

JUL 15 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 Applications
and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Consider-
ations, dated July 3, 1985.

A notice concerning a one-time extension for the performance of Type C tests on
59 containment isolation valves and deletion of isolation time requirements from
Table 3.6-1 for the main steam isolation valves and main feedwater isolation
valves, and editorial changes to valve function descriptions and system desig-
nators in Table 3.6-1 may be located on Page 27510 of this publication.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

B. J. Youngblood

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

Enclosure: FEDERAL REGISTER
DATED July 3, 1985

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
PRC System
NSIC
LB#1 D/L
MRushbrook
TAlexion

8507230552 850715
PDR ADDCK 05000483
P PDR

LB#1/DL
MRushbrook/mac
07/11/85

LB#1/DL
TAlexion
07/12/85

LB#1/DL
BJYoungblood
07/11/85

JUL 15 1985

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

Mayor Howard Steffen
Chamois, Missouri 65024

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Consideration; Bi-Weekly Notice

Background

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

the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This 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 June 19, 1985 (50 FR 25480), through June 24, 1985.

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

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant 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 August 2, 1985, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and

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

As required by 10 CFR § 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

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

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

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

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

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, 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 had 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(4).

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.

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

Date of amended request: April 15, 1983, as revised May 14, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The May 14, 1985 submittal supersedes the April 15, 1983 submittal which was previously noticed in the **Federal Register** on August 23, 1983 (48 FR 38390). The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications by incorporating revised radiological effluent and environmental monitoring limiting conditions for operation, action statements and surveillance requirements. The proposed changes are in response to NRC requests of July 11, and November 15, 1978. The proposed changes are intended to implement the design objectives and requirements of 10 CFR 50.34(a), 10 CFR 50.36a, 10 CFR Part 20, 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix A General Design Criteria 60 and 64 and 40 CFR Part 190.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One such amendment

involves 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 change proposed by the licensee is intended to implement: 10 CFR 50.34(a), which pertains to Design Objectives for equipment to control releases of radioactive materials in effluents from nuclear power reactors; 10 CFR 50.36a, which pertains to Technical Specifications of effluents from nuclear power reactors; 10 CFR Part 20, which pertains, in part, to the controlled release of radioactive materials in liquid and gaseous effluents; 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criteria 60, which pertains to control of releases of radioactive materials to the environment, and 64, which pertains to monitoring radioactively releases; and 40 CFR Part 190, which pertains to radiation doses to the public from operations associated with the entire uranium fuel cycle. This amendment, therefore, reflects changes to make the Pilgrim license conform to changes in the regulations. Since the licensee is presently obligated by these regulations to control and limit offsite releases of radioactive materials to levels which are as low as is reasonably achievable, the license change will only result in very minor changes in facility operations which are clearly in keeping with the regulations.

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 for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: November 1, 1984, as supplemented on May 16, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests changes that are primarily administrative in nature. Included are: (1) Modification of the calibration frequency of dose-rate measuring instruments, (2) re-numbering of a

previously motor-operated valve whose operator has been modified to convert to a manually-operated valve (this change is administrative since the valve will continue to remain in the locked-open position), (3) addition of H4 fuel to the Table of Core Operation Limitations (this change is editorial since H4 fuel is identical to H3 fuel values currently included in the table), and (4) other minor editorial or typographical corrections.

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 (1) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications such as a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. This example applies to changes (2), (3) and (4) described above. Thus, the staff proposes to determine that the changes involve no significant hazards consideration.

The staff has examined the proposed change regarding calibration frequency for dose-rate measuring instruments. Additional supporting information was obtained via telephone calls with the licensee. This information was then formally submitted to the NRC by letter dated May 16, 1985. The proposed modification would reduce the required calibration frequency of portable gamma monitors on the high range scales

(20R/hr) from once every 3 months to once every 6 months. Calibration on these high range scales must be done by shipping the instruments offsite to a calibration facility. Due to the high source intensity necessary to calibrate these scales, background radiation results in radiation exposure to laboratory personnel during the calibration process. Thus, calibration on these scales should not be performed too frequently. Based upon the above discussion, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed change would not involve a significant hazards consideration since it (1) does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident, (2) does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated, and (3) does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Local Public Document Room location: North Central Michigan

College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

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

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

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

Date of amendment request: June 14, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the existing Technical Specification for heatup, cooldown, and hydrostatic test of the reactor vessel by adjusting the pressure/temperature limits to account for the effects of irradiation of the Palisades reactor vessel materials. The methodology of Regulatory Guide 1.99, Revision 2 is used as the basis for the new, more restrictive limits.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes constituting an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. Although there are pressure/temperature limits presently included in the technical specifications, the changed limits are more restrictive to account for increased irradiation of the reactor vessel and to maintain the margin of safety. Revised pressure/temperature limits are required to meet the reactor vessel fracture toughness requirements in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. This would result in a higher temperature requirement for the corresponding reactor vessel pressure. Use of the proposed new limits, since they place more stringent limits on operation, would maintain the required margin of safety to the nil-ductility transition temperature for the reactor vessel material.

Therefore, since the proposed changes are similar to example (ii), the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes 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: July 11, 1984.

Description of amendment request: Resulting from the review of Multi-Plant Action Item B-24, Venting and Purging of Containment while at Full Power, the NRC requested on April 30, 1984 that Dairyland Power Cooperative (the licensee) submit revised technical specifications (TS) for containment ventilation isolation valve operability and isolation time, limiting conditions for operation, surveillance requirements, and periodic replacement of resilient valve seats. These TS and related bases for the specifications were submitted by the licensee on July 11, 1984.

Existing TS at La Crosse require that for containment integrity to exist, all penetrations required to be isolated during accident conditions must be capable of being closed by an operable containment automatic isolation valve or closed by at least one manual valve, blind flange, or deactivated automatic valve secured in the closed position. The reactor building isolation system must be tested for proper operation prior to every cold startup, but not required more often than at 30-day intervals. In addition to these existing requirements, the licensee's July 11, 1984 request proposed additional TS including (1) operability of containment ventilation valves based upon isolation time, (2) limiting conditions for operation when valves are found to be inoperable, (3) surveillance requirements which include testing after maintenance or repair and periodic replacement of resilient valve seat rings and (4) associated bases for these specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for making these determinations by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions involving no significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The proposed changes fall within this example since they are all additional requirements not currently included in the TS. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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 & Bockius, 1800 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

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

Date of amendment request: April 23, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the Technical Specifications for operation of the auxiliary feedwater system: (1) To delete the requirement that the Motor Driven Auxiliary Feedwater Pumps be automatically started in Mode 3 due to a loss of main feedwater pump signal, (2) to add statements for ACTION to be taken if more than one auxiliary feedwater pump is inoperable, (3) to clarify surveillance requirements to allow acceptance of discharge pressures based on calculational adjustments of test data to account for variations from a fluid temperature of 60 °F, and (4) to correct surveillance requirements by deleting verification of pumps starting from the control room and by verification of correct valve position for non-automatic and automatic valves depending upon the operation condition at the time of verification. The amendments would also make an administrative change to add the term "independent" to the Unit 2 Technical Specification to accurately describe the Auxiliary Feedwater Pumps.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether the license amendments involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14871). One of these examples (vi) is a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptance criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. The changes to delete the requirement that the Motor Driven Auxiliary Feedwater Pumps be automatically started in Mode 3 due to a loss of main feedwater pump signal, to clarify the surveillance requirements to allow calculational adjustments to discharge pressures to account for variations from a fluid temperature of 60°F, and to correct surveillance requirements for starting pumps from the control room and verification of

correct valve position depending upon the operation conditions are all directly related to this example as follows. During normal plant startup upon entering Mode 3, the "loss of main feedwater pump" instrumentation trip logic now automatically starts the Motor Driven Auxiliary Feedwater Pumps although delivery to the steam generators is not required. When water is required, it is usually added slowly at the direction of the operator. This acceptable operation has been recognized by the staff and was corrected in the later versions of the Westinghouse Standard Technical Specifications. The change to allow acceptance of discharge pressures based on calculational adjustments of test data to account for variations from a fluid temperature of 60 °F is to allow comparison of pump performance corrected for water density effects on discharge pressure. The staff has found the calculational adjustments acceptable but only if the fluid temperature measurement techniques are demonstrated to be substantially improved (See S. Varga, NRC, letter to J. Dolan, IMEC, dated April 11, 1985). The last changes under this example would remove the requirement to start the pumps from the control room (actually a redundant requirement to the definition of Operability under Section 1.6. of the Technical Specifications) and to verify the correct position of valves depending upon operating conditions. Non-automatic valves can be verified to be in their correct position at any time but automatic valves in the auxiliary feedwater systems may be at any position until reactor power reaches about 10% at which time the valves in the flow path can be verified fully open and the pumps in automatic control. The staff has recognized this acceptable operation and the later versions of the Westinghouse Standard Technical Specifications have been corrected. Another example (ii) provided by the Commission is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The proposed change to add statements for ACTION to be taken if more than one auxiliary feedwater pump is inoperable is directly related to this example. The current Technical Specifications address actions if only one pump is inoperable; the proposed change will address different requirements if two or all three of the pumps are inoperable.

The Commission has also provided an example (i) of a purely administrative change to technical specifications. The change to the Unit 2 description of the

Auxiliary Feedwater System to include the word "independent" will make both Units the same and consistent with the wording of the Standard Technical Specification. This change is directly related to the example. On this basis, the Commission proposed to determine that the amendments involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: May 10, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications relating to the electrical power systems and in response to the 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 would 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 or 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 as a result of a design change in the critical reactor instrumentation distribution design, and delete references to tie breakers and standby circuits to connect battery trains.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether amendments involve no significant hazards consideration by providing certain examples (48 FR 14871). One of these examples (i) is a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications. Three of the proposed changes are somewhat related to this example in that the changes all involve minor clarification of statements with example in that the changes all involve minor clarification of statements with no

change in intent or requirements. These are the changes to more precisely identify the required battery banks, the change to define the full electrolyte level up to the bottom of the maximum level indicator mark, and the change to define shutdown for battery service tests to be MODES 5 or 6. Another example (ii) is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed change to add surveillance requirements for the Undervoltage Trip Attachments and Shunt Trip Attachments is directly related to this example. Generic Letter 83.28 proposed these attachments and appropriate surveillance requirements as a means of satisfying a portion of the NRC concerns following the anticipated transients without scram event at the Salem facility.

The remaining four proposed changes are related to the example (iv) which is a change which may either 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 change on Unit 1 to eliminate a surveillance pertaining to battery recharging time is also accompanied by the addition of a surveillance requirement for new batteries which is consistent with the Unit 2 requirement. The results of the new Unit 1 surveillance requirement is clearly within the criteria found acceptable by the staff for the Unit 2 requirements. The change to eliminate the battery service test if a performance discharge test is performed would result in less actual testing, however, the performance discharge test profile envelopes the battery service test profile and completion of the performance discharge test ensures adequate capacity to meet the requirements of the battery service test. The staff has previously found this acceptable and the Standard Technical Specifications acknowledge deletion of the battery service test if the performance discharge test is performed. The third change related to this example is the deletion of a footnote which requires an AC power source be turned off when certain batteries are undergoing a load test. The licensee has redesigned the critical reactor instrumentation distribution (CRID) system so that the GRID cabinets continue to receive 120 Volt power from two sources but the inverter supplying power to the CRID will no longer connect both sources. The inverter can load the batteries alone without

interference from the second AC source, therefore, there is no need to have this second source turned off. The redesign of the CRID supply involves adding a transformer and separating the 600V AC supply from the inverter. This new equipment is in addition to previous equipment and on this basis may increase the probability of an accident but the system design is in accordance with previously acceptable criteria. The last change under this example (iv) is the change to delete references to the tie breakers and standby circuits to connect battery trains. Mechanical interlocks could not be provided for the manually operated switches, therefore, the tie breakers between trains were disconnected. Disconnecting the tie breakers removes a licensee backup system which might be used in the event of a complete loss of one battery but the NRC has not given credit to ties between trains and considers the disconnect to improve safety by assuring redundancy and separation of equipment. On the above basis, the Commission proposes to determine that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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: May 15, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

The amendment would revise Figure 6.2.1-1 "Offsite Organization" and Figure 6.2.2-1 "Unit Organization" in the Technical Specifications by deleting the positions of Manager, Nuclear Human Resources, and Administrative Supervisor, respectively. The responsibilities and functions of the Manager, Nuclear Human Resources, would be assigned to a new position of Manager of Employment in the Mississippi Power & Light (MP&L) Company's Personnel Department. The responsibilities of the Administrative Supervisor would be assigned to a new position of Personnel Supervisor reporting to the Manager of Employment. The new position of Manager of

Employment would be enhanced by the addition of two positions for nuclear recruiting while retaining the responsibilities of the present position of the Manager of Nuclear Human Resources. The Personnel Supervisor and staff would remain on site and would continue to provide personnel services for the plant under the Manager of Employment.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The primary function of the Manager, Nuclear Human Resources, is to recruit and develop employees for the Nuclear Production Department (NPD) of MP&L. The change would place this position (with the title changed to Manager of Employment) under the MP&L Personnel Department thereby making the entire resources of the Personnel Department available to support the functions of this position. The Manager of Employment would be the same person now assigned to the position of Manager, Nuclear Human Resources. The Manager of Employment would retain responsibility for three positions conducting NPD position task analyses and would be given responsibility for two new positions having responsibility for recruiting employees for the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station and other nuclear-related activities. The Personnel Supervisor and staff at Grand Gulf Nuclear Station will continue to provide personnel services for the plant under the Manager of Employment. The proposed change would increase the availability to the Nuclear Production Department of MP&L's resources in recruitment and development of employees. Because this change would not affect plant equipment design, safety criteria or safety analyses and would enhance human resource management, 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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

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

Date of amendment request: May 28, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications would make changes relative to fire protection systems including fire detectors, fire water pump diesels, spray and/or sprinkler systems, hose stations, and penetration fire barriers.

Revisions to Section 3/4.3.7 and Table 3.3-10 are proposed to reflect the installation of additional fire detection instrumentation in the Auxiliary Building and Containment. Action and Surveillance Requirements for the instrumentation located in containment have been added. Specific Surveillance Requirements for supervised and non-supervised instrumentation circuits have also been incorporated.

Revision to Surveillance Requirement Section 4.7.9.1.3 pertaining to the diesel driven fire pumps is made to reflect the as-built design of the diesel starting system which uses two independent 12-volt batteries.

The list of spray and/or sprinkler systems in Section 3.7.9.2 has been updated to reflect additions to the plant fire protection systems.

Technical Specification Section 3/4.7.9.3, Fire Hose Stations, is revised, in part, to reflect provisions of the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) for Combustion Engineering nuclear steam supply systems (NUREG-0212, Revision 2) and the operability for fire hose stations in Containment during operational MODES 5 and 6. Specifically, the licensee intends to locate fire hose station equipment outside Containment when in MODES 1-4. Table 3.7-2 has also been updated to include new hose stations.

Revision to Technical Specification Section 3/4.7.10, Penetration Fire Barriers, is made to reflect the need to protect redundant safe shutdown related systems and equipment as required by Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50. The Applicability statement has been revised to account for different equipment requirements during various plant operating MODES as specified in other portions of the Technical Specifications. The Action statement for a non-functional fire barrier reflects the STS with slight modifications to the frequency of a fire watch patrol given an operable fire detection or suppression system on *both* sides of a non-functional fire barrier. In addition, a third provision is proposed for the

Action statement which requires a temporary fire barrier/penetration seal be installed for a period not to exceed 30 days. If the barrier cannot be repaired within the specified time period, the licensee proposes to provide the Commission a special report outlining the cause of the barrier inoperability and the plans and schedules for restoring the barrier to functional status. A Special Report category is proposed to be added to Section 6.9.2. The Surveillance Requirements of Section 4.7.10 pertaining to fire barrier penetration seals are revised to reflect a reduction in the numbers of seals subject to visual inspection. Should any of the seals in the inspection sample be nonfunctional, additional inspections are to be performed.

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 (i) of this guidance is a purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. The proposed wording change to Surveillance Requirement Section 4.7.9.1.3 reflects the as-built battery design of two 12-volt batteries rather than the 24-volt battery. This change is similar to example (i) of the guidance by correcting an error. The addition made to Section 6.9.2 provides consistency throughout the Technical Specifications by listing a reporting requirement committed to in another Section and is therefore similar to Example (i).

Example (ii) of the guidance relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the technical specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The inclusion of additional surveillance and control equipment would be similar to example (ii); therefore, the additional fire detection instrumentation included in Table 3.3-10 and the additional spray and/or sprinkler systems contained in Section 3.7.9.2 would be included under this example.

Example (vi) of the guidance relates to a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a probably analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan: for example, a

change resulting from the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculational model or design method. The changes to Sections 3/4.3.3.7 and 3/4.7.9.3 are consistent with the STS as endorsed by Chapter 16 of the Standard Review Plan and, therefore, are similar to example (vi). The proposed changes to Section 3/4.7.10 are consistent with Draft Revision 3 of the STS and are within the acceptance criteria specified in the Standard Review Plan and are therefore similar to example (VI).

The revised Surveillance Requirements in Section 3/4.7.10 take into account operating experience with penetration seal material and manufacturer's technical data on seal degradation over time. Operating experience and manufacturer's data indicate that there is no degradation with age and there are virtually no maintenance requirements for fire barrier penetration seals when properly installed. Plant design changes receive a fire protection review. This review specifically addresses the need to reinstate any new or existing fire barrier penetration seals as part of the work closeout requirements. This provision provides assurance that maintenance and construction work will not result in non-functional fire barriers. Semi-annual fire inspections conducted by American Nuclear Insurers, fire inspections by the licensee's Fire Protection Engineering Section and monthly inspections conducted by Millstone Station Services personnel provide a random check of penetration seals above and beyond the proposed Surveillance Requirements of Specification 4.7.10.b. For the reasons stated above, the proposed changes to the Surveillance Requirements in Section 3/4.7.10 would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. For these same reasons, the proposed change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated or involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above considerations, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Waterford Public Library, Rope Ferry Road, Route 156, Waterford, Connecticut.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

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

Date of amendment request: June 6, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would add new technical specifications addressing the surveillance requirements related to the licensee's solid radioactive waste Process Control Program (PCP). Specifically, the requirements will state that the PCP shall be used to verify the solidification of radioactive waste.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples, (ii), of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the technical specifications. The proposal to add technical specifications addressing the surveillance requirements related to the licensee's solid radioactive waste PCP comes under example ii because there are presently no surveillance requirements. Based upon the above, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Leboeuf, Lamb, Leiby, and MacRae, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

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

Date of amendment request: April 23, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications Sections 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.10 and 5.3. The proposed changes are in support of the Cycle 4/5 refueling, which is scheduled to commence on June 7, 1985. The Cycle 4/5 refueling would involve the first of a three-phase fuel design transition from the Westinghouse 15X15 low parasitic (LOPAR) design to the 15X15 Optimized Fuel Assembly (OFA) design and an introduction of Wet Annular Burnable Absorber (WABA) rods into the core.

The OFA fuel design results in an increased rod drop time of 2.4 seconds,

as compared to a 1.8 second rod drop time for the LOPAR assembly. The accident re-analyses necessitated by the increased rod drop time have been submitted for review. The re-analyses have been performed assuming asymmetric steam generator tube plugging levels. The proposed Technical Specification revisions also include a modified F delta H limit equation reflecting an increased partial power multiplier and a provision for the use of WABA rods in the core.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan (Example vi). The amendment would allow the first of a three-phase fuel design transition from the Westinghouse 15X15 LOPAR fuel design to the 15X15 OFA design and an introduction of WABA rods into the core. To demonstrate full compatibility of the OFA and LOPAR fuel assemblies, the licensee has provided mechanical, nuclear, thermal-hydraulic, and accident evaluations. The results of the licensee's evaluations appear to be consistent with the criteria specified in the Standard Review Plan sections involving Fuel System Design (4.2), Nuclear Design (4.3), Thermal and Hydraulic Design (4.4), and Accident Analysis (Chapter 15) and were performed using methods previously reviewed and approved by the staff. 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 10601.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: May 22, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

The proposed change to the Technical Specifications incorporates a new requirement which will allow the performance of Xenon stability testing. The purpose of the testing is to show that power perturbations will be dampened.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations include changes that constitute an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. Since the proposed change adds a requirement to provide controls during the performance of a test, which is part of the originally required rise-to-power testing, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed action does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Greeley Public Library, City Complex Building, Greeley, Colorado.

Attorney for licensee: Bryant

O'Donnell, Public Service Company of Colorado, P.O. Box 840, Denver, Colorado 80201.

NRC Branch Chief: Eric H. Johnson.

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

Date of Amendment Request: January 25, 1984 and August 7, 1984 (Reference PCN-97).

Description of Amendment Request:

The proposed change would revise Technical Specification 3/4.6.4.1, "Hydrogen Monitors," which concerns the operability of hydrogen monitors and defines periodic tests to verify operability. These monitors would be used to measure hydrogen concentration within the containment following an accident. The proposed change consists of three parts as follows:

(a) T.S. 3.6.4.1 states that the two independent hydrogen monitors must be operable and defines the actions to be taken when one monitor is inoperable. Since T.S. 3.6.4.1 does not address inoperability of both monitors, plant shutdown would be required in accordance with the technical specifications. The proposed change adds an action statement to T.S. 3.6.4.1 which provides conditions under which both hydrogen monitors could be inoperable and shutdown would not be

required. A period of forty-eight hours will be allowed during which at least one hydrogen monitor must be returned to operable status. If this condition is not met, the plant must be shutdown within the following six hours.

(b) The proposed change would add an action statement to T.S. 3.6.4.1 which will provide an exception to the applicability of T.S. 3.0.4 when only one hydrogen monitor is operable. T.S. 3.0.4 prohibits upward mode changes while relying on the provisions of the action statement. Since Modes 1 and 2 (Power Operation and Start-up, respectively) require that two hydrogen monitors be operable, the plant may not enter Mode 1 or Mode 2 if one of the hydrogen monitors is inoperable. The proposed exception to T.S. 3.0.4 will allow the plant to enter a higher operational mode with one of the two hydrogen monitors inoperable.

(c) T.S. 4.6.4.1 requires that the hydrogen monitors must be tested regularly by performing channel functional tests and channel calibrations. A channel functional test involves the simulation of a signal to the hydrogen monitor. Channel calibration entails verification of the hydrogen monitor's accuracy by applying known concentrations of hydrogen to the monitor's sensor. Currently, T.S. 4.6.4.1 requires that 1% and 4% hydrogen concentration gases be used. During the channel calibration some of the containment isolation valves are required to be open, which reduces containment integrity for the period of calibration.

The proposed change to T.S. 4.6.4.1 would substitute a 0% hydrogen concentration gas for the 1% hydrogen concentration gas used for channel calibration. The 0% hydrogen concentration gas requires less testing time than the 1% hydrogen concentration gas, thereby minimizing the time period during which the containment isolation valves are open and increasing containment integrity. In addition, the hydrogen monitor manufacturer (General Electric) recommends the use of a 0% hydrogen concentration gas and one other concentration of hydrogen gas (e.g., 4%) for channel calibration.

Basis for Proposed No Significant Hazards Considerations Determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. Example (vi) relates to a change which

either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptance criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan (SRP). Example (i) relates to a purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, correction of an error.

SRP Section 6.2.5 "Combustible Gas Control In Containment," provides acceptance criteria for hydrogen monitors. SRP 6.2.5 references NUREG-0737 "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements" for specific requirements for hydrogen monitors. NUREG-0737 requires technical specifications for the hydrogen monitors. Acceptable mode technical specifications satisfying the NUREG-0737 requirements were provided to licensees in NRC Generic Letter 83-37 dated November 1, 1983.

NRC Generic Letter 83-37 delineates the NRC staff requirements for Technical Specifications for hydrogen monitors and provides an action statement which allows both hydrogen monitors to be inoperable with the condition that at least one monitor must be restored to operable status within seventy-two hours. The proposed change described in part (a) above, would allow both hydrogen monitors to be inoperable for a period of forty-eight hours during which at least one monitor must be restored to operable status. This proposed change is consistent with Generic Letter 83-37, but is more restrictive in that it allows only forty-eight hours for the restoration of the hydrogen monitor's operability, rather than seventy-two hours. Because proposed change (a) above is consistent with Generic Letter 83-37, it meets the acceptance criteria of SRP Section 6.2.5 and is similar to Example (vi) of 48 FR 14870.

The hydrogen monitors constitute post-accident monitoring instrumentation performing the same general function as the accident monitoring instrumentation in T.S. 3.3.3.6. Technical Specification 3.3.3.6, "Accident Monitoring Instrumentation," provides an exception to the applicability of T.S. 3.0.4 while complying with the action statements for any of the accident monitoring instruments covered by T.S. 3.3.3.6. Consistent with technical specifications for other accident monitoring instrumentation, the proposed change will allow an exception to T.S. 3.0.4 but only with one hydrogen monitor inoperable, whereas T.S. 3.3.3.6 would

otherwise provide an exception to T.S. 3.0.4 with either one or both hydrogen monitors inoperable. Because proposed change (b) above, achieves consistency within the technical specifications, it is similar to example (i) of 48 FR 14870.

The hydrogen monitor manufacturer (General Electric) recommends the use of a 0% hydrogen concentration gas and one other concentration of hydrogen gas (e.g., 4%) for channel calibration. The proposed change described in part (c), above, calls for the use of the manufacturer-recommended concentrations of hydrogen gas for channel calibration, rather than the use of the currently specified 1% and 4% hydrogen concentration gases. Proposed change (c) above, meets the no significant hazards criteria established in 10 CFR 50.92 in that operation with the proposed amendment would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously conducted. Specifically, the proposed change will result in equal or better calibration, thereby giving readings that are at least as good as the previous method of calibration.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. This instrument does not perform any pre-accident function. Therefore, it meets this criteria.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed change does not reduce a safety margin, since the monitor's function will not be impaired by calibration in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendation.

Local Public Document Room

Location: San Clemente Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92672.

Attorney for licensees: 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.

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

Date of Amendment Request: March 18, 1985 (Reference PCN-188).

Description of Amendment Request: The proposed change would revise Technical Specification 3/4.3.2, "Engineered Safety Features Actuation

System Instrumentation." Technical Specification 3/4.3.2 requires that Engineered Safety Features Actuation System (ESFAS) instrumentation channels be operable and defines a number of functional tests and response time tests that must be conducted periodically in order to verify operability. Specification 3/4.3.2 identifies the instruments required for the Toxic Gas Isolation System (TGIS). The TGIS is actuated when concentrations of toxic gases (e.g. chlorine, butane/propane or ammonia) in the control room supply ducts exceed the concentration setpoints. Upon receipt of a TGIS signal, the control room heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) system is automatically isolated. The setpoints are selected such that the toxic gas concentration in the control room will not exceed allowable limits during the first two minutes after the detector responds. This provides adequate protection for the control room operators by allowing sufficient time to don protective gear.

Recently, Amendments 29 and 18 to the operating licenses for San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2 and 3, respectively, deleted the requirement for TGIS carbon dioxide instrumentation. Analysis in support of this amendment demonstrated that the maximum control room concentration of carbon dioxide at any time without control room isolation would be 11,000 ppm. The carbon dioxide instrumentation was deleted because the licensee demonstrated that the protective action limit of 50,000 ppm for carbon dioxide would never be exceeded. However, through an oversight Amendments 29 and 18 did not delete all references to carbon dioxide instrumentation from the technical specifications, but only deleted the reference to the carbon dioxide instrumentation from Table 3.3-4, "ESFAS Instrumentation Trip Values." The TGIS carbon dioxide instrumentation is also included in Table 3.3-3, "ESFAS Instrumentation," and Table 4.3-2, "ESFAS Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements". The proposed change corrects this oversight by deleting the remaining references to the TGIS carbon dioxide instrumentation from these tables.

Basis for Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve

significant hazards considerations. Example (i) relates to a purely administrative change to the technical specifications: For example a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error or a change in nomenclature. The proposed change described above, by deleting the remaining references to TGIS carbon dioxide instrumentation, which should have been removed by Amendments 29 and 18, corrects an error and achieves consistency within the technical specifications. Therefore the proposed change is similar to example (i) of 48 FR 14870 and thus the NRC staff proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

Location: San Clemente Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92672.

Attorney for licensees: 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: (1) A one-time extension for the performance of Type C tests on 59 containment isolation valves (this would require a one-time exemption from Appendix J to Part 50), (2) deletion of isolation time requirements from Table 3.6-1 for the main steam isolation valves and main feedwater isolation valves, and (3) editorial changes to valve function descriptions and system designators in Table 3.6-1.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards considerations determination: (1) Appendix J to Part 50 requires that Type C tests be performed during each reactor shutdown for refueling but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years. The 59 containment isolation valves were last tested between August and December of 1983. The licensee has requested an exemption that would result in the testing being performed during the first refueling outage for Callaway, currently, scheduled to occur during April-June of 1986. The licensee's amendment application addresses the

short length of exposure of the subject valves to an operating environment and the favorable previous local leak rate test measurements. Based on these considerations, the approximately eight month extension in time for the performance of Type C tests will not involve a significant increase in the probability of valve failure and will, therefore, not increase the probability or consequences of any previously analysed accident.

Since the proposed extension will not impact isolation valve 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 length of exposure to an operating environment is small and the previous local leak rate test measurements were favorable, the proposed amendment will not significantly reduce any margins of safety.

(2) and (3) 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 amendment request is similar to the example of a purely administrative change to the technical specifications that may involve a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. The isolation time requirements for the main steam and main feedwater isolation valves are more appropriately addressed in other sections of the technical specifications, and the editorial changes to valve function descriptions are purely administrative in nature. The proposed changes to the technical specifications satisfy the criteria of this example.

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

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 et al., Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of amendments request: February 14, 1985.

Description of amendments request: The proposed change would eliminate from the NA-1&2 Technical Specifications (TS) the rod bow penalty on the nuclear enthalpy hot channel factor. The proposed change is made possible by an improved fuel rod bowing evaluation methodology that has demonstrated that the presently specified rod bow penalty on 17x17 R-grid fuel can be reduced. This improved methodology has been reviewed and approved by the NRC in its letter dated December 29, 1982 from C. O. Thomas (NRC) to E. P. Rahe, Jr., (Westinghouse) and entitled "Acceptance for Referencing of Licensing Topical Report WCAP-8691(P)/WCAP-8692(NP)". The total retained DNBR Margin for 17x17 fuel is quantified to be 9.1%. The new R-grid rod bow penalties when added together are substantially less than 9.1%. Therefore, removal of the presently specified TS rod bow penalty is compensated for by implementation of the NRC-approved rod bow penalties.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the no significant hazards consideration by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). Example (vi) of a no significant hazards consideration involves a change which 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 as specified in the Standard Review Plan. Although the instant amendment would permit a reduction of the retained DNBR margin due to the removal of the rod bow penalty on the nuclear enthalpy hot channel factor, the reduction is compensated for by implementation of the NRC-approved rod bow penalties, which provides for adequate and for some factors with additional available margin. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room locations: Board of Supervisors Office, Louisa County Courthouse, Louisa, Virginia 23093 and the Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton, Williams, Gay

and Gibson, P.O. Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23212.

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

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

Date of amendment request: May 30, 1985.

Description of amendment request: License amendment would provide revised Technical Specifications (T.S.) to direct the plant Quality Control Group to report to higher level plant management. In addition, would eliminate blank T.S. pages and would incorporate other minor administrative and editorial changes in T.S.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards consideration. Examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration are changes that relate 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, and

(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 eliminating blank T.S. pages and other minor administrative and editorial changes are encompassed in example (i).

The T.S. change to direct the Quality Control Group to report to a higher level of plant management enhances the authority of this group and represents an additional control not presently included in the T.S., as indicated in example (ii).

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.

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

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

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

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

Date of amendment request: June 11, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the technical specifications to update the pressure/temperature limit curves for hydrostatic and leak rate testing and for heatup and cooldown rates. All of these curves are being updated to show the required limitations out to 22.0 effective full power years.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: June 18, 1985 (50 FR 25364).

Expiration date of individual notice: July 18, 1985.

Local Public Document Room location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.
NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

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

Date of amendment request: February 27, 1985, as revised May 24, 1985, and June 7, 1985

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would move the Fire Service System tables from the Technical Specifications (TSs) to the Fire Protection Plan (FPP) to allow timely implementation of operability and surveillance requirements. The affected Technical Specifications are the Fire Detection Instrumentation (TS 3.3.3.7), Deluge and Sprinkler Systems (TS 3.7.11.2) and Fire Hose Stations (TS 3.7.11.4). Also a Fire Protection license

condition would be added requiring that the FPP not be changed so as to significantly decrease the level of fire protection in the plant without the Commission's approval and that all changes be submitted annually to the Commission along with the updated FSAR. See 10 CFR 50.71.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: June 14, 1985 (50 FR 24969).

Expiration date of individual notice: July 15, 1985.

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

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

Date of amendment request: April 25, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to support the operation of Crystal River Unit 3 at full rated power during the upcoming Cycle 6 operation. The proposed amendment requests changes in the following areas:

1. Reactor core safety limits and trip setpoints for reactor thermal power and axial power imbalance.
2. Minimum boric acid and borated water volumes.
3. Regulating and axial power shaping rod group insertion limits.
4. Axial power imbalance limits.
5. Reactor Protection System response time testing requirements.
6. Deletion of specific requirements pertaining to Cycle 5.

In support of the license amendment request for operation of Crystal River Unit 3 during Cycle 6, the licensee submitted, as an attachment to the application, a Babcock & Wilcox (B&W) Report, BAW-1860, dated April 1985. A summary of the Cycle 6 operating parameters along with a safety analysis are included therein.

For Cycle 6 Crystal River Unit 3 will operate with 60 fresh fuel assemblies similar to the fuel used in Cycle 5. Additionally, Cycle 6 will incorporate longer less absorbing Inconel (gray) axial power shaping rods (APSRs) instead of the silver-indium-cadmium (black) APSRs used previously.

The NOODLE code was used in determining core physics parameters and the LYNX-T code, which uses crossflow methods, in the thermal-hydraulic analyses. Other analytical methods have been used and accepted for previous cores.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: June 13, 1985 (50 FR 24849).

Expiration date of individual notice: July 15, 1985.

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

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 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on the 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.

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

Date of application for amendment: December 14, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to incorporate the requirements to perform augmented inservice inspection of the IP-2 reactor vessel during the second ten year inspection interval. The augmented inspection is required as a result of a flaw indication reported on the IP-2 reactor vessel during the cycle 6/7 refueling outage. In accordance with Section XI of the ASME Code the amendment requires the inspection to be performed at a frequency of three times over the next ten years. Should any additional inspection demonstrate that the flaw in within the Section XI allowable for which no augmented inspection is required, the amendment allows the requirement for augmented inspection to become void.

Date of issuance: June 6, 1985.

Effective date: June 6, 1985.

Amendment No.: 95.

Facilities Operating License No. DPR-26: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 27, 1985 (50 FR 7984)

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

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

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

Brief description of amendment: The amendment incorporates technical specification changes to add a description of an operating requirements for the new stack gas monitoring system.

Date of issuance: June 10, 1985.

Effective date: June 10, 1985.

Amendment No.: 75.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-6. This amendment revised the license and the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 27, 1985 (50 FR 7984).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 10, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: November 14, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the Technical Specifications to include the recently modified Reactor Enclosure Treated Waste Line Isolation Valve, CV-4049, as an automatic containment isolation valve in the list of automatic containment isolation valves which are local leak rate tested.

Date of issuance: June 7, 1985.

Effective date: June 7, 1985.

Amendment No.: 74.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-6. This amendment revised the license and the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 27, 1985 (50 FR 7985).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: September 29, 1982.

Brief description of amendment: Revises technical specifications regarding reactor coolant system safety valves to incorporate new requirements for operability and surveillance testing.

Date of Issuance: June 7, 1985.

Effective date: June 7, 1985.

Amendment No.: 43.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-45. Amendment revised the Appendix A Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 26, 1983 (48 FR 49583).

The Commission's related evaluation for the license amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 7, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: La Crosse Public Library, 800

Main Street, La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601.

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

Date of application for amendment: October 18, 1984 as revised on January 10, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: Modifies license conditions to remove specific quantity limitations for radioactive byproduct, source, or special nuclear material used for sample analysis or instrumental calibration or associated with radioactive apparatus or components.

Date of Issuance: June 5, 1985.

Effective date: June 5, 1985.

Amendment No.: 42.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-45. Amendment revised the license.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 27, 1985 (50 FR 12143).

The Commission's related evaluation for the license amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: November 3, 1983 and supplemented by letters dated July 31, 1984 and March 21, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The only requirements left in Appendix B are those that have to do with infrared aerial photography and soil sampling, and related administrative requirements. The amendment eliminates Appendix B in its entirety, leaving Appendix A, which becomes the only appendix to the Beaver Valley Unit 1 Operating License.

Date of issuance: June 24, 1985.

Effective date: June 25, 1985.

Amendment No.: 93.

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

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

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

An Environmental Assessment has been prepared in accordance with 10 CFR 50.12(b) and a finding of No Significant Impact made dated June 21, 1985 (50 FR 25806).

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

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

Date of application for amendment: July 19, 1984, as supplemented by the agreement in meeting minutes dated February 22, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment authorizes Appendix A Technical Specification (TS) changes pertaining to the primary containment atmosphere to (1) reduce the maximum oxygen limit from less than 5% to less than 4% in TS 3.5.A.6 and add appropriate text to its Bases and (2) correct a typographical spelling error in the Bases of TS Section 4.5.

Date of issuance: June 7, 1985.

Effective date: June 7, 1985.

Amendment No. 86.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16. Amendment revised the Appendix A Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the Federal Register: March 27, 1985 (50 FR 12145).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

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

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: March 1, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to account for increased flow in the pump bypass line. The specific changes add to footnote to the Safety Injection System single pump flow requirements to (1) indicate combined loops 1, 2, 3, and 4 cold leg flow is to be less than or equal to 640 gpm to be consistent with the containment analysis and (2) total flow, including miniflow, is not to exceed 700 gpm to be consistent with the limits in the ECCS analysis.

Date of issuance: June 24, 1985.

Effective date: June 24, 1985.

Amendment No. 84.

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

Date of initial notice in the Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20981).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received. None.

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

Iowa Electric Light and Power Company, Docket No. 50-311, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of application for amendment: December 5, 1984, as supplemented January 24, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to (1) permit changing the well cooling water backwash automatic valves to manual valves and to keep them locked shut, (2) correct some inconsistencies in the present specifications and as-built logic circuits for Groups 6 and 7 containment isolation valves, and (3) make the Technical Specifications clearer and more complete.

Date of issuance: June 11, 1985.

Effective date: June 11, 1985.

Amendment No. 123.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-49. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the Federal Register: February 27, 1985 (50 FR 7992).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room
location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 500 First Street, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

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

Date of application for amendment: October 1, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The revision to the Technical Specifications adds Limiting Conditions for Operation and surveillance requirements for the Control Room Air Treatment System, updates the testing requirements for the absorber filters that are a part of the Control Room Air Treatment and the Emergency Ventilation systems, and changes the testing frequencies for the above mentioned system.

Date of issuance: June 11, 1985.

Effective date: June 11, 1985.

Amendment No.: 73.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-63. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 27, 1985 (50 FR 7996).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

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

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: February 6, 1985 as supplemented June 5 and June 11, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The revisions to the Technical Specifications modify the allowable region of operation when the core power distribution is monitored by the Excore Detector Monitoring System. These revisions reflect changes in Cycle 7 operating characteristics and allow operation in fuel Cycle 7.

Date of issuance: June 19, 1985.

Effective date: June 19, 1985.

Amendment No.: 99.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 27, 1985 (50 FR 12132 at 12150). The June 5, 1985 letter provided the final Cycle 7 reload characteristics and the June 11, 1985 letter provided a Technical Specification page which was inadvertently left out of the February 6, 1985 submittal and provided addition clarification. Neither letter revised the initial noticing action.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 19, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

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

Local Public Document Room
location: Waterford Public Library, Rope Ferry Road, Route 156, Waterford, Connecticut.

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: April 2, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment modified the Technical Specifications by changing the chlorine detection system setpoint, eliminating the date associated with Regulatory Guide 1.95, changing the control room emergency ventilation system flow rate, specifying the removal efficiency of the charcoal adsorber, and the insertion of control room radiation monitoring information.

Date of issuance: June 19, 1985.

Effective date: June 19, 1985.

Amendment No.: 100.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 23, 1985 (50 FR 15997 at 16007). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 19, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: October 1, 1981.

Brief description of amendments: The changes to the Technical Specifications permit the following:

(1) Changes in the "Remarks" column of Table 3.2.B to provide indication that an interlock applies to both the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and Core Spray Systems.

(2) A clarification pertaining to the Suppression Chamber High Level trip setting in accordance with Mark I containment studies (Table 3.2.B).

(3) A revision concerning the surveillance requirements for the Primary Containment Isolation Signal (PCIS) and Low Pressure Coolant Injection (LPCI) interlock switch to correct an error by requiring more stringent requirements (Table 4.2.B).

(4) Correct the calibration frequency for Reactor Level Instrumentation which had inadvertently been changed under previous amendments (Table 4.2.F).

(5) A revision to Appendix B thermal mapping reporting frequency from 30 days to annually. In addition, this section is revised to more clearly specify the required events necessary to initiate thermal mapping monitoring and exempt data collection during periods when river and weather conditions preclude safe data gathering (Appendix B, Section 3.1).

Date of issuance: June 10, 1985.

Effective Date: June 10, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 109 and 112.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the Federal Register: April 25, 1984 (49 FR 17868).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 10, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket No. 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: October 15, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the sodium hydroxide test flow rate for Unit 2 to agree with the value for Unit 1.

Date of issuance: June 13, 1985.

Effective Date: June 13, 1985.

Amendment No.: 38.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-75: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the Federal Register: April 23, 1985 (50 FR 16011).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 13, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

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

Date of application for amendment: December 19, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the second and subsequent 10 year interval start dates of the Quality Group B and C programs of the Inservice Inspection Program and the program for High Energy Piping Outside Containment, to coincide with

the interval of the Quality Group A program. The change also incorporates inspections intervals for the Inservice Pump and Valve Testing Program, with corresponding interval start dates for the second and subsequent intervals.

Date of issuance: June 19, 1985.

Effective Date: June 19, 1985.

Amendment No.: 5.

Facility Operating Licenses No. DPR-18 Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in the Federal Register: April 25, 1984 (49 FR 17871).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 19, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610.

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

Date of amendment request: March 30, 1984.

Description of amendment request: The amendment will bring the Technical Specifications into conformance with 10 CFR 50.72, 50.73, and 50.49.

Date of issuance: June 7, 1985.

Effective date: June 7, 1985.

Amendment No.: 4.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-18. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21837).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610.

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

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

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

Date of application for amendment: April 9, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment requires that a steam generator inspection be performed during the refueling outage scheduled to begin no later than November 30, 1985.

Date of issuance: June 5, 1985.

Effective date: June 5, 1985.

Amendment No.: 89

Provisional Operating License No.

DPR-13: Amendment revised the license condition 3.E.

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: May 1, 1985 (50 FR 18587).

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

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

Date of amendment request: March 14, 1985.

Brief Description of amendment request: This amendment revises the WNP-2 license by modifying the Technical Specifications to provide relief, for one time only, from the surveillance requirement 4.4.3.2.2, of leak testing three of the eighteen Reactor Coolant System Pressure Isolation Valves. These valves are designated RCIC-V-66, RCIC-V-13 and RHR-V-23 and are identified in Table 3.4.3.2-1 of the Technical Specifications.

Date of issuance: June 12, 1985.

Effective date: June 12, 1985.

Amendment No.: 10.

Facility Operating License No. NPR-21: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: May 9, 1985, (50 FR 19596) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 12, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Richland Public Library, Swift and Northgate Streets, Richland, Washington 99352.

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

Date of application for amendment: November 30, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: Change to nuclear peaking factor resulting from use of higher burnup fuel.

Date of issuance: June 20, 1985.

Effective date: June 20, 1985.

Amendment No.: 62.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50829)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 20, 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 be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC, 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, DC 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 August 2, 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, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public

Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC, 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, DC 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).

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

Date of application for amendment: May 24, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment extends the time that one of the emergency diesel generators can be inoperative during the month of May 1985 by 3 days.

Date of issuance: June 5, 1985.

Effective date: May 24, 1985.

Amendment No. 88.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-20. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards considerations are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 5, 1985.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Kalamazoo Public Library, 315

South Rose Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49006.

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

Date of application for amendment: June 14, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Amendment No. 121 effective date from May 28, 1985 to July 31, 1985.

Date of issuance: June 20, 1985.

Effective date: June 20, 1985.

Amendment No. 125.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-49. Amendment revised the license.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment and final determination of no significant hazards are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 20, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 500 First Street, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Louisiana Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of application for amendment: May 14, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment authorized a change in Technical Specification 4.3.3.10 and 4.11.1.1.1 to provide for steam generator blowdown through the Circulating Water System (CWS) with an automatic termination feature and to define the sampling and analysis program for steam generator blowdown through the CWS or the Waterford 3 waste pond.

Date of Issuance: June 18, 1985.

Effective Date: May 16, 1985.

Amendment No. 1.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-38 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 June 18, 1985.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Bruce W. Churchill, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Local Public Document Room Location: University of New Orleans

Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront,
New Orleans, Louisiana 70122.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 26th day
of June 1985.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Edward J. Butcher,

*Acting Chief, Operating Reactors Branch No.
3, Division of Licensing.*

[FR Doc. 85-15916 Filed 7-2-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M
