

SEP 04 1985

Mr. D. F. Schnell
Vice President - Nuclear
Union Electric Company
P. O. Box 149
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

Dear Mr. Schnell:

Subject: Federal Register NRC Bi-Weekly Notices of Applications and
Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant
Hazards Considerations - Callaway Plant, Unit 1

Enclosed is a copy of the Federal Register NRC Bi-Weekly Notices of Appli-
cation and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards
Considerations dated August 28, 1985.

A notice concerning the deletion of the requirements for resistance testing
of certain fuses whose function is to provide containment penetration con-
ductor overcurrent protection, and deletion of the list of containment
penetration conductor overcurrent protective devices (circuit breakers
and fuses) from the technical specifications, per your request of May 17,
1985, may be found on Page 34947 of this publication.

Sincerely,

(S)

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

Enclosure:
Federal Register dated
August 28, 1985

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:
Docket File ←
NRC PDR
LPDR
NSIC
PRC System
LB#1 R/F
MRushbrook
Talexion

LB#1:DL
MRushbrook
09/03/85

LB#1:DL *PWOC*
Talexion:kab *T.A.*
09/03/85

LB#1:DL
BJYoungblood
9/14/85



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

SEP 04 1985

Docket No.: STN 50-483

Mr. D. F. Schnell
Vice President - Nuclear
Union Electric Company
P. O. Box 149
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

Dear Mr. Schnell:

Subject: Federal Register NRC Bi-Weekly Notices of Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations - Callaway Plant, Unit 1

Enclosed is a copy of the Federal Register NRC Bi-Weekly Notices of Application and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations dated August 28, 1985.

A notice concerning the deletion of the requirements for resistance testing of certain fuses whose function is to provide containment penetration conductor overcurrent protection, and deletion of the list of containment penetration conductor overcurrent protective devices (circuit breakers and fuses) from the technical specifications, per your request of May 17, 1985, may be found on Page 34947 of this publication.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "B. J. Youngblood".

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

Enclosure:
Federal Register dated
August 28, 1985

cc: See next page

Mr. D. F. Schnell
Union Electric Company

Callaway Plant
Unit No. 1

cc:

Mr. Nicholas A. Petrick
Executive Director - SNUPPS
5 Choke Cherry Road
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Gerald Charnoff, Esq.
Thomas A. Baxter, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
1800 M Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. J. E. Birk
Assistant to the General Counsel
Union Electric Company
Post Office Box 149
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Resident Inspectors Office
RR#1
Steedman, Missouri 65077

Mr. Donald W. Capone, Manager
Nuclear Engineering
Union Electric Company
Post Office Box 149
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

A. Scott Cauger, Esq.
Assistant General Counsel for the
Missouri Public Service Comm.
Post Office Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Ms. Marjorie Reilly
Energy Chairman of the League of
Women Voters of Univ. City, MO
7065 Pershing Avenue
University City, Missouri 63130

Mr. Donald Bollinger, Member
Missourians for Safe Energy
6267 Delmar Boulevard
University City, Missouri 63130

Mayor Howard Steffen
Chamois, Missouri 65024

Professor William H. Miller
Missouri Kansas Section, American
Nuclear Society
Department of Nuclear Engineering
1026 Engineering Building
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65211

Mr. Robert G. Wright
Assoc. Judge, Eastern District
County Court, Callaway County,
Missouri
Route #1
Fulton, Missouri 65251

Lewis C. Green, Esq.
Green, Hennings & Henry
Attorney for Joint Intervenors
314 N. Broadway, Suite 1830
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

Mr. Earl Brown
School District Superintendent
Post Office Box 9
Kingdom City, Missouri 65262

Mr. Harold Lottman
Presiding Judge, Dasconade County
Route 1
Owensville, Missouri 65066

Mr. John G. Reed
Route #1
Kingdom City, Missouri 65262

Mr. Dan I. Bolef, President
Kay Drey, Representative
Board of Directors Coalition
for the Environment
St. Louis Region
6267 Delmar Boulevard
University City, Missouri 63130

- 2 - Callaway Plant
Unit No. 1

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

Mr. Ronald A. Kucera, Deputy Director
Department of Natural Resources
P. O. Box 176
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Mr. Glenn L. Koester
Vice President - Nuclear
Kansas Gas and Electric Company
201 North Market Street
Post Office Box 208
Wichita, Kansas 67201

Eric A. Eisen, Esq.
Birch, Horton, Bittner and Moore
Suite 1200
1155 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

**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 September 27, 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

**Bi-Weekly 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 this regular bi-weekly notice. Public Law 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 bi-weekly notice includes all amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, since the date of publication of the last bi-weekly notice which was published on August 14, 1985 (50 FR 32787), through August 19, 1985.

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, NW., 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, NW., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

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

Date of application for amendment:
October 24, 1984, as supplemented
February 27, 1985 and July 8, 1985.

Description of amendment request:
This proposed action was noticed on March 27, 1985 (50 FR 12139). However, on July 8, 1985 additional information was provided and a new section 3.6.1.3, action statement b. The proposed amendments would change the Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO), the Surveillance Requirements and the associated bases for Specification 3/4.6.1.3, Primary Containment Air Locks, to specifically address the air lock door interlocks. Additionally, the Technical Specifications will be reformatted to more closely follow the guidance of the NUREG-0123, Standard Technical Specifications.

The current Specification does not specifically address an inoperable door interlock in the LCO. As such, it could be interpreted that an inoperable door interlock falls outside the "degraded mode" permitted by paragraph 3.6.1.3(a) and (b). Were that to be the interpretation, this interlock would fall under Paragraph 3.6.1.3(c) which directs the plant to be in hot shutdown within the next 12 hours and in cold shutdown within the following 24 hours. CP&L has concluded that this was not the intent of the Specification, since an inoperative door lock is clearly of a similar nature as the "degraded mode" permitted by paragraphs 3.6.1.3(a) and (b).

The amendments, therefore, proposed that the action described for an inoperable air lock door is sufficient to compensate for an inoperable door interlock. The current Technical Specification requires that the operation of the air lock door interlock be verified every six months. This verification presents the following problems:

(1) The interlock surveillance is performed independently of the air lock operability requirements.

(2) The interlock surveillance cannot be performed when the unit is at power with the drywell inerted, as the drywell is inaccessible.

(3) A low power drywell entry just to perform the interlock surveillance would present an unnecessary safety hazard

and increase radiation exposure to personnel performing the test.

The proposed revision requiring verification after each entry (except during periods of multiple entries where it is tested at least every 72 hours) will present the following resolutions:

(1) The interlock surveillance will be added to the air lock surveillance requirements by adding a new section B. Thus, the two surveillances will be performed simultaneously, ensuring that the interlock is operable whenever the air lock is required to be operable.

(2) The surveillances will be performed with the unit in cold shutdown and prior to entering operational conditions 1, 2, or 3. The above surveillance requirement is in the Brunswick pre-startup checklist and in the drywell closure checklist. After the surveillance requirement is satisfactorily completed, access to the drywell is secured. This will ensure air lock and interlock operability in operational conditions 1, 2, or 3 and until another drywell entry is made. Whenever the drywell is entered, the surveillance requirement must be repeated prior to drywell closure.

(3) With the surveillance being performed simultaneously in cold shutdown, an additional drywell entry is not necessary. This will, therefore, reduce personnel exposure to radiation and prevent an additional safety hazard.

(4) The increased surveillance on the interlock will result in an increased level of confidence in the interlock's operability. Additionally, the Specification is being reformatted to be consistent with NUREG-0123, the Standard Technical Specifications for General Electric Boiling Water Reactors.

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 the Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature; and (ii) a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The proposed change pertaining to the reformatting of the Specification is purely an administrative change as in example (i). The proposed revision requiring verification after air lock entry

(except during periods of multiple entries where it will be tested at least every 72 hours) constitutes additional controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications, and is, therefore, encompassed by example (ii). In addition, the change regarding the inoperable door interlock is also an additional control not presently included and, therefore, is encompassed by example (ii). Thus, the proposed changes discussed in this request are either administrative changes or constitute additional controls not presently included in the Specification and, therefore, conform to examples for which no significant hazards considerations exist.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to examples for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Southport, Brunswick County Library, 109 W. Moore Street, Southport, North Carolina 28461.

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

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
County, South Carolina**

Date of amendment request: July 1, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the K(z) curves of the Technical Specifications Figure 3.10-3 to preclude potential power penalties later in core life.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The cycle 10 core reload incorporated flux reduction attributes to satisfy PTS requirements for the reactor vessel. Because of this the previous K(z) curve could not be supported and a new curve was conservatively calculated for cycle 10 until the conservatism could be later removed by detailed reanalyses of the large and small break LOCA.

The proposed K(z) curve in conjunction with an F_q limit of 2.32 provides reasonable assurance of compliance with the limits of 10 CFR 50.46. Exxon Nuclear large break loss of coolant accident (LOCA) calculations for HBR2 predict a peak cladding temperature of 2042 °F for a center peaked power shape with a maximum F_q

of 2.32. The proposed K(z) axial distribution is identical to the previously accepted K(z) curve which was based on calculations performed by Westinghouse (prior to cycle 10). Recent large break LOCA calculations submitted to the NRC by Exxon Nuclear for 14 x 14 and 15 x 15 fuel rod arrays demonstrated that the predicted Exxon Nuclear fuel peak cladding temperature was within ± 50 °F of that for other fuel types similar to the Westinghouse 15 x 15 design.

However, the small break LOCA part of the K(z) curve will be based on the previously accepted Westinghouse analysis (WFLASH). Carolina Power & Light Company is participating in the WOG effort to resolve TMI Items II.K.3.30 and II.K.3.31 using the NOTRUMP Generic Analysis. This portion of the curve is primarily dependent on the system response and the linear heat rate and, therefore, the analysis is applicable.

Since: (1) The peak cladding temperature for Exxon Nuclear fuel should be within 50 °F of the Westinghouse fuel peak cladding temperature, (2) for Exxon Nuclear fuel the peak cladding temperature is 2042 °F for a center peaked power distribution at an F_q of 2.32, and (3) the previous small break LOCA analysis is applicable; we believe there is reasonable assurance that the 10 CFR 40.43 limit on peak cladding temperature of 2200 °F will be met by Exxon Nuclear fuel with the proposed K(z) curve.

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 (vi) of an amendment likely to involve no significant hazards consideration relates to changes 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 the Technical Specification is directly related to this example in that the limits of 10 CFR 50.46 will continue to be satisfied with the change and that the change is supported by refined analyses. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a 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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

**Commonwealth Edison Company,
Docket No. 50-373, La Salle County
Station Unit 1, La Salle County, Illinois**

Date of amendment request: July 15, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment to operating License NPF-11 would revise the La Salle Unit 1 Technical Specifications to reflect the alternative logic modification of the automatic depressurization system (ADS) as required by License Condition 2.C.(30)(1)(b). This requirement is described in Supplement 5 to the La Salle Safety Evaluation Report which indicated that the proposed modifications would be acceptable, following: (1) Approval by the NRC staff of the detailed logic implementation, (2) the submittal of a plant specific analysis to justify the bypass timer setting, (3) the submittal of Technical Specifications for the use of the bypass timer and manual inhibit switch, (4) modification of plant emergency procedures to address the use of the inhibit switch, and (5) completion of the modifications prior to startup after the first refueling.

The above items are addressed in this proposed amendment and this modification will be incorporated at the first refueling outage.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for 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; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has determined and the NRC staff agrees that the proposed amendments will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the revised ADS logic does not affect automatic depressurization for events where high drywell pressure occurs. This modification automates the function of reactor vessel blowdown for events where high drywell pressure does

not occur. Under these conditions, manual operation of the ADS system is called for by the emergency operating procedures and was assumed in Chapter 15 of the Final Safety Analysis Report.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because automatic depressurization is analyzed and required for events where high pressure coolant sources are unavailable and reactor vessel level is low. This change only automates what were previously manual operator actions.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the upgraded logic provides additional margin of safety for events where high drywell pressure does not occur while still providing the same level of protection for events where high drywell pressure does occur.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Public Library of Illinois Valley Community College, Rural Route No. 1, Ogelsby, Illinois 61348.

Attorney for licensee: Isham, Lincoln and Burke, Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: W.R. Butler.

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

Date of amendment request: July 10, 1985 as amended August 1, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The requested license amendment would modify the plant Technical Specification by incorporating requirements which restrict the volume of flammable liquids in the control room to no greater than one pint. If it becomes necessary to introduce quantities of flammable liquids in excess of one pint written permission is obtained from the Supervising Control Operator or Shift Supervisor and a dedicated fire watch is assigned to the activity to ensure that the flammable liquid would not threaten the safe shutdown capability.

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 (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is example (ii) which is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not

presently included in the technical specifications.

The Staff has reviewed the licensee's amendment request to add requirements for limiting the volume of flammable liquids in the control room to no greater than one pint and concluded that it falls within the envelope of example (ii) because the proposed amendment would result in an additional administrative limitation or control not presently included in the technical specifications.

Based on the above, the staff therefore proposes to determine that this amendment request involves a no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

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.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut, and Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-245 and 50-336, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: July 9, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments to the Operating Licenses would add subparagraph 6.2.2.g to the Technical Specifications. These proposed changes provide that administrative procedures be developed and implemented to limit the working hours of unit staff who perform safety-related functions. These proposed procedures will follow the general guidance of the NRC Policy Statement on working hours as stated in Generic Letter No. 82-12.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for making a no significant hazards consideration determination (48 FR 14870). Example (ii) of this guidance states that a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications, for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement, would not likely constitute a significant hazard. The proposed changes fall within the envelope of item (ii), since they increase the level of assurance that safety related functions will be performed properly by virtue of limiting the working hours and thus reducing possible fatigue of unit staff who perform these functions.

Accordingly, the staff proposed to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room locations: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457 (Haddam Neck) and Waterford Public Library, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut (Millstone Units 1 and 2).

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Garfield, Esq., Day, Berry and Howard, One Constitution Plaza, Hartford, Connecticut 06103.

NRC Branch Chiefs: John A. Zwolinski (Haddam Neck and Millstone Unit 1) and Edward J. Butcher, Acting (Millstone Unit 1) and Edward J. Butcher, Acting (Millstone Unit 2).

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Docket Nos. 50-003 and 50-247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: June 18, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications for Indian Point, Units 1 and 2 to incorporate administrative changes to the Facility Organization. The proposed amendment would also revise the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2 Technical Specifications to: (1) Limit overtime for critical shift job positions, (2) change the composition of the Station Nuclear Safety Committee (SNSC), (3) change the audit frequency of the Emergency Preparedness Program and Safeguards Contingency Plan, (4) provide for the reporting of relief and safety valve challenges (5) conform the provisions regarding the Monthly Operating Report to those of the Standard Technical Specifications and (6) clarify the record retention requirements.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Consistent with the Commission's criteria for determining whether a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations, 10 CFR 50.92 (48 FR 14870), the proposed revisions to the Technical Specifications will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated, or involve a significant reduction in margin of safety. The proposed changes would reflect: (1) Organizational change (2) overtime limits for critical job positions (3) Station Nuclear Safety Committee (SNSC) membership changes (4) more

frequent auditing of the Emergency Plan and Security Plan (5) reporting requirement for relief and Pressurizer Safety Valve challenges and (6) record retention clarification. The licensee's submittal contains evaluations containing the following conclusions. The organization changes will not reduce the effectiveness of the facility organization nor would the changes decrease the required qualification of personnel. The overtime limits for critical positions constitutes an additional limitation and control not presently included in the Technical Specification but, implemented for some time through administrative controls. The changes to the SNSC membership will not reduce the effectiveness of the committee nor would the changes decrease the qualifications of the members. The change in frequency of the Emergency and Security Plan audits is to conform to the regulations of 10 CFR 50.54(t) and 10 CFR 73.40(d) and is conservative. The reporting of relief and safety valve challenges constitutes an additional limitation and restriction not presently included in the Technical Specifications and conforms the specification to the Standard Technical Specification. The clarification of record retention requirements is purely administrative in nature and achieves consistency in the technical specifications.

The staff expects to agree with the licensee's conclusions. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

Attorney for licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, 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: July 31, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Indian Point 2 Technical Specifications to permit a one-time extension of the surveillance interval limits for various systems and components so the surveillance tests for the applicable systems and components can be performed during the 1986 refueling outage. Issuance of the proposed Technical Specifications would avoid a plant shutdown of approximately five weeks to perform the

surveillance tests. The licensee proposes to perform the affected surveillance tests during the upcoming refueling maintenance outage presently scheduled to commence in the first quarter of 1986.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Consistent with the Commission's criteria for determining whether a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations 10 CFR 50.92 (48 FR 14871), the proposed one-time revision to the Technical Specifications will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated, or involve a significant reduction in margin of safety. The licensee's submittal contains an evaluation of the effects of permitting a one-time revision to the Technical Specifications. The results of the evaluation indicated that the quality of the systems and components and their ability to perform will be maintained during the extension period to that level currently provided by the Technical Specifications for a maximum surveillance interval. It is expected that our final evaluation will agree with the licensee's conclusions.

Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, 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: August 6, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications to delete Specifications 5.3.A.2 and 5.3.A.4 which specifically describe the reactor core design for the initial core. Additionally, the proposed amendment would revise the references of Technical Specification 5.3 to reflect the proper sections of the updated Final Safety Evaluation Report (FSAR) and to delete the Fuel Densification Report, which is now referenced in the updated FSAR.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Consistent with the Commission's

criteria for determining whether a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations 10 CFR 50.92 (48 FR 14871), the proposed revisions to the Technical Specifications will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated, or involve a significant reduction in margin of safety. The licensee's submittal contains an evaluation concluding that the deletion of Technical Specifications 5.3.A.2 and 5.3.A.4 would have no effect on the present or future with regard to reactor core design because the Specifications contain historical information only. The staff expects to agree with the licensee's conclusions. The revisions to the Specification 5.3 references are purely administrative to achieve consistency between the updated FSAR and the Technical Specifications.

Therefore the staff proposes to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards determination.

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

Attorney for licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, 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: August 6, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specification 3.8.A.1 to include a provision for utilizing a temporary closure plate in place of the equipment door during refueling. The proposed change is being requested to improve the efficiency of the refueling work. The temporary closure door will provide penetrations for temporary services which will enable many maintenance activities to be performed while maintaining integrity during core alterations of fuel movement.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Consistent with the Commission's criteria for determining whether a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations, 10 CFR 50.92 (48 FR 14871), the proposed revisions to the Technical Specifications will not involve

a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated or involve a significant reduction in margin of safety. The licensee's submittal contains an evaluation of the effects of utilizing a temporary closure plate in place of the equipment door during refueling. The evaluation concludes that the closure plate will perform all required functions, i.e., provide additional margin for a fuel handling accident by restricting direct communication with the environment and provide a seismic envelope to restrict the potential escape of radioactivity resulting from seismic events during refueling. It is expected that our final evaluation will agree with the licensee's conclusions.

Therefore the staff proposed to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards determination.

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

Attorney for licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, Esq., 4 Irving Place, New York, New York 10003.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50-255, Palisades Plant, Van Buren County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: July 30, 1985.

Description of amendment request: Proposed amendment to License DPR-20 to delete Technical Specification requirement for High Pressure Safety Injection (HPSI) Flow monitoring instruments.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The HPSI flow instruments, one in each of the four injection lines to each reactor coolant loop, are monitoring instruments only and provide no actuation function. Their inoperability does not affect the operability of the HPSI. These instruments only provide confirmation of flow which can be determined by other means. Therefore, deletion of the requirement for operability of these instruments would not affect the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed. These instruments are not used in any way to provide a safety margin for reactor operation, accidents, or transients. Therefore, no reduction in a safety margin results from their deletion. Operation of the plant for normal operation or in response to transients or accidents is unchanged and therefore a new or different kind of accident from

those previously evaluated is not created. The results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. In this case, the subject flow instruments are not included in the Standard Technical Specifications which are identified in Chapter 16 of the Standard Review Plan. Also, these instruments are not required in any of the other Combustion Engineering Plants. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed change would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Van Zoeren Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

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

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

Dairyland Power Cooperative, Docket No. 50-409, La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor, Vernon County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: June 25, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This submittal modifies a pending request for amendment dated December 19, 1983 with regard to Technical Specification 4.1.6 which concerned plant shutdown in case of site flooding. The December 19, 1983 request was noticed in the *Federal Register* on March 22, 1984 (49 FR 10733). This proposed amendment would add a requirement that specifies a lower flood level than previously proposed at which the plant must be shut down.

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 is a change that constitutes an additional restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The above proposed change resulted from the Systematic Evaluation Program (SEP) review of the La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor. The basis for this change is contained in the La Crosse Integrated Plant Safety Assessment Report NUREG-0827. The change would add a requirement that specifies the flood level at which the plant must be shut down; thus, it introduces an additional restriction or control which does not currently exist. The staff proposes to conclude that the proposed change would be encompassed within

example (ii) and, therefore, would involve a no significant hazards consideration determination.

Local Public Document Room location: La Crosse Public Library, 800 Main Street, La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601.

Attorney for licensee: O.S. Heistand, Jr., Esquire, Morgan, Lewis & Brockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

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: September 7, 1984, as amended April 9, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would change the Technical Specifications to add limiting conditions for operation, surveillance requirements and bases for the Standby Shutdown System (SSS) and associated components.

Specifically, Technical Specification 3.7.14 would require that the SSS be operable in Modes 1, 2, and 3. Table 3.7-8 would identify minimum SSS instruments to be those which sense reactor coolant pressure, pressurizer level, steam generator level, incore temperature and standby makeup pump flow, and would also identify the readout location (Standby Shutdown Facility Control Panel) and minimum channels (one) required to be operable. Table 3.7-8 would designate the minimum equipment to be: (1) The diesel generator and associated switchgear; (2) the diesel starting 24-volt battery bank and charger; (3) standby makeup pump and water supply; (4) 250/125 volt battery bank, associated charger, and associated switchgear; (5) steam turbine driven auxiliary feedwater pump; and (6) solenoid "c" to valve SA 48 ABC. Table 3.7-8 would also identify the location of this equipment. An appropriate action statement in the event that less than the minimum SSS equipment in Table 3.7-8 should be OPERABLE and surveillance specifications for each of these minimum SSS equipment would be added by the proposed amendment.

Specification Table 4.7-2 would require channel checks (except for standby makeup pump flow which would not be applicable) each month and channel calibrations each refueling outage for instruments used to determine reactor coolant pressure, pressurizer level, steam generator level, incore temperature and standby makeup pump flow.

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 examples, (ii), involving no significant hazards considerations 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 current Technical Specifications do not include operability nor surveillance requirements for the Standby Shutdown System. Therefore the proposed amendment matches the example. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the change does not involve significant hazards considerations.

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.

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: December 10, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would modify Technical Specification 6.2.2.f with respect to the specified objectives on normal working hours of unit staff who perform safety-related functions. The modifications would substitute a 12-hour day with alternating 48-hour and 36-hour work week in place of the 8-hour day, 40-hour week. For those occasions which require substantial amounts of overtime or during extended periods of shutdown for refueling, major maintenance or major plant modifications, the specified guidelines on the maximum number of working hours recommended on a temporary basis for any 48-hour period would be increased 4 hours (i.e., from no more than 24 hours to no more than 28 hours). The corresponding guideline of not more than 16 hours any 24-hour period and not more than 72 hours for any 7-day period would not be changed by the proposed amendments.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee states that the change from an 8 to a 12-hour shift has been found to be more efficient, to reduce shift

turnover from 3 to 2 per day, and has the advantage of worker transfer continuity (i.e., an individual worker transfers the duties to the person from whom he or she had taken over the duties 12 hours earlier). The licensee finds this continuity enhances familiarity with the ongoing operations for the shift workers, results in enhanced safety and improved work quality, and enhances the effective management of shift turnovers. This observation by the licensee is consistent with our experience with other operating nuclear power plants utilizing a 12-hour shift. The change to allow an individual to work 28 hours in a 48-hour period provides flexibility for those occasions when an individual works 16 hours, takes a 12-hour break, and returns for a normal 12-hour shift (i.e., the change allows this individual to compete that normal shift).

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 Commission has reviewed the licensee's request for the above amendments and finds that the proposed changes deal only with the establishment of administrative objectives for working hours of unit staff. Because the changes do not affect any equipment, operating procedure, or safety analysis, the Commission 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; 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. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to find that the amendments would not involve a 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.

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 17, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes would eliminate ambiguities in two surveillance requirements in the Technical

Specifications for Radwaste Treatment Systems by more clearly indicating that the requirements for dose projections are intended only with respect to untreated releases. Specifically, Surveillance Specification 4.11.1.3.1 would be changed to reflect that dose projections are not required for liquid effluents which have been processed by the Liquid Radwaste Treatment System prior to being discharged. Similarly, the proposed amendment would clarify Surveillance Specification 4.11.2.4 to reflect that dose projections are not required for gaseous effluents which have been processed by the Gaseous Radwaste Treatment System prior to being released.

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 (i) a purely administrative change to the technical specification. The clarification sought by the proposed amendments is consistent with the Commission's original intent to require dose projection due to liquid or gaseous releases only when untreated effluents are to be discharged, and with the intent of the Commission's model Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications (RETS) for PWRs, NUREG-0472, Revision 2, February 1, 1980. Thus, this proposed action is purely administrative and fits the example. The Commission, therefore, proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a 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.

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: April 9, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise a Technical Specification surveillance requirement which is part of an augmented inservice inspection program for snubbers. The change would affect

the second of three sampling plan options available for functional tests of snubbers. This second sampling plan is defined by Specification 4.7.8.e(2) and requires that a representative sample of snubbers be tested each refueling in accordance with Specification Figure 4.7-1. Figure 4.7-1 provides the acceptance criteria method for the functional test results and denotes a "reject" region and a "continue testing" region. If at any time the plotted test results fall within this "reject" region, then all snubbers are to be functionally tested. Surveillance requirement 4.7.8.e(2) and its accompanying Figure 4.7-1 would be changed to delete the "reject" region on Figure 4.7-1, to substitute an expanded "continue testing" region, and to clarify the manner in which test results are to be plotted on Figure 4.7-1. The test results should be plotted sequentially in the order of sample assignment (i.e., each snubber should be plotted by its order in the random sample assignment, not by the order of testing). References to the "reject" region in the text of Specification 4.7.8.e(2) and bases 4.7.8 would be deleted. Bases 4.7.8 would also be supplemented by a footnote to note that if testing continues to between 100-200 snubbers (or 1-2 weeks) and still the "accept" region for Figure 4.7-1 has not been reached, then the actual percent of population quality (the ratio of total number of failed snubbers to the cumulative number of snubbers tested) should be used to prepare for extended or 100% testing.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: McGuire Technical Specification 3.7.8 requires that all safety related snubbers be operable for specified operating modes and would not be changed by the proposed amendment. Only the surveillance requirement by which each snubber is to be demonstrated operable, in part by functional testing of a representative sample of snubbers each refueling, would be changed, and then only with respect to the second of three available sample plans designated by Specification 4.7.8.e.

Under Specification 4.7.8.e(2), a representative sample of snubbers, beginning with an initial selection of at least 37 snubbers, is functionally tested in accordance with a graph (Specification Figure 4.7-1) of "C", the total number of snubbers found not meeting the acceptance requirements of Specification 4.7.8f (i.e., failure), versus "N", the cumulative number of snubbers tested. The existing graph denotes three separate regions designated "accept," "continue testing" and "reject." The

"accept" and "continue testing" regions are separated by a curve, $C=0.055N-2.007$; the "continue testing" and "reject" regions are presently separated by a curve, $C=0.055N+2.007$. To apply the graph, test results are plotted on Figure 4.7-1. Under the existing Technical Specifications, if at any time the point plotted falls in the "reject" region all snubbers are to be functionally tested. If at any time the point plotted falls in the "accept" region, testing of snubbers may be terminated. When the point plotted lies in the "continue testing" region, additional snubbers are to be tested until the point falls in the "accept" region or the "reject" region, or all the required snubbers have been tested. Deletion of the "reject" region, as proposed, effectively changes that region of the graph to a "continue testing" region. Therefore, snubbers would continue to be tested until the plotted point falls in the "accept" region or until all the required snubbers have been tested.

Statistical studies within the licensee's submittal of April 9, 1985, and within a draft document by a task force of the Operations and Maintenance Group (OM-4) of the ASME Committee, "Examination and Performance Testing of Nuclear Power Plant Dynamic Restraints (Snubbers)" (ANSI/ASME OM4-1985) demonstrate that the proposed deletion of the "reject" region would not have a significant adverse effect on the effectiveness of the sampling plan. The Commission's preliminary review of these documents supports this conclusion. This revised plotting sequence is a more appropriate method for implementing the sampling plan.

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 amendments and has determined that should this request be implemented, it would not; (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. This conclusion is reached because snubbers are required to be operable to ensure that structural integrity (of both the reactor coolant system and all other safety-related systems) is maintained during and following a seismic or other event initiating dynamic loads and can have no effect on cause mechanisms, and because only surveillance

requirements are affected and not the limiting condition for operation. Although the proposed amendment do not involve changes in surveillance frequency nor operating conditions, they do involve changes in surveillance methods and acceptance criteria. However, the statistical studies indicate that while the probability of false acceptance of a bad population under the proposed amendments is real, it is negligible. Consequently, the staff has also determined that the proposed amendments, if implemented, would not (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety or a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that these changes do not involve a 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, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-321, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: May 20, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TSs) to delete the requirements that a summary technical report of the secondary containment intergrated leak rate test be submitted within three months of the conduct of that test and that a report of the primary coolant leakage into the drywell be submitted every five years.

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 Example (i), an amendment involving a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications. TSs exist for both maintaining secondary containment integrity and maintaining limits on reactor coolant leakage into the drywell. Neither the Hatch Unit 2 or the BWR 4 Standard Technical Specifications contain requirements for submittal of these reports and the

deletion of these reports is a change to achieve consistency in the TSs. Further, there is no definition or requirement in the Hatch Unit 1 TSs of what should be in a five-year report on primary coolant leakage into the drywell. These reporting requirements are administrative in nature and their removal is a purely administrative change. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves a proposed change that is similar to an example for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves 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, Docket No. 50-321, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: July 26, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment revises the TSs for Hatch Unit 1 to add a specification and table addressing component cyclic and transient limits and to correct the table number in TS 6.10.2.e to reference the newly added table.

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 involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a change which constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. Another example (i) relates to a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications. The proposed addition of the specification on cyclic and transient limits constitutes an additional limitation and fits example (ii) above. The proposed correction of the table number fits example (i) above. The Commission therefore proposes to determine that this action involves 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, Docket No. 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: August 2, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment revises the TSs for Hatch Unit 2 to correct and clarify the hydrogen recombiner heater testing requirements of TS 4.6.6.2.b.4 by changing the word "phase" to "element" and changing the test value of 100×10^6 ohms to 1.0×10^8 ohms.

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 (i) of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications. This change clarifies the fact that the vendor recommended heater to ground resistance reading of 1.0×10^6 ohms is unique to the heater elements. The present value of 100×10^6 ohms only applies to the resistance of cabling to ground, and as such, is not solely applicable to overall element integrity. This change is an administrative change similar to the example. The Commission therefore proposes to determine that this action involves 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.

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

Date of amendment request: June 19, 1985.

Description of amendment request: Requests approval of changes to the Appendix A Technical Specifications (TS) pertaining to the Post Accident Sampling System. These changes are to Section 6, Administrative Controls, and implicitly to the Table of Contents of the TS.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: On November 1, 1983, the staff issued

Generic Letter (GL) 83-36, "NUREG-0737 Technical Specifications," which included guidance on technical specifications on the Post-Accident Sampling System (PASS), NUREG-0737 Item II.B.3. By letter dated June 19, 1985, the licensee has proposed changes to the TS which are new requirements pertaining to the PASS. These requested changes are to section 6, Administrative Controls, and implicitly to the Table of Contents identifying the new subsection of the TS. The proposed changes are to incorporate the guidance given in GL 83-36 into the TS.

The requested changes to the TS are an additional requirement not currently in the TS. Therefore, these requested changes are encompassed by the Commission's example (ii), provided in 48 FR 14870, of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. Therefore, 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: July 22, 1985.

Description of amendment request: Requests approval of a change to the Appendix A Technical Specifications (TS) which is a new requirement pertaining to limiting overtime of station personnel. This change is to Section 6.2, Organization, Administrative Controls, of the TS.

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 (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the TS. On January 10, 1983, the staff issued Generic Letter 83-02, "NUREG-0737 Technical Specifications," which included guidance on TS on NUREG-0737 Item I.A.1.3, Limit Overtime. The licensee (GPU Nuclear Corporation) responded

to GL 83-02 but did not submit TS to limit overtime. The staff reviewed the licensee's justification for not submitting TS to limit overtime and concluded that it did not meet the staff's interpretation of the Commission's policy in this area. The staff by letter dated May 30, 1985, requested that the licensee submit TS to limit overtime.

The licensee has proposed changes to the TS to incorporate the guidance in GL 83-02 on NUREG-0737 Item I.A.1.3 into the TS. The proposed change to the TS is an additional requirement not currently in the TS. Therefore, this proposed change is encompassed by the Commission's example (ii) and 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, et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: July 31, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

On June 4, 1984, the NRC issued a Safety Evaluation Report which supported exemptions to certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Fire Protection Requirements, for Three Mile Island Unit 1. This requested Technical Specification change updates Table 3.18-1, Fire Detection Instruments, to include three locations where fire detection instrumentation has been added as a result of NRC acceptance of the exemption requests.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The proposed amendment is in the same category as Example (ii) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870) in that the change constitutes an additional control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The addition of the fire detection instrumentation in the three locations will provide increased assurance that a fire will be detected at an early stage before significant damage has occurred. Therefore, the amendment is considered not to involve significant hazards considerations.

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.

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-309, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, Lincoln County, Maine

Date of amendment request: May 8, 1985, as supplemented May 29, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendments would permit operation after approval of changes to the plant's Technical Specifications (TS) that would assure 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; 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 interlaboratory comparison program. These proposed TS would also incorporate into the TS the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

This proposed amendment falls into two categories for which the Commission (48 FR 14870) has provided examples of amendments not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. The Commission's examples include: (ii) A change that constitutes an additional restriction or control not presently in the TS and (vii) a change to make a license conform to changes in regulations. The new waste management requirements constitute additional limitations not currently in the TS (example (ii)). In addition, this proposed amendment has been put forward in response to the revised Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50, making it a change in the TS to conform to changes in regulations (example (vii)). Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, Wiscasset, Maine.

Attorney for licensee: J.A. Ritscher, Esq., Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02210.

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-309, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, Lincoln County, Maine

Date of amendment request: June 14, 1985 as supplemented August 7, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

This proposed amendments provides Technical Specifications changes needed to support Cycle 9 operation of the Maine Yankee plant. This proposed amendment would: (1) Modify the Technical Specifications to reflect Cycle 9 power distributions, insertion limits, and peaking factors; (2) reflect the required fuel centerline design limit for each fuel type; (3) reflect replacement of part strength Control Element Assemblies (CEAs) with full strength CEAs; and (4) describe maximum reactor inlet temperature used in modified safety analyses.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

As discussed in *Maine Yankee Cycle 9 Core Performance Analysis* dated April 1985 (YAEC-1479), the fresh fuel assemblies used in Cycle 9 design are being manufactured by Combustion Engineering and are not significantly different than those previously used at Maine Yankee. This fuel design has been found acceptable to NRC in previous reload cores at Maine Yankee and at other facilities. The acceptance criteria for the Technical Specifications associated with the Cycle 9 design are the same as the acceptance criteria for the current Technical Specifications. The analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance of the Cycle 9 design have been previously found acceptable by the NRC except for minor modifications in methods employed for control element assembly (CEA) ejection and steam line break analyses. The methods used to analyze these events have been previously submitted to the NRC. The staff has recently approved the use of the modified method for CEA ejection analysis. The review of the steam line break methods analysis is near completion and its final approval will be required prior to the final issuance of the Cycle 9 Technical Specifications. The same methods have been previously applied by Yankee Atomic Electric Company on the Yankee plant in Rowe, Massachusetts.

Additional changes for Cycle 9 include the replacement of part-strength CEAs with full strength CEAs in the

non-scrammable locations in CEA bank 5 and an increase in the maximum allowable core inlet temperature from 550 °F to 552 °F. Both of these changes are evaluated in detail in the *Maine Yankee Cycle 9 Core Performance Analysis* dated April 1985.

As shown in the analysis, the changes associated with Cycle 9 do not affect the probability of an accident previously evaluated in the Maine Yankee Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). The effect of Cycle 9 operation on the consequences of accidents previously evaluated in the Maine Yankee FSAR is presented in the *Maine Yankee Cycle 9 Core Performance Analysis*. As shown in that analysis, the consequences of accidents previously evaluated have not significantly increased and continue to be well within applicable acceptance criteria.

The changes associated with Cycle 9 have been evaluated by the licensee and the staff agrees with the licensee's conclusion that the changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The margin of safety of the Cycle 9 design is evaluated in the *Maine Yankee Cycle 9 Core Performance Analysis*. The thermal, thermal-hydraulic and physics characteristics of Cycle 9 are not significantly different from previous reload cores and thus the Cycle 9 design does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

In summary, the *Maine Yankee Cycle 9 Core Performance Analysis* does 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 previously evaluated; or (3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Therefore we propose to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, Wiscasset, Maine.

Attorney for licensee: J.A. Ritscher, Esq., Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02210.

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

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

Date of amendment request: July 12, 1985, as amended August 12, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would make five changes to the Technical Specifications

as follows: (1) Figure 6.2.2-1, "Unit Organization" would be revised by replacing the Radiation Control Supervisor with two new supervisors—Radiation Control Supervisor, Operations, and Radiation Control Supervisor, Technical Support. (2) Table 3.8.4.2-1 "Primary Containment Penetration Conductor Overcurrent Protective Devices" would be revised by adding two circuit breakers for equipment needed to improve a ventilation system for a reactor water sample station inside containment. (3) Technical Specification 4.1.3.3, "Control Rod Scram Accumulators" would be revised by eliminating the upper limit of the setpoint on the low pressure alarm. (4) Table 3.3.7.9-1 "Fire Detection Instrumentation" would be revised by adding four fire protection zones in the control building and their associated surveillance requirements. (5) Technical Specification 4.8.1.1.2, "Electrical Power Systems—AC Sources," would be revised by adding surveillance requirements for the automatic bypass of the diesel generator ground overcurrent trip upon receipt of an ECCS actuation signal.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration: Change (1) is proposed to provide increased overview of radiological activities. The responsibilities of the current Radiation Control Supervisor would be divided between two new supervisors. The Radiation Control Supervisor, Operations would be responsible for radiological aspects of plant maintenance and operations activities. The Radiation Control Supervisor, Technical Support would be responsible for health physics support activities including dosimetry, radwaste, emergency planning, and radiation protection equipment. Both new supervisors would be qualified in and with requirements specified in the Final Safety Analysis Report, section 13. Because this change would not affect plant equipment design, safety criteria or safety analyses, would not change responsibilities for supervision of radiation control, and would increase the overview of radiological aspects of plant operation and maintenance by using two qualified supervisors in place of one, this change does 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, nor does it involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Change (2) is proposed as the result of a design change to decrease airborne radioactive contamination at a reactor

water sample station inside containment. A heater and fan would be added to the ventilation system at the sample station to improve filter efficiency. Circuit breakers would be included in the electrical circuits for the fan and the heater as overcurrent protection for the conductors which penetrate the containment. The breakers are designed and would be installed in accord with NRC regulatory requirements and industry codes and standards. Because the change merely adds two circuit breakers of a type already in use in the facility and which will be designed and installed in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements, and the change does not affect safety criteria or analyses, change (2) does 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, nor does it involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Change (3) is proposed to eliminate actuation of the low pressure alarm for the scram accumulators because of instrument drift in the conservative direction (higher actual pressure). The present setpoint is 1520+30-0 psig. The purpose of the low pressure set point is to ensure the minimum pressure in the accumulator necessary to scram the control rods.

Operation to date has resulted in spurious alarms due to drift of more than +30 psi between surveillance tests. The change would eliminate any upper limit on the setpoint, resulting in an alarm only if pressure was less than the setpoint value. Because safety equipment design, safety criteria or safety analyses are not affected, change (3) does 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. Since the safety function to actuate an alarm if accumulator pressure decreased below 1520 psig would not be changed, change (3) does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples (ii) is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. Changes (4) and (5) are similar to this example. Change (4) would add surveillance requirements to the Technical

Specifications for fire detection instruments in Unit 2 areas of the control building which contain safe shutdown electrical cables for Unit 1. Change (5) would add surveillance requirements for a safety related bypass of an operational related trip used to protect the diesel generator from ground overcurrent.

Accordingly, for the reasons cited above, the Commission proposes to determine that these five changes do not involve significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Hinds 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.

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

Date of amendment request: August 12, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would make three changes in the Technical Specifications: (1) Change the names of two valves listed in Table 3.3.7.4-1 "Remote Shutdown Systems Controls" and four valves listed in Table 3.6.4-1, "Containment and Drywell Isolation Valves"; (2) designate a different valve in the residual heat removal (RHR) to reactor head spray line as reactor coolant system pressure isolation valve (Table 3.4.3.2-1) and as containment isolation valve (Table 3.6.4-1) and make associated changes in the listing of primary containment penetration conductor overcurrent protective devices (Table 3.8.4.1-1), and motor-operated valve thermal overload protection (Table 3.8.4.2-1), and; (3) add specifications in Table 3.3.3-1, "Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) Actuation Instrumentation" to incorporate interlock instrumentation which is designed to prevent inadvertent overpressurization of low design pressure emergency core cooling systems by the reactor coolant systems, and make associated changes in Table 3.3.3-3 "ECCS Response Times", Table 4.3.3.1-1, "ECCS Actuation Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements", Surveillance Requirement 4.4.3.2.2 "Reactor Coolant System Operational Leakage", Table 3.4.3.2-2 "Reactor Coolant System

Interface Valves Pressure Monitors-Alarm", and Table 3.4.3.2-3 "Reactor Coolant System Interface Valves Pressure Interlocks".

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples (1) is a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications. Change (1) is similar to this example in that it is a change in nomenclature of valves to be consistent with plant nomenclature. Change (2) the designation of valve E12-F394 to serve as the inboard containment isolation valve, is an operational enhancement which would allow local leak rate testing of the inboard isolation valve without removing the drywell head and insulation. This change would reduce radiation exposure of personnel since the leak rate testing could be accomplished in a shorter time period. The previously designated valve, E51-F066, would be deleted from the list of containment isolation valves. Use of valve E12-F394 as the isolation valve also eliminates valve E12-F344 as a potential leakage path from the drywell so that valve E12-F344 would also be deleted from the list of containment and drywell isolation valves. Valve E12-F394 and the associated power and control circuits in the RHR to reactor head spray line where designed and installed in accordance with applicable industry and regulatory codes and standards and the GGNS quality assurance program. Therefore, the change is consistent with the licensing basis and the safety analyses. Because change (2) does not affect the isolation safety function, safety criteria or safety analysis and it would decrease personnel radiation exposure, this change does 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, nor does it involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Change (3), the addition of Technical Specifications for interlock instrumentation on pressure isolation valves, is needed to implement a design change required by a license condition. The present compensatory requirement for leak tests of LPCS and LPCI check valves would be deleted. The design change would result in an increase of 51 °F in calculated peak cladding temperature to 2149 °F during a postulated loss of coolant accident because of a longer time required for LPCS and LPCI injection valves to open.

The calculated peak cladding temperature of 2149 ° is still below the limiting 2200 °F required by 10 CFR 50.46, so the safety margin is not affected. The design change will be performed in accordance with appropriate regulatory and industry codes and standards, the GGNS quality assurance program, and applicable requirements of the GGNS FSAR. Therefore, the design change would be consistent with the licensing basis. Because change (3) will add requirements not presently included in the Technical Specifications which more than offset the removal of the compensatory leak test requirement, and because the change would result in the performance of the ECCS safety function without affecting the safety margin, this change does 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, nor does it 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: Hinds 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.

Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50-298, Cooper Nuclear Station, Nemaha County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: May 15, 1985, as supplemented by submittal dated July 11, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The original amendment request of May 15, 1985 was initially noticed on July 17, 1985 (50 FR 29012), and was submitted in response to NRC Generic Letter (GL) 84-15, "Proposed Staff Actions to Improve and Maintain Diesel Generator Reliability," dated July 2, 1984. In this Generic Letter, the NRC staff identified cold fast starts of diesel generators as contributing to premature diesel engine degradation due to unnecessary wear. The NRC has concluded that the frequency of diesel generator fast start tests from ambient conditions should be reduced. Accordingly, the licensee, in the May 15, 1985 submittal, proposed to reduce the number of diesel generator tests required by Technical Specifications when the other diesel

generator is determined to be inoperable. The current Technical Specifications require a diesel generator to be tested immediately and daily thereafter when the other diesel generator is determined to be inoperable. The original amendment request would have retained the requirement for an immediate test but deleted the requirement for subsequent daily test starts. After discussions with the NRC staff, the licensee, by letter dated July 11, 1985, submitted a revision which would retain the requirement for an immediate diesel generator test and add a requirement for subsequent tests every three days thereafter.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee submittal of May 15, 1985 provided an evaluation of the initially proposed change and a basis for a proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The revision submitted by letter dated July 11, 1985 represents a more stringent limitation than that initially proposed and is encompassed by the May 15, 1985 evaluation. The licensee has stated that the proposed change does not delete diesel generator operability requirements when one diesel generator is determined to be inoperable. Diesel generator fast start operability is still present to mitigate the consequence of a large loss of coolant accident coincident with a loss of offsite power. Diesel generator operability will still be demonstrated by monthly routine tests and immediately and every three days after one diesel generator is determined to be inoperable. The NRC staff has determined that excessive diesel generator testing contributes to premature engine degradation and that an overall improvement in reliability and availability can be gained by eliminating excessive fast starts. The licensee has stated that the proposed change that reduces the frequency of diesel generator testing is consistent with the objectives expressed in GL 84-15 and may therefore result in enhanced reliability.

Based on the above, the staff concludes that the proposed amendment will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because, although some diesel generator tests would be eliminated, operability is still demonstrated by other required surveillance tests. The reduced number of fast starts may, in fact, increase the probability of diesel generator availability in the event of an accident.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any

accident previously evaluated because the proposed change introduces no new mode of plant operation and no physical modifications are required to be performed to the plant.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. It is anticipated that any reduction in the margin of safety would be insignificant since the purpose of the proposed change is to conform to the NRC guidelines of GL 84-15. The recommendations in GL 84-15 were promulgated to increase diesel generator reliability and thereby cause an increase in the overall margin of safety in the plant.

Based on the above evaluation, the staff finds that the criteria for a no significant hazards consideration determination, as set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), are met. The staff has, therefore, made a proposed determination that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Auburn Public Library, 118 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68305.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. G.D. Watson, Nebraska Public Power District, Post Office Box 499, Columbus, Nebraska 68601.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 24, 1985.

Description of amendment request: Effective January 1, 1984, the requirements contained in 10 CFR 50.72 and 10 CFR 50.73 replaced all existing requirements for licensees to report "Reportable Occurrences" as defined in individual plant Technical Specifications. The licensee has proposed to delete Action b in Section 3.3.7.9, "Fire Detection Instrumentation" of the Technical Specifications. Action b of Section 3.3.7.9 requires that the licensee:

Restore the minimum number of instrument(s) to OPERABLE status within 14 days or, in lieu of any other report required by specification 6.9.1, prepare and submit a Special Report to the Commission pursuant to Specification 6.9.2 within 30 days outlining the action taken, the cause of the inoperability and the plans and schedule for restoring the instrument(s) to OPERABLE status.

This Technical Specification requires the licensee to restore instruments within 14 days or submit a special report. Based on the January 1, 1984 NRC rule change the reporting

requirement is no longer applicable and neither are the references to 6.9.1 or 6.9.2 applicable since the appropriate sections pertaining to reporting requirements have already been deleted in accordance with this rule change. The requirement to restore the instruments is also no longer applicable since the Technical Specification as presently written does not require the licensee to restore the instruments within a specified length of time if a special report is submitted. The deletion of action b in its entirety poses no additional safety hazard since a fire watch must be established to inspect the zone(s) containing the inoperable instrument(s) within one hour. This requirement is specified in Action a of section 3.3.7.9. The deletion of Action b is merely the deletion of a reporting requirement because without a reporting requirement the restoration of inoperable instruments has no basis since it was the Licensee's option not to restore the instrumentation within a specified time but instead file a report. This proposed change is consistent with the January 1, 1984 NRC rule change.

Basis for Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination: The licensee in his letter dated June 24, 1985, stated that the proposed change does not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in margin of safety. The NRC staff agrees with the licensee's evaluation in this regard and proposes to find that the change to the Technical Specifications does not involve a significant hazards consideration. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the no significant hazards consideration standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration, example (vii) is 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 proposed change is encompassed by this example and therefore the NRC staff proposes to find that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

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

NRC Branch Chief: W. Butler.

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: April 26, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to delete the requirement for demonstrating operability of the emergency diesel generators when the following systems are declared inoperable: Core Spray; Low Pressure Coolant Injection (LPCI) mode of the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) System, and Containment Cooling. The proposed amendment would also remove the diesel generators from the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) for these systems when these systems are declared inoperable. In addition, the proposed revisions would change the diesel generator testing frequency from "once every 8 hours" to "once every 24 hours" when reserve power is unavailable from one or both off-site sources or, when one of the diesel generators is declared inoperable. The proposed amendment also contains several editorial changes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed amendment was submitted in response to NRC Generic Letter (GL) 84-15, "Proposed Staff Actions to Improve and Maintain Diesel Generator Reliability," dated July 2, 1984. In this generic letter, the NRC staff identified cold fast starts of diesel generator sets as contributing to premature diesel engine degradation due to unnecessary wear. The NRC has concluded that the frequency of diesel generator fast start tests from ambient conditions should be reduced. Specifically, GL 84-15 states the NRC position that requirements for testing diesel generators while emergency core cooling equipment is inoperable be deleted from Technical Specifications. Accordingly, the licensee proposed to delete from the FitzPatrick TS, requirements for diesel generator testing when it is determined that a core spray subsystem, residual heat removal pump, low pressure coolant injection subsystem, or containment cooling subsystem is inoperable.

The change in diesel generator testing frequency from once in 8 hours to once in 24 hours when reserve power is unavailable from one or both offsite

sources or, when one of the diesel generators is declared inoperable, has been proposed by the licensee to further reduce the number of cold fast starts. Testing every 8 hours under these circumstances would not result in increased availability of the diesels. The FitzPatrick diesels have been shown to have a high reliability factor (two diesels have a factor of 1.0 and the other two diesels have a factor of 0.99). These factors have been determined in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.108 "Periodic Testing of Diesel Generator units used as On-site Electric Power System of Nuclear Power Plants." Repeated testing at frequent intervals would have a detrimental effect on the engines, resulting in possible decreased availability.

Based on the above, the staff concludes that the proposed amendment will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because, although some diesel generator tests would be eliminated, operability is still demonstrated by other required surveillance tests. The reduced number of fast starts may, in fact, increase diesel generator availability in the event of an accident.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes introduce no new mode of plant operation or plant physical modifications.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the purpose of the proposed changes is to conform to the guidelines of GL 85-15, the recommendations of which were promulgated to increase diesel generator reliability and thereby cause an increase in the overall margin of safety.

Based on the above evaluation, the staff finds that the criteria for a no significant hazards consideration determination, as set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), are met. The staff has, therefore, made a proposed determination that the proposed amendment involves no 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.

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

Date of amendment request: April 7, 1981, as supplemented and revised November 14, 1983, and April 9, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would make changes to the Technical Specifications by adding to the list of required snubbers, providing surveillance requirements including frequency and acceptance criteria, and providing limiting conditions for operation for the facility should snubbers be inoperable. These changes were proposed to incorporate the provisions of the model Technical Specifications transmitted to all power reactor licensees in a letter dated November 20, 1980.

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: ". . . (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 changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example in that the proposed change would add Limiting Conditions for Operation and surveillance requirements on existing and newly installed snubbers, and is thus similar to the example described above.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are 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 considerations.

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.

Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket No. 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 3, San Diego County, California

Date of amendment request: May 9, 1985 (reference PCN-163).

Description of amendment: The proposed changes would revise San Onofre Unit 3 Technical Specifications 3.1.2.7, 3.1.2.8, and Bases 3/4.1.2. Technical Specifications 3.1.2.7 and 3.1.2.8 require borated water source operability and specify volume, temperature and boron concentration requirements which assure that sufficient negative reactivity control is available during each mode of facility operation. These technical specifications define the minimum boric acid tank water volume and temperature required as a function of the boric acid concentration. The proposed change increases the boric acid storage tank water volume specified by Technical Specification 3.1.2.7, consistent with the revised safety analysis associated with plant refueling and cycle 2 operation. In addition, the proposed change decreases the boric acid storage tank water volume/concentration specified in Technical Specification 3.1.2.8, but nevertheless maintains the reactivity control required for cycle 2 operation, as is demonstrated by the cycle 2 safety analysis.

Bases for Proposed no Significant Hazards Consideration Determination: The proposed changes to Technical Specifications 3.1.2.7 and 3.1.2.8 are similar to Example (iii) of 48 FR 14870, in that they result from a nuclear reactor core reloading where no significant changes have been made to the boration source acceptance criteria of the technical specifications, or to the analytical methodology used to demonstrate conformance to these criteria.

Local Public Document Room Location: San Clemente Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92672.

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.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit No. 1, Callaway County, Missouri

Date of amendment request: May 17, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The purpose of the proposed amendment request is for deletion of the requirements for resistance testing of certain fuses whose function is to provide containment penetration conductor overcurrent protection, and deletion of the list of containment penetration conductor overcurrent protective devices (circuit breakers and fuses) from the technical specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The technical specifications currently require that, among other things, all containment penetration conductor overcurrent protection fuses shall be demonstrated operable at least once per 18 months by selecting and functionally testing a representative sample (10%) of each type of fuse on a rotating basis. The license amendment application addresses the fact that resistance checking of fuses only generates data that is not indicative of performance, and that routine removal of fuses for testing can result in damaging of the fuse holder and contact points. Based on these considerations, and the fact that the licensee proposes to establish a fuse inspection and maintenance program in lieu of field testing by resistance, the deletion of the requirements for resistance checking of these fuses will not involve a significant increase in the probability of fuse failure. Since the proposed deletion of field testing by resistance will not impact fuse integrity, will not affect the method of plant operation, and will not affect equipment important to safe operation, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new and different accident from any previously evaluated. Since the resistance checking of fuses only generates data that is not indicative of performance, and the fact that resistance checking will be replaced by an inspection and maintenance program, the deletion of the requirements for resistance checking of these fuses will not significantly reduce any margins of safety.

The technical specifications also list the containment penetration conductor overcurrent protective devices (circuit breakers and fuses). The license amendment application also addresses the fact that the deletion of this list from the technical specifications shall in no way degrade compliance with the operability of the containment penetration conductor overcurrent protective devices since it is proposed that the list of these devices will be maintained in the appropriate plant procedures. However, maintaining the list in the procedures instead of in the technical specifications will allow the

licensee to have the flexibility in the future to change the list as needed without requesting a technical specification change. Examples of such changes are the addition or deletion of circuits (and breakers) or the changing of a circuit to require a larger or a smaller breaker, as a result of a design change in the plant. On April 6, 1983, the NRC published guidance in the **Federal Register** (48 FR 14870) concerning examples of amendments that are not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. This part of the amendment request is similar to the example of a purely administrative change to the technical specifications. The list of containment electrical penetration protective devices will be administratively maintained at the plant rather than in the technical specifications, and this will in no way degrade compliance with the operability requirements of these devices.

Based on the foregoing, the requested amendment does not present a significant hazard.

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.

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

NRC Branch Chief: B.J. Youngblood.

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: July 12, 1985.

Description of amendment requests: This amendment would delete the surveillance requirements on the Boron Injection Tank Level Instruments in Table 4.1 of the Technical Specifications. These surveillance requirements were removed from the Technical Specifications in Amendment Nos. 95 and 94 (dated February 24, 1984) to Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37, respectively, but were inadvertently included in Technical Specification Amendment Nos. 97 and 96 on Table 4.1-1 (dated June 19, 1984). This amendment would remove the surveillance requirement from the text previously deleted by Amendment Nos. 95 and 94.

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 (Example i) states: "A purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example . . . correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature." The proposed change is similar to the example in that it is a correction of an error. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do 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.

Washington Public Power Supply System, Docket No. 50-397, WNP-2 Richland, Washington

Date of amendment request: May 16, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications for the Washington Public Power Supply System, Nuclear Plant No. 2 (WNP 2). The proposed revision, if approved, will change the Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2 and modify the minimum allowable voltage band on auto starting of Diesel Generators DG-1 and DG-2 making it consistent with the output breaker closure permissive setpoint.

As presently stated, the WNP-2 Technical Specification potentially allows the establishment of a condition that could preclude operation of the Diesel Generators unless additional operator action is taken. Design of the Division 1 and 2 generator output breakers will not allow closure of the breaker until the voltage is within 94% of rated voltage. The rated voltage is 4160 VAC and 94% of this value is 3910 VAC. The Technical Specifications, as currently written, require that the voltage must be 4160 ± 420 VAC which is the range 3740 to 4580 VAC. When the voltage is in the lower part of this range, 3470 to 3910 VAC, it is within the current specification but too low to allow closure of the breaker. The minimum permissible voltage should be 3910 VAC. Thus, the voltage range on starting should be specified $4160 + 420, - 250$ VAC for DG-1 and DG-2. No change is necessary for DG-3.

The Supply System has reviewed this proposed change per 10 CFR 50.59 and determined that no unreviewed safety questions will result from this amendment. The staff concurs in that determination.

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 example 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." The proposed Technical Specifications amendment will impose a more stringent surveillance requirement and eliminate a potential possibility that the Diesel Generators 1 and 2 will fail to provide power when required. Because the amendment will result in an improvement of plant safety and because the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are 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 consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Richland Public Library, Swift and Northgate Streets, Richland, Washington 99352.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Walter R. Butler.

Washington Public Power Supply System, Docket No. 50-397, WNP-2 Richland, Washington

Date of amendment request: July 9, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications for the Washington Public Power Supply System, Nuclear Plant No. 2 (WNP-2). The proposed revision, if approved, would amend Administrative Controls, section 6.2.3, of the Technical Specifications to alter and make more flexible the composition of the Nuclear Safety Assurance Group (NSAG).

The Technical Specification 6.2.3.2 as presently written reads,

The NSAG shall be composed of a least five, dedicated, full-time engineers, a minimum of three located on site and two at the home office. Each shall have a bachelor's degree in engineering or related science and at least 2 years professional level experience in his field, at least 1 year of which experience shall be in the nuclear field.

The Supply System proposes to modify the first sentence so as to allow

one or two members of the NSAG to be located at the home office without requiring such location for precisely two of the group. In addition, this amendment will correct a typographical error in a previously granted amendment, Amendment No. 11.

The Supply System has reviewed this change per 10 CFR 50.59 and determined that no unreviewed safety questions will result from this amendment.

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 example involving no significant hazard 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. Although not precisely in accord with the specific examples cited, the change in the requirement for the location of each member of the NSAG is a purely administration detail consistent with the intent of the Commission's guidance, and the Technical Specifications and it is without safety significance. The error correction is precisely a cited example. Therefore the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists.

Accordingly the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Richland Public Library, Swift and Northgate Streets, Richland, Washington 99352.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Walter R. Butler.

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-305, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: July 11, 1985.

Description of amendment request: License amendment would provide consistency between 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix J and Kewaunee Technical Specifications (TS) in regard to containment air lock testing and provide the air lock between-the-seal pressure in this TS.

Basis for proposed no significant hazard consideration determination:

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standard in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards consideration. An example of an action involving no significant hazards consideration is a change that 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. That portion of the change which added a between-the-seals pressure to the TS served to make the TS as consistent with 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix J section III.D.2.(b)(iii). Therefore, the change provided for consistency in the TS as encompassed by example (i).

The remaining portion of the TS change, maintaining containment integrity after air lock doors are opened, involved changing the TS to agree with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix J in regard to requiring leak testing within three days of being opened. Therefore, the change provided for consistency in the TS as encompassed by example (i).

Since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to examples for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Wisconsin Library Learning Center, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

Attorney for licensee: Steven E. Keane, Esquire, Foley and Lardner, 777 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

During the period since publication of the last bi-weekly 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 Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.21(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 Evaluations 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, NW., 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.

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

Date of application for amendment: March 24, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deleted all the radiological parts of Appendix B to the Facility Operating License (Environmental Technical Specifications).

Date of issuance: August 9, 1985.

Effective date: August 9, 1985.

Amendment No.: 68.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-8. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20969 at 20970).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a letter dated August 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas

Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801.

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

Date of applications for amendment: October 16, 1984 and November 9, 1984 as modified February 8, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to reflect changes in the reporting requirements outlined in 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 and the guidance provided in our Generic Letter 83-43. It also modifies the administrative section of the Technical Specifications to recognize changes in title, plant organization, and the Operating Review Committee membership and responsibilities.

Date of issuance: August 14, 1985.

Effective date: August 14, 1985.

Amendment No.: 88.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-35. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 23, 1985 (50 FR 3048 and 50 FR 3049) Subsequent to the initial notice in the **Federal Register**, the Boston Edison Company, by letter dated February 8, 1985, provided Technical Specification pages which more closely follow the wording of the Standard Technical Specifications. These modifications do not change the substance of the amendment. An additional change was proposed in the letter, relative to review of the Fire Protection Plan, which is not included in this amendment and will be resubmitted by Boston Edison. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 14, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: April 9, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments change the Technical Specifications (TS) to permit loading of up to four fuel bundles around each source range monitor, if needed, in order to obtain the required minimum count rate.

Date of issuance: August 6, 1985.

Effective date: August 6, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 89 and 114.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20971).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 6, 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.

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

Date of application for amendment: May 18, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to delete section 6.14, "Environmental Qualification," and to remove the reference to section 6.14 from the records section of the technical specification. The current requirements for environmental qualification are contained in 10 CFR 50.49.

Date of issuance: August 12, 1985.

Effective date: August 12, 1985.

Amendment No. 64.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20973). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 12, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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: September 5, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications to add leak rate limits and test requirements for the automatic depressurization system.

Date of issuance: August 5, 1985.

Effective date: August 5, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 111 and 50.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45951).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 5, 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 application for amendments: November 19, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modify the Technical Specification Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements relating to snubbers.

Date of issuance: August 5, 1985.

Effective date: August 5, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 112 and 51.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 27, 1985 (50 FR 7987).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: March 29, 1982 supplemented by letters dated April 18, 1983, November 29, 1983 and February 12, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: This amendment made editorial changes to accurately describe reactor trip system instrumentation. By letter dated February 12, 1985, the licensee withdrew other proposed changes to update organization charts and position titles, duties, and committee assignments of plant personnel. The latter changes are the subject of separate proposed license amendments: see 50 FR 7991 issued February 27, 1985.

Date of issuance: August 5, 1985.

Effective date: August 5, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 85 and 71.

Facilities Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 22, 1983 (48 FR 28580).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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 application for amendments: December 17, 1984, supplemented by letter dated June 4, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendment changes 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 value listing, to correct an error in one reference to the battery electrolyte temperature for surveillance, and to make a number of editorial changes. Proposed changes by the licensee to delete the offsite committee's review of the meeting minutes of the onsite committee and to add a provision to allow committee changes without prior NRC review and approval are still under discussion with the licensee.

Date of issuance: August 5, 1985.

Effective date: August 5, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 87 and 73.

Facilities Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 27, 1985 (50 FR 7991).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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 application for amendments: May 10, 1985, supplemented by letter dated June 20, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical

Specifications relating to the electrical power systems and in response to the NRC Generic Letter No. 83-28, add surveillance requirements to periodically test the undervoltage trip attachments and shunt trip attachments. The changes to the electrical power system more precisely identify the required battery banks, define the full electrolyte level as up to the bottom of the maximum level indication mark, define shutdown for battery service tests to be MODES 5 and 6, for Unit 1 eliminate a surveillance pertaining to battery recharging time to be consistent with the Unit 2 requirements, eliminate the battery service test if a performance discharge test is performed, delete a footnote which designates when AC power sources are turned off or on, and as a result of a design change in the critical reactor instrumentation distribution design, deleted references to tie breakers and standby circuits to connect battery trains.

Date of issuance: August 5, 1985.

Effective date: August 5, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 86 and 72.

Facilities Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 3, 1985 (50 FR 27506).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: May 15, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the Technical Specifications to implement a reorganization of the Personnel Department.

Date of issuance: August 7, 1985.

Effective date: August 7, 1985.

Amendment No.: 3.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-29. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 3, 1985 (50 FR 27506).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Hinds Junior College, McLendon Library, Raymond, Mississippi 39154.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-245 and 50-336, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1 and Unit No. 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: May 18, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications to delete section 6.13, "Environmental Qualification"; to renumber the following sections in the Technical Specifications; and to remove a reference to the deleted section from the Records section of the respective plant technical specifications. The current requirements for environmental qualification are contained in 10 CFR 50.49.

Date of issuance: August 12, 1985.

Effective date: August 12, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 105 and 103.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-21 and Facility Operating License No. DPR-65: These amendments revised the Technical Specifications for Millstone Unit 1 and Unit 2.

Date of initial notices in Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20984) and June 4, 1985 (50 FR 23548).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in Safety Evaluations dated August 12, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Waterford Public Library, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut 06385.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50-245, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: March 15, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments remove the Training Supervisor from the Facility Organization Charts, Figure 6.2.2, of the Millstone 1 and 2 technical specifications. The Training Supervisor now reports to the corporate Director of Nuclear Training. This change is the result of the implementation of a corporate Nuclear Training Department and is part of a consolidation of nuclear training responsibility under the corporate Director of Nuclear Training.

Date of issuance: August 6, 1985.

Effective date: August 6, 1985.

Amendment No.: 104 and 102.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-21 and Facility Operating License No. DPR-65. These amendments revised the Appendix A Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 23, 1985 (50 FR 16007).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Waterford Public Library, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut 06385.

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: March 28, March 29 (3) and April 4, 1985.

Brief description of amendment:

These amendments change the Technical Specifications to: (1) Delete a reference to a Station Emergency Procedure with minor changes in wording; (2) delete specific footnotes for Cycle 5 refueling and operations; (3) add a footnote to delete a requirement for containment atmosphere particulate and gaseous radiation monitors to be in operation during Type "A" integrated leak rate testing; (4) revise a surveillance requirement to make Diesel Generator Testing consistent with requirements of Generic Letter 83-30; and (5) revise a surveillance requirement to delete the physical description of trisodium phosphate dodecahydrate.

Date of issuance: August 2, 1985.

Effective date: August 2, 1985.

Amendment No.: 101.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-65. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (FR 50 20969 at 20984) (3 notices) and June 4, 1985 (50 FR 23543 at 23549) (2 notices).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 2, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Waterford Public Library, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

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: February 22, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications to revise the function and membership of the Safety Review Committee and clarify the responsibility of the Plant Operating Review Committee.

Date of issuance: August 9, 1985.

Effective date: August 9, 1985.

Amendment No.: 94.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-59. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 23, 1985 (50 FR 16010).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: October 31, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the function and membership of the Safety Review Committee (SRC) of the Power Authority of the State of New York for Indian Point 3.

Date of issuance: August 8, 1985.

Effective date: August 8, 1985.

Amendment No.: 60.

Facilities Operating License No. DPR-64: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 31, 1984 (49 FR 25371).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 8, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Southern California Edison Company, Docket No. 50-206, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1, Diego County, California

Date of application for amendment: December 13, 1984, as supplemented January 16, 1985 and revised April 10, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment: (1) Modifies portions of the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications that were issued by Amendment 79 to the license, (2)

updates former Section 5.8 of the environmental Technical Specifications (TS) and redesignates this section as Section 6.19 of the Appendix A TS, and (3) deletes the remaining portion of the Appendix B TS.

Date of issuance: August 5, 1985.

Effective date: August 5, 1985.

Amendment No.: 90.

Provisional Operating License No.

DPR-13: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications and the license.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20990).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: San Clemente Public Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92672.

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 application for amendment: December 13, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to delete certain review requirements of the Plant Operations Review Committee.

Date of issuance: August 9, 1985.

Effective date: 90 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 120, 115 and 91.

Facility Operating License Nos. DRP-33, DRP-52 and DRP-68. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 27, 1985 (50 FR 12164).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-305, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendment: May 30, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: Revises Administrative Controls Technical Specifications.

Date of issuance: August 5, 1985.

Effective date: August 5, 1985.

Amendment No.: 65.

Facility Operating License No. DRP-43: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 3, 1985 (50 FR 27511).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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 period since publication of the last bi-weekly 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 to be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared and 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: Director, Division of Licensing.

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendments. By September 27, 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.

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 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).

Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket No. STN 50-528, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1, Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of application for amendment: July 12, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment authorized a one time only change in Technical Specification 3.4.5.2, Action Statement b, to allow an additional 72 hours in hot standby before proceeding to cold shutdown. This additional time was requested to determine the pathway of leakage under conditions of temperature and pressure more conducive to detection.

Date of Issuance: August 5, 1985.

Effective Date: July 12, 1985.

Amendment No.: I.

Facility Operating License No.: NPF-41.

Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Press release issued requesting comments as to proposed no significant hazards Consideration No.

Comments received: No.

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 5, 1985.

Attorney for licensees: Mr. Arthur C. Gehr, Snell & Wilmer, 3100 Valley Center, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

Local Public Document Room location: Phoenix Public Library, Business, Science and Technology Department, 12 East McDowell Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company, Docket No. 50-315, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: July 18, 1985 and July 19, 1985, as supplemented by letter dated July 3, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to reflect revised heatup and cooldown, and low temperature (cold) overpressure protection through twelve effective full power years of reactor operation.

Date of issuance: August 9, 1985.

Effective date: August 9, 1985.

Amendment No.: 88.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-58. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes. FRN 50 30319 dated July 25, 1985.

Comments received: No.

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 9, 1985.

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

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

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 22nd day of August 1985.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Edward J. Butcher,
*Acting Chief, Operating Reactors Branch #3,
Division of Licensing.*

[FR Doc. 85-20592 Filed 8-27-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M