October 24, 1984 (49 FR 42822).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 24, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50–366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: December 21, 1983, as supplemented April 16 and May 2, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the TSs for Hatch Unit 2 to: (1) Increase the number of traveling incore probe (TIP) system detectors that are required to be operable from three to four, and (2) allow operation of the TIP system with one or more inoperable detectors.

Date of issuance: January 31, 1985.

Effective date: January 31, 1985.

Amendment No.: 43.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–5. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38399). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 31, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Dockets Nos. 50–321 and 50–366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of applications for amendments: May 31, 1983, as supplemented September 1 and November 22, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revise the TSs for Hatch Unit 1 to: (1) Reduce the equilibrium activity concentration limit for reactor coolant, (2) increase time per year that reactor coolant activity is allowed to exceed the equilibrium value, (3) increase the time allowed for isolating steam valves when an activity limit is exceeded, (4) increase the dose equivalent iodine concentration above which additional samples are required, (5) increase the rate of increase in offgas activity at which reactor coolant samples are required, (6) reduce the dose equivalent I–131 concentration at which reactor coolant samples are required to be taken, (7) require additional coolant samples, (8) relax the requirement for equivalent I–131 analysis, (9) make editorial changes, and (10) add a reporting requirement.

Date of issuance: February 4, 1985.

Effective date: February 4, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 106 and 44.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–57 and NPF–5. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 24, 1984 (49 FR 7036).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 4, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50–219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: August 11, 1980 and supplemented October 18, 1982, December 5, 1983, February 9 and March 23, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment authorized changes to the Appendix A Technical Specifications relating to station electric distribution system voltages.

Date of Issuance: February 11, 1985.

Effective date: February 11, 1985.

Amendment No.: 80.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR–16. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45952). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 11, 1985. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room: Ocean County Library, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50–289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 1, July 11, August 2, and September 11, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the TSs related to the allowable concentration of hydrogen and oxygen in the waste gas holdup system and the associated hydrogen/oxygen monitoring instrumentation. The amendment permits unlimited oxygen content provided that hydrogen content is below 4% and permits unlimited hydrogen content provided that the

oxygen limit is below 2%. The TSs require two hydrogen monitors and two oxygen monitors to assure compliance with the above limits. Limiting conditions for operation are also included.

Date of issuance: February 4, 1985.
Effective date: February 4, 1985.
Amendment No.: 104.
Facility Operating License No. DPR-50. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984, (49 FR 45953).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 4, 1985.

No sugnificant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Streets, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126.

Iowa Electric Light and Power Company, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of application for amendment: October 5, 1984.
Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to incorporate the requirements of automatic actuation of the automatic depressurization system (ADS) valves in accidents which do not involve a high containment pressure, and provides for surveillance requirements of manual override switches.
Date of issuance February 1, 1985.
Effective date: February 1, 1985.
Amendment No.: 110.
Facility Operating License No. DPR-49. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50805).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 1, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location; Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Iowa Electric Light and Power Company, Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of application for amendment: August 17, 1984.
Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to incorporate the revised setpoint for bypass of reactor scrams during turbine trips and generator load rejection at low power levels.
Date of issuance: February 5, 1985.
Effective date: February 5, 1985.
Amendment No.: 111.
Facility Operating License No. DPR-49. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38401).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-309, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, Lincoln County, Maine

Date of application for amendment: April 13, 1984.
Brief description of amendment: This amendment modified the Maine Yankee Technical Specifications concerning operability and surveillance of various monitoring equipment required by NUREG-0737.
Date of issuance: January 29, 1985.
Effective date: January 29, 1985.
Amendment No.: 81.
Facility Operating License No. DPR-36: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25350 at 25363).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 29, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No comments received.

Local Public Document Room location: Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, Wiscasset, Maine.

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-309, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, Lincoln County, Maine

Date of application for amendment: March 1, 1976 as supplemented April 11, 1984.
Brief description of amendment: This amendment modified the Maine Yankee Technical Specifications concerning Containment Leak Testing to conform with 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix J.
Date of issuance: February 4, 1985.
Effective date: February 4, 1985.
Amendment No.: 82.
Facility Operating License No. DPR-36: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** July 20, 1983 (48 FR 33076 at 33082) and June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25350 at 25363).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 4, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Wiscasset Public Libray, High Street, Wiscasset, Maine.

Mississippi Power & Light Company, Middle South Energy, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Clairborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: October 9, 1984.
Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the Technical Specifications to implement a change of position title in the offsite organization for management of the facility.
Date of issuance: February 1, 1985.
Effective date: February 1, 1985.
Amendment No.: 1.
Facility Operating License No. NPF-29: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45955).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 1, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Hinds Junior College, George M. McLendon Library, Raymond, Mississippi 39154.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50-336, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, Town of Waterford, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: December 10, 1984.
Brief description of amendment: This amendment modified the Technical Specifications authorizing the use of an outage equipment door in place of the equipment hatch door during refueling operations.
Date of issuance: February 12, 1985.

Effective date: February 12, 1985.
Amendment No.: 98.
Facility Operating License No. DPR-65: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50794 at 50808).
The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 12, 1985.
No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.
Local Public Document Room location: Waterford Public Library, Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: September 19, 1984.
Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises License Condition 2.C.(23)(b) of Facility Operating No. NPF-14 and License Condition 2.C.(8)(b) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-22. The license condition previously required seismic qualification of the in-vessel fuel racks prior to commencement of the first refueling outage. Since the licensee has no need for the in-vessel fuel rack during the first refueling outage the NRC staff will require the licensee to seismically qualify the in-vessel fuel rack prior to use.
Date of issuance: January 15, 1985.
Effective date: January 15, 1985.
Amendment Nos.: 28 and 5.
Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22: Amendment revises the license.
Date of initial notices in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45961). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 15, 1985. So significant hazards consideration comments were received.
Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50-387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: May 18, 1984 and September 20, 1984.
Description of amendment request: This amendment revises the Unit 1. Technical Specifications to reflect changes incorporated into the Unit 2 Technical Specifications. These changes are administrative in nature.
Date of issuance: February 6, 1985.
Effective date: As of date of issuance.
Amendment No.: 29.
Facility Operating License No. NPF-14: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notices in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45956). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 6, 1985. No comments on the proposed no significant hazards consideration finding were received.
Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: September 19, 1984 with supplemental information January 3, 1985.
Brief description of amendments: The purpose of these amendments is to change Susquehanna Unit 1 and Unit 2 Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.2-1 by revising the list of motor-operated valves in the Emergency Service Water (ESW) system to support the corrective action described in the licensee's final report dated September 22, 1983, regarding a deficiency involving water hammer in the ESW system. Specifically, ESW valves HV-08693 A and B would be added to Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.2-1 for Unit 1 and Unit 2. Additionally, in the Unit 2 Technical Specifications ESW pump discharge valves HV-01101 A, B, C and D would be deleted from Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.2-1.
Date of issuance: February 7, 1985.
Effective date: Prior to start-up following the Unit 1 first refueling outage.
Amendment Nos.: 30 and 6.
Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notices in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50817). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 7, 1985. No comments were received on the proposed no significant hazards consideration finding.
Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: December 6, 1984.
Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1 and Unit 2 Technical Specifications to allow common DC 125-volt battery loads to be supported by the Unit 1 or Unit 2 batteries. Previously, only the Unit 1, 125-volt batteries were able to support these common loads.
Date of issuance: February 8, 1985.
Effective date: February 8, 1985.
Amendment Nos.: 31 and 7.
Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** Individual notice dated January 7, 1985 (50 FR 904). The Commission's related evaluation of these amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 8, 1985. No significant hazards consideration comments were received.
Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Company Docket Nos. 50-387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: September 7, 1984.
Brief description of amendment: This amendment supports modifications involving the installation of overcurrent relays on each reactor recirculation pump circuit breaker in order to provide redundant overcurrent protection for the primary containment penetration conductors.
Date of issuance: February 15, 1985.
Effective date: Upon start-up following the first refueling outage.
Amendment No.: 32.
Facility Operating License No. NPF-14: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50815). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 15, 1985. No comments on the proposed no significant hazards

consideration determination were received.

Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50–387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: September 24, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment reflects the installation of a permanent radiation monitoring system in the new fuel storage vault and spent fuel storage pool areas.

Date of issuance: February 15, 1985.

Effective date: Thirty (30) days from the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 33.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–14: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50816). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 15, 1985. No comments on the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination comments were received.

Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company Docket No. 50–387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: September 19, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: This amendment revises Technical Specification 4.6.1.7 parts "C" and "d" to support plant modifications that will be made during the first refueling outage for Unit 1. The plant modifications involve the relocation of two temperature elements used to monitor drywell atmosphere temperature in the area of the recirculation pumps. The change to part "c" includes revised elevation and azimuth valves of the relocated temperature elements and the change to part "d" is editorial in nature.

Date of issuance: February 15, 1985.

Effective date: Upon start-up following the first refueling outage.

Amendment No.: 34

Facility Operating License No. NPF–14: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Dates of initial notices in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50817). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 15, 1985. No significant hazards consideration comments were received.

Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company Docket Nos. 50–387 and 50–388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: September 28, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment request changes the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1 and Unit 2 Technical Specifications 4.6.5.3 and 4.7.2 with regard to HEPA filters and charcoal adsorber units to incorporate clarifications discussed in NRC Generic Letter No. 83–13, dated March 2, 1983. The clarification to the Technical Specifications were provided to clearly reflect the required relationship between the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 2, and ANSI N510–1975; the testing requirements of the HEPA filters and charcoal adsorber units; and the NRC staff assumptions used in its safety evaluations for the ESF atmospheric cleanup systems.

Date of issuance: February 15, 1985.

Effective date: February 15, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 35 and 8.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–14 and NPF–22: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45961).

The Commission's related evaluation of these amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 15, 1985. No comments on the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination were received.

Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Dockets Nos. 50–277 and 50–278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: November 10, 1983.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to permit continued operation of the Reactor Water Cleanup System (RWCU) with isolation of the filter-demineralizer, and permit overriding of an isolation signal for up to 48 hours when the high temperature sensor is inoperable, provided the water temperature is verified to be less than 180° once per hour. These changes also involve the clarification of TS lanaguage related to the scram discharge volume and the deletion of obsolete references to completed modifications.

Date of issuance: February 7, 1985.

Effective date: February 7, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 104 and 108.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–44 and DPR–56. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 25, 1984, (49 FR 17869). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 7, 1985.

No significant hazard consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Portland General Electric Company, et al., Docket No. 50–344, Trojan Nuclear Plant, Columbia County, Oregon

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deleted license condition 2.C(10) pertaining to the US/IAEA Safeguards Agreement.

Date of issuance: February 5, 1985.

Effective date: February 5, 1985.

Amendment No.: 101

Facility Operating License No. NPF–1. Amendment revised the license.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a letter transmitting the amendment dated February 5, 1985.

Local Public Document Room location Multnomah County Library, 801 S.W. 10th Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

Portland General Electric Company, et al., Docket No. 50-344, Trojan Nuclear Plant, Columbia County, Oregon

Date of application for amendment: October 1, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment adds requirements for operability, visual inspections and periodic testing of mechanical snubbers and adds similar improved requirements for hydraulic snubbers.

Date of issuance: February 6, 1985.

Effective date: February 6, 1985.

Amendment No.: 102.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-1. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50794 at 50819).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 6, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Location of Local Public Document Room Multnomah County Library, 801 S.W. 10th Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of application for amendment: October 9, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications by changing the high reactor pressure setpoint for recirculation pump trip from "greater than or equal to 1120 psig" to the corrected value of "less than or equal to 1120 psig."

Date of issuance: January 30, 1985.

Effective date: January 30, 1985.

Amendment No.: 86

Facility Operating License No. NDR-59 Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45963).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaulation dated January 30, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Penfield Library, State University College of Oswego, Oswego, New York.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket No. 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: September 29, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment removes a license condition requiring the installation of upper inspection ports on the Salem Unit No. 2 steam generators.

Date of issuance: February 7, 1985.

Effective date: February 7, 1985.

Amendment No.: 29

Facility Operating License No. DPR-75: Amendment revised the License.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50821).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 7, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of application for amendment: October 16, 1984, as revised November 8, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment temporarily changes TS Section 1.2.8, definition of refueling interval, from 18 months to 24.5 months for surveillance testing of the Reactor Internals Vent Valves. Upon startup from the next refueling outage, this temporary definition will expire.

Date of issuance: January 22, 1985.

Effective date: January 22, 1985

Amendment No.: 59.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 20, 1984, 49 FR 49528.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 22, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Sacramento City-County Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendment: July 19, 1984, and supplemented November 29, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the Technical Specifications to clarify educational requirements of candidates for Senior Reactor Operator's Licenses.

Date of issuance: January 24, 1985.

Effective date: January 24, 1985.

Amendment No.: 36.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-12. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38408) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 24, 1985.

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, Garden and Washington Street, Winnsboro, South Carolina 29180.

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, South Carolina Public Service Authority, Docket No. 50-395, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendment: June 19, 1984, as revised November 29, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the Technical Specifications to define allowable power levels for reactor coolant system flow rates less than 100% of thermal design flow.

Date of issuance: January 31, 1985.

Effective date: January 31, 1985.

Amendment No.: 37.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-12. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** October 24, 1984 (49 FR 42830).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 31, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, Garden and Washington, Streets, Winnsboro, South Carolina 29180.

Southern California Edison Company, Docket No. 50-206, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1, San Diego County, California

Date of application for amendment: September 9, 1983 as modified April 12, 1984 and supplemented November 14, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment approves changes to Appendix A Technical Specifications which incorporate containment leakage testing requirements to conform with 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix J.

Date of issuance: February 8, 1985.

Effective date: February 8, 1985.

Amendment No.: 87.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-13. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25374).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 8, 1985. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: San Clemente Branch Library, 242 Avendia Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92672.

Southern California Edison Company, et al. Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Units 2 and 3, San Diego County, California

Dates of application for amendments: April 24, April 27, July 9, August 7, August 21, August 27, and September 12, 1984.

Brief Description of amendments: The amendments change Technical Specifications to (1) provide consistency with the modified plant design for ECCS Subsystems, (2) add a new specification, Emergency Chilled Water System, (3) increase the reuired shutdown margin required when the core average moderator temperature is less than or equal to 200°F, (4) add a new surveillance requirement which verifies that only one charging pump is operable in Mode 5, when the reactor coolant system is drained below the hot leg centerline, and (5) change the boric acid storage tank volume/concentration.

Date of issuance: December 19, 1984.

Effective date: Amendment No. 28 is effective December 19, 1984. Certain portions of Amendment 17 are effective December 19, 1984; the remainder of Amendment 17 is effective prior to initial entry into Mode 5 following first refueling.

Amendment Nos.: 28 and 17.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-10 and NPF-15: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Dates of initial notices in **Federal Register:** October 24, 1984 (49 FR 42832 and 49 FR 42833). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 19, 1984. No significant hazards consideration comments were received.

Local Public Document Room Location: San Clemente Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California.

Tennessee Vally Authority, Docket Nos. 50-260 and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 2 and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of application for amendments: December 13, 1984.

Brief Description of amendments: The amendments modify Commission Orders dated March 25, 1983 to extend the deadline for installation of NUREG-0737 items II.F.1.1 and II.F.1.2 instrumentation having local readout capability.

Date of issuance: February 12, 1985.

Effective date: February 12, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 110 and 85.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-52 and DPR-68: Amendment revised the licenses.

Dates of initial notices in **Federal Register:** December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50825).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 12, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments recieved: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Athens Public Library, South and Forrest, Athens, Alabama 35611.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee

Dates of application for amendments: July 21, 1983, and August 20, 27, and 28, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications related to containment isolation valves, vital batteries, fire detectors, and the basis statement for the steam generator low-low level instrumentation.

Date of issuance: January 24, 1985.

Effective date: January 24, 1985.

Amendment Nos. 37 and 29.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-77 and DPR-79. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Dates of initial notices in **Federal Register:** October 12, 1983 (48 FR 46460) and November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45979).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 24, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Bicentennial Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County Missouri

Date of application for amendment: October 3, 1984 and supplemented on December 6, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment requested the addition of two 100,000 gallon tanks in order to provide sufficient storage time for secondary effluent to allow sample analysis and to show acceptability of the water prior to release to the environment.

Date of issuance: February 4, 1985.

Effective date: February 4, 1985.

Amendment No.: 2.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-30: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45979).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 4, 1985. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No comments received.

Local Public Document Room Locations: Fulton City Library, 709 Market Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251 and the Olin Library, Skinker and Lindell Boulevards, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri

Date of application for amendment: October 8, 1984.

The amendment revises the Administrative Controls Section of the Technical Specifications. Figure 6.2-2 has been revised to include two additional managerial positions in the plant organization; section 6.5.1.2 has been revised to include an additional member of the On-Site Review Committee.

Date of issuance: January 30, 1985.

Effective date: January 30,1985.

Amendment No.: 3.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-30: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications. Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45070). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is

contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 30, 1985. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No comments received.

Local Public Document Room locations: Fulton City Library, 709 Market Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251 and the Olin Library of Washington University, Skinker and Lindell Boulevards, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: February 7, 1984 as supplemented May 18, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications related to the limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements to delete the requirements for the design feature that automatically transfers high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) suction to the suppression pool from the condensate storage tank, upon high water level in the suppression pool.

Date of issuance: January 23, 1985.

Effective date: January 23, 1985.

Amendment No.: 85.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-28: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 25, 1984 49 FR 17876. Subsequent to the initial notice in the **Federal Register**, the licensee provided NRC-requested documentation by letter dated May 18, 1984. This documentary information does not affect the discussion or conclusions of the initial notice of our proposed determination in any way.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated Janaury 23, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of application for amendment: December 15, 1983 and August 1, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revise the NA-1&2 TS 3.0.3 to provide consistency with the time requirements and wording specified in the NRC approved standardized Westinghouse TS which are appropriately applied to NA-1&2. The time requirements state the time allowed for placing a unit in Hot Standby, Hot Shutdown and Cold Shutdown in the event a Limiting Condition of Operation and/or associated Action Statement cannot be satisfied because of circumstances in excess of those addressed in a specification.

Date of issuance: February 1, 1985.

Effective date: February 1, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 62 and 46.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7.: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 24, 1984 (49 FR 7048) and December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50794 at 50827).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 1, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Board of Supervisors Office, Louisa County Courthouse, Louisa, Virginia 23093, and the Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of application for amendments: March 16, 1984, revised November 21, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the NA-1&2 TS to be in conformance with the new Licensee Event Report System as stipulated in 10 CFR Part 50.73 and the immediate notification requirements for operating nuclear power reactors as provided in 10 CFR Part 50.72 which became effective January 1, 1984.

Date of issuance: February 1, 1985.

Effective date: Within 7 days after date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 63 and 47.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 25, 1984, (49 FR 17850) and December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50794 at 50827). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 1, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Board of Supervisors Office, Louisa County Courthouse, Louisa, Virginia 23093, and the Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry county, Virginia

Date of application for amendments: September 19, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments will revise Technical Specification Table 4.1-2A to delete the requirement to test the control rod drop times at cold conditions after a refueling shutdown or after maintenance requiring the breach of the Reactor Coolant System.

Date of issuance: January 22, 1985.

Effective date: January 22, 1985.

Amendment Nos. 101 and 100.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45980).

Significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-305, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendment: June 4, 1984, as revised August 21, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment consists of changes to position titles and includes minor organizational changes. In addition, it concludes additional Senior Reactor Operator requirements, clarification of environmental sample locations and corrections of minor errors.

Date of issuance: January 22, 1985.

Effective date: January 22, 1985.

Amendment No. 60.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-43: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29924) and renoticed October 24, 1984 (49 FR 42835).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 22, 1985.

Significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Wisconsin, Library Learning Center, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND FINAL DETERMINATION OF NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING (EXIGENT OR EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES)

During the 30-day period since publication of the last monthly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual 30-day Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing. For exigent circumstances, a press release seeking public comment as to the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination was used, and the State was consulted by telephone. In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant, a shorter public comment period (less than 30 days) has been offered and the State consulted by telephone whenever possible.

Under its regulations, the Commission may issue and make an amendment immediately effective, notwithstanding the pendency before it of a request for a hearing from any person, in advance of the holding and completion of any required hearing, where it has determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved.

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see: (1) The application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Dirctor, Division of Licensing.

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendments. By March 29, 1985, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, disignated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an approrpriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's 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 fifteen (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 fifteen (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, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. 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.

Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

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, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C., by the above data. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (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 (800) 325–6000 (in Missouri (800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (*Branch Chief*): 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 Executive Legal Director, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to the 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 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petitioner has made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. STN 50–454, Byron Station, Unit 1, Ogle County, Illinois

Date of Application for amendment: January 18, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: Adds a footnote to table of Containment Isolation Valves to allow certain valves to be opened intermittently under administrative controls.

Date of issuance: January 18, 1985.

Effective date: January 18, 1985.

Amendment No.: 1.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–23: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.

Comments received: No.

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 28, 1985.

Attorney for licensee: Isham, Lincoln and Beale, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois.

Local Public Document Room location: Rockford Public Library, 215 N. Wyman Street, Rockford, Illinois 61103.

Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–282 and 50–306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of application for amendment: January 18, 1985.

Description of amendments: These amendments change the Technical Specificiation section 3.3.D.2c dealing with the allowable inoperable period of the cooling water headers of the service water system.

Date of Issuance: February 15, 1985.

Effective date: February 15, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 72 and 65.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–42 and DPR–60: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes. **Federal Register** notice January 30, 1985 (50 FR 4285).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 15, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Attorney for the licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket No. 50–281, Surry Power Station, Unit No. 2, Surry County, Virginia.

Date of application for amendment: January 4, 1985, as supplemented January 9, and January 28, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification 4.17.A to extend the snubber inspection interval from 62 days ± 25% until the 1985 refueling outage.

Date of issuance: February 1, 1985.

Effective date: February 1, 1985.

Amendment No.: 101.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–37.

Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes. January 17, 1985 (50 FR 2635).

Comments received: No.

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 1, 1985.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Hunton and Williams, Post Office Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23213.

Local Public Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 20th day of February 1985.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

E.G. Tourigny,

Acting Chief, Operating Reactors Branch No. 3, Division of Licensing.

[FR Doc. 85–4674 Filed 2–26–85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket Nos. 50–400–OL]

Carolina Power & Light Co., North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency (Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant) Assignment of Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board

Notice is hereby given that, in accordance with the authority conferred by 10 CFR 2.787(a), the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Panel has assigned the following panel members to serve as the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board for this operating License proceeding:

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman
Dr. Reginald L. Gotchy
Howard A. Wilber.

Dated: February 21, 1985.

C. Jean Shoemaker,

Secretary to the Appeal Board.

[FR Doc. 85–4814 Filed 2–26–85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–483]

Union Electric Co.; Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards; Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing

The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–30, issued to Union Electric Company, for operation of the Callaway Plant, Unit 1 located in Callaway County, Missouri.

This amendment would revise the time period associated with Technical Specification Surveillance 4.6.1.6.1 by extending each of the three scheduled containment vessel tendon surveillances six (6) months, in accordance with the licensee's request dated February 12, 1985. This extension is requested because the services of INRYCO, the inspection contractor for Union Electric and Alabama Power Co., are needed to evaluate anomalies recently found at the Farley Unit 2 plant. Union Electric Company released INRYCO to Alabama Power Company so that the outage associated with the Farley problem is not unnecessarily extended.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's