

FEB 19 1986

Distribution:
Docket File
PRC System
PDR
LPDR
PBD7 Reading
JLee (2)

DOCKET NO(S). 50-382
Mr. R. S. Leddick
Vice President - Nuclear Operation
Louisiana Power & Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

SUBJECT: LOUISIANA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY - WATERFORD
STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3

The following documents concerning our review of the subject facility are transmitted for your information.

- Notice of Receipt of Application, dated _____.
- Draft/Final Environmental Statment, dated _____.
- Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No. _____, dated _____.
- Notice of Hearing on Application for Construction Permit, dated _____.
- Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License, dated _____.
- ~~Weekly~~ ~~Monthly~~ Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving no Significant Hazards Considerations, dated 01/29/86 (See page 3715)
- Application and Safety Analysis Report, Volume _____.
- Amendment No. _____ to Application/SAR dated _____.
- Construction Permit No. CPPR- _____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____, dated _____.
- Order Extending Construction Completion Date, dated _____.
- Other (Specify) _____

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

cc: See next page

8603050471 860219
PDR ADDCK 05000382
P PDR

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE | PBI7 | | | | | | |
| SURNAME | JLee | | | | | | |
| DATE | 2/11/86 | | | | | | |

Mr. R. S. Leddick
Louisiana Power & Light Company

Waterford 3

cc:

W. Malcolm Stevenson, Esq.
Monroe & Leman
1432 Whitney Building
New Orleans, Louisiana 70103

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Executive Director
for Operations
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000
Arlington, Texas 76011

Mr. E. Blake
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
1800 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Carole H. Burstein, Esq.
445 Walnut Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Mr. Gary L. Groesch
P. O. Box 791169
New Orleans, Louisiana 70179-1169

Mr. Charles B. Brinkman, Manager
Washington Nuclear Operations
Combustion Engineering, Inc.
7910 Woodmont Avenue, Suite 1310
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Mr. F. J. Drummond
Project Manager - Nuclear
Louisiana Power and Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

Mr. K. W. Cook
Nuclear Support and Licensing Manager
Louisiana Power and Light Company
142 Delaronde Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70174

Resident Inspector/Waterford NPS
P. O. Box 822
Killona, Louisiana 70066

Mr. Jack Fager
Middle South Services, Inc.
P. O. Box 61000
New Orleans, Louisiana 70161

Chairman
Louisiana Public Service Commission
One American Place, Suite 1630
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

**Mr. William H. Spell, Administrator
Nuclear Energy Division
Office of Environmental Affairs
P. O. Box 14690
Baton Route, Louisiana 70898**

**President, Police Jury
St. Charles Parrish
Hahnville, Louisiana 70057**

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

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law (Pub. L.) 97-415, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is publishing this regular bi-weekly notice. 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 January 15, 1986 (50 FR 1868), through January 17, 1986.

Notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license and proposed no significant hazards consideration determination and opportunity for hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed

amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

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

Comments should be addressed to the Rules and Procedures Branch, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

By February 28, 1986, 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 requirement 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 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, 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).

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, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

Alabama Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama

Date of amendments request:
December 16, 1985.

Description of amendments request:
The licensee proposed changes to Technical Specifications (TS) to revise

the Limiting Condition of Operation (LCO) and Surveillance Requirements (SR) for the reactor trip breakers including the automatic shunt trip feature modifications. The modifications resulted from the Commission staff's Generic Letter (GL) 83-28 dated July 8, 1983, based on generic implications of the Salem ATWS events. Item 4.3 of GL 83-28 required that Westinghouse reactor plants designs be modified to add automatic reactor trip by means of a shunt trip device. This modification for the Farley Nuclear Plant was approved by Commission letter dated September 20, 1983. Item 4.3 also required addition of TS to assure operability and surveillance of the modified design.

By GL 85-09 dated May 23, 1985, licensees were instructed to submit TS changes per model TS attached to the generic letter. These changes to the LCO and SR were to explicitly require independent testing of the undervoltage and shut trip attachments during power operation and independent testing of the control room manual switch contacts during each refueling outage. The licensee has administratively implemented testing of the modified reactor trip breakers, the bypass breakers, and the main control board switches. Following GL 85-09 and subsequent discussions with the Commission staff, the licensee proposes related TS changes being considered by the staff.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: By Attachment 2 to the licensee's December 16, 1985 letter, an analysis of a no significant hazards consideration was provided. We reviewed the licensee analysis and concur with the finding. In addition, the Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The example of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: "(ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications, for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." The proposed change fits this example in that the proposed change adds additional operability and surveillance requirements on the reactor trip bypass breakers and the undervoltage and shunt trip logic as well as an additional surveillance requirement on the manual trip switch circuitry. Therefore, on this basis the staff proposes to determine that the applicant does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: George F. Trowbridge, Esquire, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: Lester S. Rubenstein.

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

Date of application for amendment: November 25, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would relocate a footnote from item 1.c.1 of Table 3.3.2-1 to item 1.c.1 of Table 4.3.2-1 to ensure that required surveillance testing of mechanical vacuum pumps is identified.

Currently, footnote d from item 1.c.1 of Table 3.3.2-1 indicates that upon receipt of the high radiation trip signal from the main steam line, the mechanical vacuum pumps are tripped. The proposed amendment deletes footnote d from Table 3.3.2-1 and adds it to item 1.c.1 of Table 4.3.2-1 to indicate that surveillance testing is required to verify the main steam line high radiation trip of the mechanical vacuum pumps. In addition, the footnote has been revised to include verification of the mechanical vacuum pump line value closing.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) has determined that: 1. The requested amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because relocating the footnote from the LCO table (Table 3.3.2-1) to the surveillance table (Table 4.3.2-1) does not require the modification or revision to any plant configuration, system function, operating parameters or setpoints.

2. The requested amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated for the same reasons as already discussed by item (1) above.

3. The requested amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed TS does not change any surveillance testing requirements; it only clarifies and highlights the need for verifying that the mechanical vacuum pump will trip and the mechanical vacuum pump line will close on main steam line monitor high radiation isolation signal during the surveillance test for the main steam line

radiation monitor. Therefore, the margin of safety is maintained.

Based on the above, CP&L has determined that the proposed change meets the criteria of 10 CFR 50.92(c) and, therefore, does not involve significant hazards consideration.

The staff has reviewed the application and significant hazards review submitted by the licensee and finds the application and the significant hazards review acceptable.

Based on the staff review of the application and the significant hazards determination above, the Commission proposed to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazard condition.

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

Attorney for licensee: George F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller.

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

Date of application for amendment: December 10, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2 that would make clarifications to ambiguous wording of footnotes in Specification 3/4.5.3.1.

Specification 3.5.3.1 deals with the core spray system. Operability of the core spray system is required while in operational conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. When in operational condition 5, the core spray system need not be operable provided that the reactor vessel head is removed, the cavity is flooded, the spend fuel pool gates are removed, and the water level is maintained within specified levels. The note allowing this exception currently states in part: "The core spray system is not required to be OPERABLE when the suppression pool is inoperable provided . . .". This footnote is inconsistent with the guidance provided in the BWR/4 Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1234). The footnote is being revised to delete reference to suppression pool operability.

When the core spray system is inoperable in operational condition 5, the reactor vessel must be flooded and the fuel pool gates removed. With the

suppression pool operable, additional assurance of core flooding is provided by one low pressure cooling injection (LPCI) loop. The plant is in a more conservative condition with the suppression pool operable than inoperable since an additional source of makeup water is available to the LPCI system. This is consistent with the basis of Specification 3.5.3.1 which does not consider suppression pool operability with regard to core spray system operability. Additionally, the revision of this footnote will minimize operator confusion and ensure operational flexibility for modification and maintenance of the core spray system. This change clarifies the footnote, removing the implication that core spray may not be inoperable while the suppression pool is operable.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 FR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The licensee evaluated this request and has determined that:

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated because the changes do not result in any physical alterations of the plant configuration or changes to setpoints or operating parameters.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated for the same reasons as stated in item (1).

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because rewording of ambiguous statements will help to avoid the possibility of operator confusion, thereby increasing the margin of safety.

Based on the above reasons, the licensee has determined that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The staff has reviewed the licensee significant hazards consideration and finds it acceptable. Based on the above discussion the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment

request does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: George F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller.

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

Date of amendment request: November 13, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications (TS) for the H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant Unit No. 2. The proposed revision involves deleting Technical Specification requirements for monitoring a highly borated water inventory and its associated limiting conditions for operation and surveillance.

Carolina Power and Light's (CP&L) submittal is in response to Generic Letter 85-16 which highlighted incidents at operating plants in which boric acid has crystallized in the internals of vital safety related pumps and piping thereby rendering those systems inoperable. In addition, licensees of Westinghouse plants have requested that they be allowed to either physically remove the boron injection tank from safety injection piping or reduce boron concentrations in the tank to levels safely used in other sections of the safety injection piping and refueling water storage tank. To support their request, licensees have submitted new analyses of the steamline break event that demonstrated that their proposed change involves no significant hazards consideration. The staff has reviewed these analyses and granted these requests.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (vi) of actions not likely to involve 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 (SRP).

CP&L has submitted an analysis of the steamline break event with boron injection tank (BIT) removal or dilution to zero concentration boric acid for H.B. Robinson Unit 2. Although the concentration of the BIT has some potential implications or consequences of an accident, this impact is limited or bounded by the steamline break event. The CP&L analysis demonstrated that removal of capacity to inject highly borated water into the core does not produce a significant reduction in minimum departure from nucleate boiling ratio when compared to the large margin to fuel failure which remains.

The proposed changes fit example (vi) described above since the changes are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the SRP. On this basis, therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Lester S. Rubenstein.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374, La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2, La Salle County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: December 20, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments to Operating License NPF-11 and Operating License NPF-18 would revise the La Salle Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications to reflect Commonwealth Edison's (licensee) management organizational changes both at the corporate level and at the La Salle County Station as a result of a reorganization. The licensee indicates that all functions performed by individuals meet the minimum acceptable levels described in Section 4.2.4 of ANSI N18.1-1971, for each respective requirement.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). Example (i) stated, "A purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications." These proposed

amendments fall under this example since these changes are administrative in nature.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes that the changes would fall into the category of a no significant hazards consideration determination since the changes are administrative.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Public Library of Illinois Valley Community College, Rural Route No. 1, Ogelsby, Illinois 61348.

Attorney for licensee: Isham, Lincoln and Burke, Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam.

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

Date of amendment request: January 9, 1986.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment to Operating License NPF-11 would revise the La Salle Unit 1 Technical Specification to change the instrument response time for the main steam line low pressure trip function in Table 3.3.2-3 from 1 to 2 seconds.

La Salle Unit 1 is in a refueling outage, and is in the process of updating unqualified equipment with environmentally qualified equipment. The licensee is replacing the Barksdale main steam line low pressure switches, similarly as was done in Unit 2, with environmentally qualified SOR switches which cannot consistently meet the less than or equal to 1 second response time required by the Technical Specifications in Table 3.3.2-3. As a consequence, analyses were performed using the new response time in order to confirm that the previous analyses were still applicable. No new nor unanalyzed safety issue results from the extension of this sensor response time to 2 seconds versus 1 second. The purpose of this low pressure isolation is to protect the fuel by restricting reactor operation to pressure regimes covered by the data base for the GEXL correlation.

The use of 2 seconds for instrument response, as determined according to Technical Specification definitions, does not challenge nor violate this fuel protection criteria.

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

amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences for an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the revised response time for the main steam line low pressure switches is bounded by the original analysis performed by General Electric for pressure regulatory failure-high.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because no new accident is possible by the required response time. No plant equipment is removed.

3. Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the original design function is not affected and the increased response time is bounded by the original analysis.

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

Local Public Document Room

Locations: Public Library of Illinois Valley Community College, Rural Route No. 1, Ogelsby, Illinois 61348.

Attorney for licensee: Isham, Lincoln, and Beale, Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 50-254, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: October 29, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would (1) delete from the Technical Specifications (TS) maximum average planar linear heat generation rate (MAPLHGR) curves for two fuel types that will be vacated from the core (2) incorporate into the TS MAPLHGR curves for two new fuel types to be used for cycle operation (3) extend the MAPLHGR curve for one fuel type now in the core from 45,000 megawatt days per short ton (MWD/ST) to 55,000 MWD/ST to extend the protective thermal limit to higher values of average planar exposure and thereby extend the useful life of the fuel.

In addition to the above change, all MAPLHGR curves would be reissued

unchanged (except as noted above) but with the curves replotted for clarity and with page numbers and sheet numbers adjusted as required to reflect the above additions and deletions.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The licensee has evaluated the proposed Technical Specification amendment and has determined that it does not represent a significant hazards consideration. Based on the criteria for defining a significant hazards consideration set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), operation of Quad Cities Unit in accordance with the proposed amendment would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because:

(a) The amendment involves restrictions on the reactor power distribution during normal operation which of itself cannot initiate an accident and therefore does not increase the probability of an accident, and

(b) These restrictions on power distribution are based on a reanalysis of accidents in accordance with NRC-approved methods, and are specific to ensure that the consequences of LOCA remain within the existing accident criteria established for Quad Cities in the FSAR; or

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated for the same reason as (1)(a). above; or

3. Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety since the amendments are specifically intended to ensure that the 10 CFR 50.46 ECC criteria continue to be protected.

With regard to the second part of the proposed amendment, i.e., incorporation in the TS MAPLHGR curves for two new fuel types for use in the upcoming operating cycle, the Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazard consideration exists by providing specific examples (48 FR 14870). Example (iii) of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is a change resulting from a nuclear reactor core reloading, if no fuel assemblies significantly different from those found previously acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at the facility in question are involved. Each of the two new fuel types is a barrier-type fuel having properties similar to fuel already in the core. Each has the same physical configuration, and similar material composition and isotopic enrichment as fuel already analyzed and approved for previous reloads. Because

the proposed use of the new fuel types is encompassed by example (iii), this action is not likely to involve significant hazards considerations.

In addition to the above changes, all other MAPLHGR curves now in the TS would be reissued unchanged but replotted for clarity, and page and sheet numbers would be adjusted to reflect the additions and deletions discussed above. Since example (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration includes "a purely administrative change to technical specifications", these changes to achieve clarity and consistency are purely administrative in nature, and therefore involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Robert G. Fitzgibbons, Jr., Isham, Lincoln & Beale, Three First National Plaza, Suite 5300, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

NRC Project Director: John A. Zwolinski.

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

Date of amendment request: December 6, 1985, as modified January 7, 1986.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would (1) permit the repair of degraded steam generator tubes by installing metal sleeves in the degraded tubes rather than removing them from service by plugging them, (2) change the definition of tube degradation (3) add additional reporting requirements dealing with tube sleeving and (4) renumber existing technical specification pages.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Item (1) of the proposed amendment, as identified above, would change the technical specifications to allow repair of defective steam generator tubes by either sleeving or plugging. Tube plugging is currently permitted by the existing technical specifications. For tube sleeving, the licensee intends to repair selected degraded steam generator tubes by installing a metal sleeve (Inconel 690) between the tube sheet and the first tube support to provide an elevated resistance to pitting

experienced on the secondary side of the steam generator tube bundle. The sleeving materials and installation techniques to be applied are similar to those previously evaluated and accepted by the staff at Millstone Unit 2.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's application and based upon the information provided therein concludes that the proposed amendment does not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

These conclusions are based on the fact that sleeve design, installation, testing and inspection procedures will assure that the required steam generator is structurally sound. Further, the proposed method of repairing the degraded tubes will restore the original capabilities of the tubes and will provide a level of safety in operation commensurate with that anticipated for the facility had it not experienced the need to repair the steam generators.

With regard to items 2, 3 and 4, as identified above, the Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). One of the examples not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is example (i) which relates to an administrative change to the technical specifications. We have reviewed the licensee's proposed definition change, the addition of reporting requirements for tube sleeving, and technical specification page renumbering and conclude that these changes fall within the envelope of example (i) because they are simple administrative changes to the plant technical specifications.

Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the license amendment requests involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Christopher I. Gimes.

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

Date of amendment request: December 11, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed license amendment would change technical specifications that are directly related to the fuel cycle design and safety analyses for Cycle 14. The technical specification changes include: (1) The definition of quadrant power tilt ratio; (2) setpoints for protection instrumentation; (3) isothermal coefficient of reactivity; (4) limiting heat generation rates; (5) power distribution monitoring and controls; (6) reactor coolant system flow, temperature and pressure.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The new fuel assemblies are identical to the fuel assemblies that were approved and inserted into the Haddam Neck core for fuel Cycle 13. (Operation in Cycle 13 is expected to end on January 4, 1986). The licensee, using calculational methods previously accepted by the staff, has calculated new technical specification values that maintain the current safety margins.

On the basis of its analysis, the licensee has concluded that the proposed amendment does not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The licensee has reviewed the proposed changes in accordance with 10 CFR 50.92, and has concluded that they do not involve a significant hazards consideration. The basis for this conclusion is that the criteria of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are not compromised; a conclusion which is supported by the licensee's determinations made pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59.

In addition, the Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). The proposed changes to the technical specifications fall within the envelope of example (iii) in that they involve changes resulting from a nuclear reactor core reloading and no fuel assemblies are involved which are significantly different from those found acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at the Haddam Neck Plant. No significant changes have been made to the acceptance criteria for the technical specifications, and the analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance with the technical specifications and regulations are not significantly changed from those which

the NRC has previously found to be acceptable.

Based on the information provided by the licensee, the staff proposes to determine that the license amendment request involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.
Attorney for licensee: Gerald Garfield, Esquire, Day, Berry and Howard, Counselors at Law, City, Place, Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3499.
NRC Project Director: Christopher I. Grimes.

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi-2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of amendment request:
December 23, 1985.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment to Operating License NPF-43 would revise the Fermi-2 Technical Specifications to change the minimum rod block trip setpoint in Table 3.3.6-2 and in Specifications 4.3.7.6 and 4.9.2 from 0.7 counts per sound (CPS) to 0.3 CPS.

Since receiving its low power license in March 1985 and the full power license in July 1985, the Fermi-2 Unit has not been operated at power levels sufficient to maintain the strength of the startup sources. The licensee estimates that the source strength may be insufficient to meet the present minimum setpoint value of 0.7 CPS after mid-February 1986.

The plant was shutdown in early October 1985 to install environmentally qualified equipment and to install an independent, alternate shutdown system for fire protection. Subsequent problems with the emergency diesel generators (EDG's) will probably delay restart of the facility to mid-February 1986. The licensee's proposed revision to the Fermi-2 Technical Specifications is for a limited amount of time and only for the first core.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:
The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences for an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the source range monitors (SRM's) which register the count rate, are not required to perform any protective function. Accordingly, the evaluation of accidents did not rely on either their presence or functioning.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed lower value of the rod block monitor setpoint is within the demonstrated operating range of the SRM's to detect neutron levels in the reactor core. This is ensured by the licensee's determination that it can satisfy the minimum signal to noise ratio of 2 even at a count rate three times lower (i.e., 0.1 CPS) than the proposed lower setpoint value of 0.3 CPS.

Additionally, the method of achieving criticality in the reactor is by introducing small reactivity additions by withdrawing one rod at a time through a relatively small distance. This method ensures that the reactor will go critical with a relatively long period which can be confirmed by the SRM's

3. Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the SRM setpoint change does not affect the protective function of the reactor protection system. This protective function is provided by the intermediate range monitors (IRM's), and they are unaffected by the proposed revision.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Monroe County Library System, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

Attorney for licensee: John Flynn, 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48226.
NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam.

Duke Power Company, et al., Docket No. 50-413 Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1, York County, South Carolina

Date of Amendment Request: July 31, 1985.

Description of Amendment Request:
The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications (TS) 6.5, 6.6, 6.8 and 6.10, concerning "Administrative Controls." This proposed amendment would (1) seek to add the Superintendent of Integrated Scheduling to TS 6.5.1.3, 6.5.1.5, 6.6.1b., 6.8.2, and 6.8.3c. (2) seek to add the

Superintendent of Station Services to TS 6.5.1.8 and 6.8.1c, and (3) change the record retention period in TS 6.10.2 for records of quality assurance activities required by the QA Manual. The effect of the first part would be to allow the Superintendent of Integrated Scheduling to review and/or approve modifications of safety-related structures, systems or components (TS 6.5.1.3), proposed tests and experiments which affect nuclear safety and are not addressed in the FSAR or the Station Technical Specifications (TS 6.5.1.5), Reportable Events (6.6.1b), and procedures specified under Specification 6.8.1 and changes thereto (TS 6.8.2 and 6.8.3), if so designated by the Station Manager. The second part is outside the scope of this notice. Regarding the third part of the proposed amendment, Specification 6.10.2 presently requires that the records of the quality assurance activities be retained for the duration of the Operating License. The proposed change would substitute a new Specification 6.10.3 requiring that these records be retained for the period specified by ANSI N45.2.9-1974, "Requirements for Collection, Storage, and Maintenance of Quality Assurance Records of Nuclear Power Plants."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether license amendments involve significant hazards consideration by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to administrative changes to the technical specifications.

The proposed amendment to TS 6.5, 6.6 and 6.8 is an example of (i) because the change relates to an increase in the number of supervisory positions. Since this new supervisory position is required to meet the same qualifications as the other existing supervisory positions, there would be no loss of technical review capability, and there would be no adverse impact on safety. The proposed change to TS 6.10 would involve only the substitution of a more specific and more appropriate requirement for QA records retention pursuant to a standard accepted by the NRC staff. Because this substitution would not shorten the retention period for those types of QA records which the Commission has determined should be retained for the plant lifetime, and does appropriately recognize that some of the QA record types have limited significance and may be retained for lesser periods, the proposed change has

no adverse impact on safety and matches the example. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that this request does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. William L. Porter, Duke Power Company, P.O. Box 33189, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242.
NRC Project Director: B. J. Youngblood.

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

Date of amendment request: August 20, 1985 as supplemented November 6, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would increase the containment overall integrated leakage rate in Technical Specification 3.6.1.2 from its current L_1 value of 0.20% per day to 0.30% per day, and from its current L_2 value of 0.14% to 0.21% per day. (See Appendix J to 10 CFR 50 for definitions of L_1 and L_2 , corresponding at McGuire to containment pressures of 14.8 psig and 7.4 psig, respectively).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee provided revised radiation exposure calculations for a design basis LOCA using the methodology from Revision 1 of the Standard Review Plan (SRP), Section 6.5.2. SRP Section 6.5.2 recognizes that containment spray systems with boric acid spray solutions have been shown to be effective for removal of elemental and particulate iodine. The revised analyses demonstrate for thyroid doses that the proposed 50% increase in the containment leakage rate would be nearly offset by the effect of the spray system. This permits the licensee to take credit for the iodine removal effect of the boric acid which is contained in containment spray water for other reasons. Since noble gases are unaffected by containment sprays, an increased containment leakage rate would result in increased whole body and skin doses. However, for the McGuire Nuclear Station, thyroid radiation exposure is the limiting criteria, and the licensee's calculations show that the whole body and skin doses would remain well below the acceptance criteria in Appendix A of SRP Section 15.6.5 for offsite exposure (i.e., 10 CFR 100.11 values) and acceptance criteria in SRP 6.4 (i.e., GDC 19) for control room personnel.

The results of the licensee's calculations of onsite dose inside the control room are as follows: The whole body dose increases from 0.2 to 0.3 rem, which is less than the allowable limit of 5 rem; the skin dose increases from 4 to 6 rem, which is less than the allowable limit of 30 rem; and the thyroid dose decreases from 26 to 19 rem, which is less than the allowable limit of 30 rem.

The results of the licensee's calculations of offsite dose at the exclusion area boundary are as follows: The whole body dose increases from 3 to 4 rem, which is less than the allowable limit of 25 rem; and the thyroid dose increases from 198 to 208 rem, which is less than the allowable limit of 300 rem. The results of the licensee's calculations of offsite dose at the low population zone are as follows: The whole body dose increases from 0.6 to 0.7 rem, which is less than the allowable limit of 25 rem; and the thyroid dose decreases from 65 to 51 rem, which is less than the allowable limit of 300 rem.

Preliminary review and separate calculations by the NRC support these results and statements by the licensee.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions involving no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples (vi) involves a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan; for example, a change resulting from the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculational model or design method. The proposed amendments match the example because, as noted above, the doses after a design basis LOCA with the increased containment leakage rate, but with allowance for the containment spray system, would remain below the acceptance criteria for radiological exposure in Appendix A of SRP 15.6.5 and in SRP 6.4. Other criteria in the SRP sections would not be affected by the proposed change. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the change involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: B. J. Youngblood.

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

Date of Amendment Request: December 2, 1985.

Description of Amendment Request: The proposed change would revise the Appendix A Technical Specifications by correcting a typographical error in Section 6.4.1 "ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS."

Administrative Control 6.4.1 describes the requirements for the retraining and replacement training program at Waterford 3, including reference to ANSI 3.1-1978, "For Selection and Training of Nuclear Power Plant Personnel."

To meet the intent of Administrative Control 6.4.1, the correct citation in ANSI 3.1-1978 is Section 5.5 entitled "Operator Retraining and Replacement Training." However, due to a typographical error, Administrative Control 6.4.1 presently incorrectly cites Section 5.2 of ANSI 3.1-1978 entitled "Training of Personnel to be Licensed by the NRC". The proposed change corrects this error by referencing Section 5.5 of ANSI 3.1-1978.

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 (i) relates to a purely administrative change to technical specifications, correction of an error, or change in nomenclature.

The proposed change to Administrative Control 6.4.1, as described above, will correct a typographical error by citing the proper section of ANSI 3.1-1978. Therefore, the proposed change is similar to example (i).

This change is solely for the purpose of correcting typographical error and has no effect on plant operations. Therefore, the proposed change will not: (1) involve an increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3)

involve a reduction in a margin of safety.

As the change requested by the licensee's December 2, 1985 submittal fits the example provided, as well as satisfies the criteria of 50.92, it is concluded that: (1) The proposed change does not constitute a significant hazards consideration as defined by 10 CFR 50.92; (2) there is a reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the proposed change; and (3) this action will not result in a condition which significantly alters the impact of the station on the environment as described in the NRC Final Environmental Statement.

Local Public Document Room

Location: University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, Louisiana 70122.

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

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton.

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

Date of amendment request:

September 6, 1985 as supplemented October 3 and December 16, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

This proposed amendment provides Technical Specification changes needed to require that the auxiliary turbine driven auxiliary be operable during plant operation. This proposed amendment would require that the reactor shall not be maintained in a power operation condition unless at least three independent steam generator auxiliary or emergency feedwater pumps and associated flow paths are operable to supply emergency feedwater to all three steam generators with:

1. Two emergency feedwater pumps, each capable of being automatically powered from separate operable emergency busses, and
2. One auxiliary feedwater pump capable of being powered from an operable steam supply system, and
3. An inventory of over 100,000 gallons of primary grade feedwater.

If one auxiliary or emergency feedwater pump is inoperable, it is to be restored to operable status within 168 hours or the plant is to be in at least hot standby status within the next 6 hours and hot shutdown within the following 6 hours.

With one emergency feedwater and one auxiliary feedwater pump inoperable, be in HOT STANDBY in 24

hours and in HOT SHUTDOWN within the following 6 hours.

With two emergency feedwater pumps inoperable be in at least HOT STANDBY within 6 hours and in HOT SHUTDOWN within the following 6 hours.

With all three auxiliary and emergency feedwater pumps inoperable, immediately initiate corrective action to restore at least one pump to OPERABLE status as soon as possible.

With the emergency feedwater flow path to a steam generator out of service, return the flow path to service within 168 hours, or be in HOT STANDBY within 6 hours and in HOT SHUTDOWN within the following 6 hours.

Basis for proposed non significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee presented the following basis for no significant hazards consideration determination:

1. Discussion of the Proposed Change:

The proposed change adds a limiting condition for operation for the turbine driven auxiliary feedwater pump. Operation of the plant is allowed for up to 168 hours with the pump out of service and for up to 24 hours with the turbine driven auxiliary feedwater pump and one of the motor driven emergency feedwater pumps out of service. The current Technical Specifications do not address operability of the auxiliary feedwater pump.

The proposed change also includes minor changes to the existing Technical Specifications on the motor-driven emergency feedwater pumps, in order to improve consistency with the standard specifications for CE plants.

2. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or the consequences of an accident previously analyzed?

No, it does not. The only design basis accident potentially affected by this change is postulated loss of main feedwater. The probability of a loss of main feedwater is not affected. The proposed change increases the reliability of the feedwater supply and could decrease the consequences of certain loss of feedwater scenarios which are beyond the design basis of the plant.

3. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed?

No it does not. The requirement for the turbine driven feedpump to be operable could mitigate a postulated loss of all AC power. The proposed change does not create the possibility of any non-design basis accident.

4. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No it does not. The requirement for the auxiliary feedwater pump to be operable should result in an increase in the margin of safety.

5. Does the proposed change involve a significant hazards consideration as defined by 10 CFR 50.92?

Based on the above, the licensee has concluded that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration as defined by 10 CFR 50.92.

The staff agrees with the licensee's conclusion.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

NRC Project Director: Ashok C. Thadani.

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

Date of amendment request: August 6, 1981 as supplemented by letter dated December 2, 1985.

Description of amendment request: Revises earlier Technical Specification change request regarding the verification of drywell-suppression chamber vacuum breakers closures.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The proposed amendment would incorporate the following changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in addition to those previously noticed in the **Federal Register** June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25368)

1. Delete the licensee's original proposal permitting continuous operation with one drywell-suppression chamber vacuum breaker in the position between "fully closed" and "3 degrees open."

2. Require initiation of the bypass area leakage test within 8 hours of detection of a "not fully seated" position indication.

3. Require a bypass area leakage test within 24 hours following the operability test of vacuum breakers if a "not fully seated" position indication exists.

4. Require periodic bypass area leakage tests for the duration of a "not fully seated" position indication.

Further, the licensee requests several minor editorial and typographical

corrections. Typical of these requested editorial changes is a change from 'will' to 'shall' and the addition of the word 'outage' as in refueling outage.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of an action not involving a significant hazards consideration includes a change (ii) that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: For example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The major changes (items 2,3,4) described above matches this example in that they would add further operational restrictions not presently included in the TSs.

The licensee also withdrew a previously proposed TS change request as discussed in Item above. Based upon the above, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller.

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

Date of amendment requests: February 11, 1982, as amended on August 24, 1983 and November 1, 1985.

Description of amendment requests: Proposed addition of Technical Specification (TSs) provisions covering overtime work restrictions for certain plant personnel in accordance with NUREG-0737, Item I.A.1.3. The proposed amendment would add overtime work restrictions for certain plant personnel to Section 6 (Administrative Controls) of the Peach Bottom Technical Specification in accordance with Generic Letter 83-02 (NUREG-0737 Technical Specifications, January 10, 1983). The above cited Generic Letter provided Standard Technical Specifications for certain NUREG-0737 requirements, including the overtime limits identified in NUREG-0737, Item I.A.1.3. The proposed amendment would

incorporate the major provisions of these Standard TSs as requested by the staff in Generic Letter 83-02.

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 example (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is (ii) a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications for example, a move stringent surveillance requirement. Since the current TSs do not have requirements limiting overtime of certain plant personnel, these requested changes represent additional limitations and restrictions not presently found in the Peach Bottom TSs.

Since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to the example cited above for which no significant hazards considerations exists, the Commission proposes to determine that this action involves no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller.

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

Date of amendment requests: November 18, 1985.

Description of amendment requests: Certain changes regarding plant organization as specified in Section 6 (Administrative Controls) and revised organization charts. The proposed revisions to the Technical Specifications (TSs) involve the following:

1. A division of the Health Physics and Chemistry organization into two groups, each directed by a senior level supervisor;
2. A reorganization of station upper management through the introduction of two new positions: Superintendent Operations and Superintendent Plant Services;
3. A new station organization chart;

4. A The addition of the Administrative Engineer, Assistant Maintenance Engineer, Outage Planning Engineer, and ALARA—Health Physicist to the station organization chart;

5. A revision to the licensed operator staffing requirements during period when both units are shutdown;

6. A provision to permit certain changes to the organization chart and onsite safety review committee composition without prior NRC approval;

7. A change in several titles on the organization charts;

8. A revision to the composition of the onsite safety review committee;

9. A provision to incorporate several minor changes in order to establish consistency between the Peach Bottom TSs and the Limerick TSs;

10. A revision to clarify the person authorized to approve procedures; and

11. A revision to the Management Organization Chart to reflect reorganization and title changes.

All of the above proposed changes would affect Section 6 (Administrative Controls) of the current Peach Bottom TSs.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed amendment to the TSs would permit the following:

1. Currently, Figure 6.2-2, Organization for Conduct of Plant Operations, shows the Senior Health Physicist as being responsible for both the Health Physics and Chemistry programs. The proposed change to figure 6.2-2 would divide the organization into two groups, each directed by a senior level supervisor. Health Physics activities would continue to be supervised by the Senior Health Physicist. A new position of Senior Chemist would be established with the responsibility for the supervision of the radiochemistry and conventional chemistry activities. The individual assigned to the new position of Senior Chemist meets the qualifications of Regulatory Guide 1.8, September 1975, "Personnel Selection and Training."

2. The licensee proposes changing the title of "Station Superintendent" to "Manager—Nuclear Plant" and the creation of two positions (Superintendent—Operations, and Superintendent—Plant Services) at the superintendent level to handle the plant management responsibilities previously handled in a single line organization through an Assistant Superintendent to the Station Superintendent. The Licensee indicates that Reorganization is intended to better focus management attention on the performance of each of

the primary plant organizations essential to safe and effective operations. The individuals to be assigned to the positions of Superintendent—Operations, and Superintendent—Plant services are the Assistant Superintendent and Technical Engineer, respectively. The position of Manager—Nuclear Plant will be filled by the incumbent Station Superintendent.

3. The licensee proposes to show the position of Administration Engineer, Outrage Planning Engineer, and ALARA-Health Physicist on the organization chart. The duties of the Administration Engineer include the administration of security, clerical, and selected regulatory activities. The duties of the Outrage Planning Engineer involve the planning, coordination, and management of plant outage activities. Both positions are currently held by individuals holding an SRO license; although, this is not a requirement. The licensee indicates that the position of ALARA-Health Physicist would enhance the implementation of the Peach Bottom ALARA program.

4. The organization chart in Figure 6.2-2 has been redrawn using a new format to improve clarity and depict the plant organization more accurately.

5. The licensee proposes a change in the minimum licensed operator staffing requirements for the control room. Currently, Figure 6.2-2 requires two senior licensed operators (SRO) and three licensed operators (RO) per shift at all times. The licensee proposes change, as stated in Note 3 on Figure 6.2-2, would reduce the requirements to one SRO and two RO's during periods when Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3 are both in the shutdown or refuel mode. The licensee states the proposed staffing requirements are consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications and the Commission's regulation (10 CFR 50.54m).

6. Licensee proposes a change to Section 6.2.2 (page 243) that would permit certain revisions to the organization charts without prior NRC approval. The licensee states that the revisions would be limited to changes that do not decrease the effectiveness of the organization. The proposed revisions would require the reporting of changes to the NRC within 30 days, followed by a license amendment application within 4 months. The licensee proposes a similar provision regarding changes to the composition of the PORC (page 246). These provisions would permit minor revisions, and improvements, in the staff organization without the implementation

delays inherent in the current license amendment process.

7. The licensee proposes changes to the organization chart on Figures 6.2-1, 6.2-2 and 7.1.1, and to pages 243, 246, 247, 248, and 254, to reflect the following title changes: "Station Superintendent" to "Manager—Nuclear Plant," and "Results Engineer" to "Performance Engineer". These proposed changes represent only a change in nomenclature, as the responsibilities of these two positions remain unchanged.

8. Licensee proposes revisions to the onsite safety review committee (PORC) composition depicted in specification 6.5.1.2 (page 246) to reflect the addition of the Superintendent—Operations, Superintendent—Plant Services, Outage Planning Engineer, and Senior Chemist to the organization as previously described. The licensee states that their experience and knowledge of nuclear plant activities would enhance the review capabilities of the PORC. To accommodate these additions, the positions of Assistant Superintendent, Results (Performance) Engineer, Reactor Engineer, and Instrument and Controls Engineer are being proposed for removal as primary PORC members. The number of PORC members is not changed by this application. These four individuals would fill senior plant management positions and the licensee states that they meet the qualifications of ANSI/ANS 3.1-1978 and ANSI N18.1 1971 for comparable positions.

9. The licensee has proposed certain changes to the Peach Bottom TS organization charts as the result of NRC staff comments dated March 18, 1985. These changes would add the position of Assistance Maintenance Engineer and delete a footnote to establish consistency with the organization chart in the Limerick TSs. In addition, minor additions have been proposed to Section 6.5.1.4, 6.5.1.6 and 6.8.2 to provide consistency within the Peach Bottom TSs and consistency between the Peach Bottom TSs and the Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-0123, Revision 3.)

10. A further revision to Section 6.8.2 is proposed that would explicitly permit the Plant Manager to delegate approval authority for selected procedures to the PORC member who has primary responsibility for implementation of the procedures. The licensee states that the current specification is unclear regarding the delegation of approval authority, and the proposed change would avoid interpretational problems. The licensee further states that the proposed revisions do not impact the

review and approval responsibilities of procedures by PORC, and current administrative controls will continue to ensure PORC approval prior to the final signoff by the responsible PORC member. The revision would distribute this administrative task among several members of the senior plant staff and would expedite completing the approval process for needed revisions. The proposed approval process utilizes the PORC member who is most familiar with activities governed by the procedures and their revision.

11. In addition to the proposed changes described in items (6) and (7) above, Figure 6.2-1, Management Organization Chart is revised to depict the splitting of the Generation Division into separate Fossil/Hydro and Nuclear groups, and the formation of a Nuclear Services group. The NRC was previously informed of this reorganization in letters dated April 4, 1983 and May 29, 1984. The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility is in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The licensee has determined per 10 CFR 50.92 the following:

The organizational changes described in requests 1, 2, 3, 8, and 11 do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because they will enhance station management control over plant activities essential to safe and effective operations. These changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because they likewise enhance station management control over plant activities essential to safe and effective operations. The changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because they are intended to better focus management attention on the performance of each of the primary plant organizations essential to safe and effective operations.

Changes 4 and 7, involving a new format for the organization chart and title revisions, do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because they improve clarity

and are revisions in nomenclature only. These changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because they are administrative changes only and will improve clarity. The changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because they are revisions in nomenclature only.

Change 5 regarding licensed operator staffing requirements does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because it applies only to the shutdown or refuel mode of operation and conforms to the Commission regulation (10 CFR 50.54m). The change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because it applies only to the shutdown or refuel mode at operation. The change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because it conforms with the Commission's regulation (10 CFR 50.54m).

Changes 6, 9, and 10 which streamline the licensing process for minor revisions and establish consistency with the Standard Technical Specifications do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because they would permit organizational and procedural improvements without the implementation delays inherent in the current license amendment process. These changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because they would permit organizational (administrative) and procedural improvements without the implementation delays inherent in the current license amendment process. The changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because they permit manpower resources in both the utility and NRC to concentrate on issues of safety significance rather than the administrative burden of processing minor revisions to the Operating License.

The licensee has determined and the NRC staff concurs that these changes have little safety significance and that the proposed amendment will not alter any of the accident analyses.

Based on our review of the proposed modifications, the staff finds that there exists reasonable assurance that the proposed changes in Section 6 (Administrative Controls) will have little or no impact on the public health and safety.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to the Peach Bottom TSs

involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller.

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

Date of amendment request: October 1, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specification (TS) to clarify the function of the Plant Operating Review Committee (PORC). The existing wording in Section 6.5 of the TS implies that the PORC performs both a review and an audit function. Although this dual function does apply to the Safety Review Committee (SRC), the PORC performs only a review function. The proposed revision, by making this clarification, makes the TS consistent with the licensing basis of the plant.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One example of actions involving no significant hazards consideration is (i) A purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. The proposed revision is clearly encompassed by this example.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the proposed license amendment does not involve significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller.

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

Date of amendment request: November 15, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The purpose of the proposed amendment is to revise technical specifications 4.6.1.1.c, 3.6.1.2.a, 3.6.1.2.b, 4.6.1.2.a, 4.6.1.2.d, 3.6.1.3.b, 4.6.1.3.b, and 4.6.1.7.2 to indicate that containment leak rate testing (Type A, B, C tests per 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J) is to be performed at the calculated peak containment internal pressure (P_a) of 48.1 psig. This value for P_a is a result of containment pressure/temperature analyses in the SNUPPS FSAR (refer to Section 6.2.1.4.3.3 and Table 6.2.1-2).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee states that this change has no effect on the Integrated Containment Leakage Rate Test results submitted via the referenced letter (ULNRC-794). This Type A test was performed at 50.05 psig. However, all Local Leakage Rate Tests (Type B and C) have been performed at the current Technical Specification value of P_a (i.e., 48.0 psig). To reconcile the use of this slightly lower test pressure, an evaluation was performed to determine the impact on meeting the acceptance criteria for Type B and C tests. The results of this evaluation indicated a negligible effect on meeting the acceptance criteria (i.e., a 0.1% increase in the total leakage for Type B and C tests which remains 25% of all the allowable value of $0.8L_a$). Therefore, the error estimated to result from performing the Local Leakage Rate Test at 48.0 psig is within the uncertainty associated with the test method and is considered to be insignificant. The technical specification changes requested will ensure that future testing is performed at the correct pressure. These changes will have no effect on plant design or operation.

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; specifically a change to achieve consistency between the technical specifications and the FSAR. Based on the above, the requested amendment does not involve a significant licensee consideration.

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, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: B.J. Youngblood.

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

Date of application for amendment: November 18, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The purpose of the proposed amendment is to revise Technical Specification Figures 6.2-1 and 6.2.2 and Section 6.5.1.2 to reflect the Nuclear Function Quality Assurance organizational changes associated with the establishment of a new corporate Quality Systems Department.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Quality Systems Department will implement a quality improvement process on a corporate basis, assist various corporate functions in developing and implementing quality services programs, and be responsible for the quality assurance activities of the Nuclear Function. Nuclear Quality Assurance Division revisions reflect changes in personnel assignments and in paths of reporting relationships. Figure 6.2-1 is revised to: Delete the position of Assistant Manager, Quality Assurance; to indicate that the Manager, Quality Assurance reports to the newly created position of General manager, Quality System; to show that the Manager, QA is located at the Callaway site; to indicate that the Manager, QA is assisted by staff permanently located onsite and staff located at the general office building; and, finally, to show that the General Manager, Quality Systems has a direct path to the Vice President, Nuclear on all quality assurance matters. The General Manager, Quality Systems and the Vice President, Nuclear report to the Executive Vice President. Figure 6.2-2 is revised to show that the Manager, QA is located onsite and reports to the General Manager, Quality Systems located offsite. In addition, the Manager, QA has direct access to the Manager, Callaway Plant on all quality assurance matters. Technical Specification 6.5.1.2 is revised to indicate that quality assurance membership on the Onsite Review Committee is held by the Superintendent-Operations Support, QA.

These organizational changes were made to enhance the effectiveness and

capability of the Union Electric Quality Assurance Program. While the revisions represent changes in reporting relationships, they do not represent a change in organizational commitments. While personnel assignments are changed, the revisions do not reduce commitments to minimum qualifications. The location of the Manager, QA at the site does not negatively impact the Quality Assurance Program. The Quality Assurance Division has more personnel onsite than in the general office, and the physical distance (approximately two hours by automobile) is not prohibitive for the frequent presence of the Manager, QA at both the site and the general office. Two site Superintendent positions will effectively replace the former Assistant Manager, QA position. This change will increase quality assurance management resources and at the same time offer promotional and career path options to enhance personnel retention and experience. The two site Superintendents will meet the same minimum qualification requirements as the former Assistant Manager, QA. The site QA staff previously reported via three Supervising Engineers and one QA supervisor to the Assistant Manager, QA. The site QA staff will now report via four Supervising Engineers to the two Superintendents who report directly to the Manager, QA. The corporate QA staff will report to the Manager, QA through a Superintendent and two Supervising Engineers. Finally, the revisions do not alter the independent reporting paths between the Nuclear Quality Assurance and Nuclear Operations Departments. Under the new organization, the independence of the Quality Assurance reporting path is enhanced. The Manager, QA previously reported fully and directly to the Vice President, Nuclear. Now, the Manager, QA reports to the General Manager, Quality Systems and has direct access to the Manager, Callaway Plant on all Quality Assurance Program matters. The General Manager, Quality Systems reports to the Executive Vice President and has direct access to the Vice President, Nuclear on all QA Program matters.

In summary, the licensee concludes from the above discussion that while personnel assignments are revised and reporting relationships are changed, the commitments to minimum qualifications and basic organizational reporting requirements are unchanged. While many of the changes are administrative in nature, the new organization does provide additional structural controls not presently included in the technical specifications.

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 in some respects similar to the example of a purely administrative change to the technical specifications. This amendment request is in other respects similar to the example that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the technical specification. Based on the above, the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: B.J. Youngblood.

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

Date of application for amendment: November 15, 1985.

Description of amendment request: By letter dated November 15, 1985, the licensee, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, submitted a proposed license amendment for NRC review and approval which would revise the Vermont Yankee Technical Specifications to delete sections associated with the requirement that valves in the equalizer piping between the recirculation loops be closed during reactor operation. The valves were required to be closed in order to isolate the recirculation loops. The equalizer piping, including the valves, will be removed during the present pipe replacement outage. This will accomplish the desired isolation without the requirements that the valves be closed.

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 (vi) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change which 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 are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. This proposed Technical Specification Change deletes the requirement that equalizer valves be closed in order to isolate recirculation loops, because the new physical configuration of the piping accomplishes isolation by the absence of connecting piping. The Commission's staff concludes that any change in the safety margin will be small and the change is clearly within acceptable criteria as specified in the Standard Review Plan. Therefore, the change is similar to Commission example (vi). Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

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

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller.

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

Date of amendment request: October 4, 1985, and supplemented on December 5, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This proposed amendment, if approved, will change §§ 3/4.3.5 (Reactor Core Isolation Cooling (RCIC) System Actuation Instrumentation), and 3/4.7.3 (Reactor Core Isolation Cooling System) of the WNP-2 Technical Specifications. The change would remove some of the Technical Specifications requirements pertaining to the RCIC system, reflecting a system downgrade as a result of modifications to the Automatic Depressurization System (ADS) logic. These modifications were previously approved and incorporated as Amendment No. 11 to the WNP-2 Operating License, NPF-21.

As a result of Amendment No. 11, the Supply System was authorized and required to implement an option proposed by the BWR Owners Group to eliminate the high drywell pressure trip portion of the existing ADS logic and to add a manual inhibit switch. These modifications satisfied the NRC-mandated change to the existing ADS system logic which was a condition of the WNP-2 license, License Condition 2.C(18). As a result of these changes, the ADS is now responsive to a wider range of transients and, in conjunction with the low pressure Emergency Core

Cooling System (ECCS), provides an independent and separate backup to the High Pressure Core Spray (HPCS) system for high pressure events.

Therefore, the scope of the requirement for RCIC as an HPCS backup is reduced.

Elimination of the need for RCIC to mitigate design basic events allows those components necessary for RCIC system operation with no other safety function to be removed from the WNP-2 equipment qualification program. Those RCIC components still required to isolate primary or secondary containment, or whose failure can result in the loss of other Class-1 functions, will remain in the equipment qualification program.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The Supply System has determined and the staff agrees that it does not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, because the same safety functions previously provided by the RCIC system are performed by the ADS in combination with the Low Pressure Injection Systems.
2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated, because no system design functions have been changed.
3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, because ADS, in combination with Low Pressure Injection Systems, provides the same function previously accomplished by the RCIC system with no change to overall system performance criteria.

Based on staff review of the requested modifications, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested changes to the WNP-2 Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

NRC Project Director: E. Adensam.

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

Date of amendment request: October 28, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This proposed amendment, if approved, will change a license condition of the WNP-2 Operating License NPF-21. Attachment 2, paragraph 3.(b) of License Condition 2.C.(16), as amended, now requires that the licensee shall implement (install or upgrade) requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.97, Rev. 2, for flux monitoring prior to startup following the first refueling outage. The licensee has requested that implementation of this requirement be delayed until the second refueling outage.

Technical difficulties with both of the available monitor designs require resolution before a commitment is prudent. One of the two available detector designs (external core) is currently being tested on Boiling Water Reactors and apparently, has sensitivity problems at low power and low moderator temperatures. The other detector (incore) installs from the top of the reactor vessel requiring reactor vessel head removal for maintenance and neutron activation would complicate the maintenance procedures. A timely resolution of these concerns does not appear imminent at this time. Given procurement lead times, the unresolved technical concerns and the need for a deliberate engineering evaluation and selection process, installation by the first refueling outage is not practical.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The Supply System has determined, and the staff agrees, that the proposed change does not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the existing instrumentation consists of four redundant safety-related channels. Additionally, there are unrelated systems in place to provide operators with sufficient data to assess reactor conditions (e.g., control rod position monitors, reactor vessel level and pressure monitors) in the unlikely event of an accident condition prior to replacement. (2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident, because no function of the flux monitor system is being changed; therefore, no new or different kind of accident is conceivable. (3) Involve a significant reduction in a safety margin as adequate instrumentation is provided to allow the operator to assess reactor conditions without this monitor in the unlikely event of an accident condition that could cause the monitor currently in-place to fail prior to replacement.

Based on staff review of these proposed modifications, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested change to the WNP-2 License involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

NRC Project Director: E. Adensam.

Yankee Atomic Electric Company, Docket No. 50-29, Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Franklin County, Massachusetts

Date of amendment request: January 6, 1986.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would modify the Technical Specifications (TS) to allow submission of a supplement to the January 1 semiannual radioactive effluent release report. The supplement would contain the dose and meteorological summary report, and would be required within 150 days of January 1 each year.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for making a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). Example (i) of

actions involving no significant hazards consideration involves a change that constitutes a purely administrative change to the TS; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the TS, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. The administrative controls section of the current TS requires the submission of the radioactive effluent release report within 60 days after January 1 and July 1 each year. The January 1 report currently is required to include a summary of the previous year's hourly meteorological data, and an assessment of radiation doses from radioactive liquids and gases. The proposed change would allow an additional 90 days (total of 150 days) after January 1 to provide the hourly meteorological data and dose assessment. This proposed change does not modify the information to be submitted, only the date of submission. This proposed change constitutes an administrative change to the TS.

Based on this discussion, the staff proposed to determine that the requested action could not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Greenfield Community College, 1 College Drive, Greenfield, Massachusetts 01301.

Attorney for licensee: Thomas Dignan, Esquire, Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Project Director: George E. Lear.

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED NOTICES OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO OPERATING LICENSES AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARD 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.

Duke Power Company, et al., Docket No. 50-413, Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1, York County, South Carolina

Dates of amendment requests: March 15, August 7, October 30, November 7, December 17, December 20 and December 23, 1985.

Brief description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Unit 1 Technical Specifications to eliminate typographical errors, provide additional clarification, improve consistency, adjust nomenclature, bring portions of the specifications into conformance with current NRC staff positions, incorporate Unit 2 information where appropriate, and make other minor changes.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: January 6, 1986 (51 FR 455).

Expiration date of individual notice: February 6, 1986.

Local Public Document Room location: York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730.

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 that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendments, (2) the amendments, and (3) the Commission's related letters, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental

Assessments as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC, 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, DC 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

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

Date of application for amendments:
April 26, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications to allow completion of the third containment Integrated Leak Rate Test prior to the 10-year Inservice Inspection outage.

Date of issuance: January 8, 1986.

Effective date: January 8, 1986.

Amendment Nos.: 112 and 95.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 6, 1985 (50 FR 46208 at 46210).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 8, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Commonwealth Edison Company,
Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374, La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2, La Salle County, Illinois

Date of amendments request: October 11, 1985.

Brief Description of amendments: The amendments to Operating License NPF-11 and Operating License NPF-18 revise the La Salle Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications to remove during refueling (or unloading) of the first (last) fuel assemblies adjacent to the Source Range Monitors (SRM) the requirement that the SRM meet a minimum count rate with fuel in the core. Other loading requirements will be unchanged. The primary reason for the licensee wanting to change is to eliminate the need for sources and to minimize the need for Fuel Loading Chambers during loading operations. The primary basis for the safety of the requested change is that the core will be well subcritical during the loading of the initial assemblies, and

subsequent loading will be well monitored by the SRM.

Date of issuance: January 7, 1986.

Effective date: January 7, 1986.

Amendment Nos.: 32 and 18.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-11 and NPF-18. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 6, 1985 (50 FR 48211)

Comments received: Yes. Source: State of Illinois by telecon.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 7, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments:
May 2, 1983.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments incorporate changes to the Technical Specifications which impose more stringent surveillance requirements on the use of the Economic Generation Control System for each unit.

Date of issuance: January 14, 1986.

Effective date: January 14, 1986.

Amendment Nos.: 91 and 88.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-29 and DPR-30. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 21, 1983 (48 FR 43131). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 14, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments:
August 19, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments would change specimen capsule withdrawal schedule to reflect low leakage loading patterns and requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix H.

Date of issuance: January 16, 1986.

Effective date: January 16, 1986.

Amendment Nos.: 92 and 82.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 9, 1985 (50 FR 41245) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 16, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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 amendments:
August 6, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to include anticipatory Technical Specifications to include anticipatory reactor trip upon turbine trip. The change was directly requested by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Generic Letter dated September 20, 1982 and is required to satisfy NUREG-0737 "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements" Item II.K.3.12. In addition the amendment includes a modification to bypass (block) the anticipatory reactor trip upon turbine trip below 35% power. The 35% power level was chosen because at this level the elimination of reactor trip on turbine trip will not challenge the probability of a small-break LOCA resulting from a stuck-open pressurizer PORV. The purpose of the modification is to increase plant availability by reducing the length of time required to restart following a readily correctable turbine trip at low power.

Date of issuance: January 13, 1986.

Effective date: January 13, 1986.

Amendment Nos.: 107.

Facilities Operating License Nos. DPR-26: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 25, 1985 (50 FR 38913).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 13, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: April 2, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise a surveillance requirement and footnote associated with Technical Specification 3.4.1.3.3, Rod Position Indication System to allow closing of the reactor trip breakers to perform required surveillance. Action on that part of the proposed amendments which would have added "Control Rod Drive System capable of rod withdrawal" has been deferred pending receipt of further information from the licensee.

Date of issuance: January 9, 1986.

Effective date: January 9, 1986.

Amendment Nos.: 50 and 31.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 6, 1985 (50 FR 46212). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 9, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-335, St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 1, St. Lucie County, Florida

Date of application for amendment: July 19, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications to permit continued operation at rated thermal power for a specified time following a dropped control element assembly and reformulates the action statements of Technical Specification 3.1.3.1.

Date of issuance: January 15, 1986.

Effective Date: January 15, 1986.

Amendment No.: 71.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-67: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 11, 1985 (50 FR 37072 at 37081).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 15, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Indian River Junior College

Library, 3209 Virginia Avenue, Ft. Pierce, Florida.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-335, St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 1, St. Lucie County, Florida

Date of application for amendment: October 22, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications to support the installation of the safety grade Auxiliary Feedwater Actuation System that has been installed to satisfy the requirements of NUREG-0737, Action Item I.I.E.1.2. The changes revised, and added to, Tables 3.3-3, 3.3-4, 3.3-5 and 4.3-2 and listed an additional responsibility for the Facility Review Group in Technical Specification 6.5.1.6.

Date of issuance: January 15, 1986.

Effective Date: January 15, 1986.

Amendment No.: 72.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-67: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 4, 1985 (50 FR 49779 at 49785).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 15, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Indian River Junior College Library, 3209 Virginia Avenue, Ft. Pierce, Florida.

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

Date of application for amendments: August 23, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the TSs for Hatch Units 1 and 2 to add and delete valves listed in the containment isolation valve tables to reflect drywell pneumatic system modifications that were made to Unit 2 and that will be made to Unit 1 during the outage scheduled to begin in December, 1985.

Date of issuance: December 26, 1985.

Effective Date: December 26, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 120 and 59.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-57 and NPF-5: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 25, 1985 (50 FR 38916).

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

Safety Evaluation dated December 26, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia 31513.

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

Date of application for amendment: May 9, 1985, as supplemented August 30, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendment revises the TSs to delete the breaker setpoints from Table 3.8.2.6-2, to remove the reference to these setpoints from the surveillance requirements, and to add a requirement that the breakers be tested as specified by NEMA AB-2-1980. It also corrects several erroneous identification numbers listed in Table 3.8.2.6-1.

Date of issuance: January 9, 1986.

Effective Date: January 9, 1986.

Amendment No.: 60.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 25, 1985 (50 FR 38915)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 9, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia 31513

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

Date of application for amendment: June 19, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: Authorizes changes to the Appendix A Technical Specifications which are new requirements pertaining to the Post Accident Sampling System. These changes are to Section 6, Administrative Controls.

Date of issuance: January 14, 1986.

Effective Date: January 14, 1986.

Amendment No.: 98.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 28, 1985 (50 FR 34941).

The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 14, 1986. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: November 13, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Technical Specifications to incorporate corrections to Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications (RETS) (a) for the Steam Air Ejector Post-treatment Monitor, (b) to reflect actual design and operating conditions, (c) for the use of vendor process control programs, and (d) of the errors of grammar and typing.

Date of issuance: January 4, 1986.

Effective date: January 4, 1986.

Amendment No.: 128.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 4, 1985, (50 FR 49785) The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 4, 1986.

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.

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

Date of application for amendment: October 17, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Technical Specifications to incorporate an action statement in Section 3.7.C, defining the actions which will be taken if the stated limiting conditions for operation cannot be met.

Date of issuance: January 9, 1986.

Effective date: January 9, 1986.

Amendment No.: 129.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50806) The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 9, 1986.

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: April 26, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to: (1) add the requirement for maintaining the suppression pool temperature within specified limits, and (2) delete the requirement of maintain a drywell to suppression chamber differential pressure.

Date of issuance: January 7, 1986.

Effective date: January 7, 1986.

Amendment No.: 76.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 4, 1985 (50 FR 49786). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 7, 1986.

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: July 24, 1985, supplemented and clarified by letters dated September 16, October 17 and 28, November 25 and 27, and December 3, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment authorized the licensee to increase the spent fuel pool storage capacity from 667 to 1112 fuel assemblies.

Date of issuance: January 15, 1986.

Effective date: January 15, 1986.

Amendment No.: 109.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 11, 1985 (50 FR 37072 at 37085) and November 4, 1985 (50 FR 45877). Letters received on November 25 and 27, 1985 and December 3, 1985 were for clarification only and did not materially affect the application as previously noticed; and

therefore, the application remains within the scope of the previous notices.

The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 16, 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, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

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

Date of application for amendment.: July 11, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the reactor vessel materials surveillance capsule removal schedule.

Date of issuance: January 10, 1986.

Effective date: January 10, 1986.

Amendment No.: 94.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-40. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 11, 1985 (50 FR 37072 at 37088).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 10, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County, California

Date of application for amendments: September 20, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the combined Technical Specifications for Units 1 and 2 concerning the time interval for performing the first visual inservice inspection of safety related snubbers.

Date of issuance: January 7, 1986.

Effective date: January 7, 1986.

Amendment Nos. 5 and 3.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82: Amendments revising the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 23, 1985 (50 FR 43033) The Commission's related evaluation of

the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 7, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room
location: California Polytechnic State University Library, Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

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

Date of application for amendment: September 30, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment deletes License Condition 2.C(14) of the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station Operating License NPF-22.

License Condition 2.C(14) previously read as follows:

(14) *Control of Heavy Loads (Section 9.1.4, SSER#6)*

Prior to startup following the first refueling outage, PP&L shall submit commitments necessary to implement changes in modifications required to fully satisfy the guidelines of Section 5.1.2 through 5.1.6 of NUREG 0612 (Phase II—nine month response to the NRC generic letter dated December 22, 1980).

Based on Generic Letter 85-11, dated June 28, 1985, "Completion of Phase II of 'Control of Heavy Loads at Nuclear Power Plants' NUREG-0612" the staff has found this License Condition to no longer be necessary. Generic Letter 85-11 concluded, based on the improvements in heavy loads handling obtained from the implementation of NUREG 0612, Phase I, further action is not required to reduce the risks associated with the handling of heavy loads. Specifically, it was concluded that a detailed Phase II review of heavy loads is not necessary and Phase II is to be considered complete.

Date of issuance: January 9, 1986.

Effective date: Upon issuance.

Amendment No.: 21.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-22: Amendment deleted License Condition 2.C.(14).

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 6, 1985 (50 FR 46216).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 9, 1986.

No comments were received regarding the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

Local Public Document Room
Location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South

Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

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

Date of application for amendment: November 24, 1982; October 21, 1983; February 29, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies a license condition to change the monitoring and inspection of the service water intake structure.

Date of issuance: December 20, 1985.

Effective date: December 20, 1985.

Amendment No.: 48.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-12: Amendment revised the license.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21839).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 20, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: August 5, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to permit offgas post-treatment and main stack radiation monitors to be considered operable for up to 1 hour during purging of the instruments. The Note 4 to Table 3.2.D, requested in TVA's submittal, has not been included. It would be redundant to Limiting Condition for Operation 3.2.D.1(b).

Date of issuance: January 13, 1986.

Effective date: 90 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 126, 121 and 97.

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 9, 1985 (50 FR 41256) and December 4, 1985 (50 FR 49792).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 13, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-327 and 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee.

Date of applications for amendments: October 2 and November 7, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to delete the table listing Containment Penetration Conductor Overcurrent Protection Devices and to make them meet the intent of the NRC model Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications for PWRs.

Date of issuance: January 14, 1986.

Effective date: January 14, 1986.

Amendment Nos.: 42 and 34.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50826).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 14, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room
location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Bicentennial Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401.

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

Date of application for amendments: April 30, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the NA-1&2 TS in accordance with the current TS and with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendices G and H. The amendments update the pressure-temperature limit curves to be applied during heatup and cooldown. The updated curves, which are valid through 10 Effective Full Power Years for NA-1&2, are based on conservative extrapolated vessel irradiation levels which reflect the results of evaluations of the first surveillance capsules removed from both NA-1&2. The removal and evaluation of these capsules constitutes part of the Reactor Vessel Materials Surveillance Program established by Virginia Electric and Power Company in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix H. Based on the revised pressure-temperature limit curves, accompanying changes have also been made to the reactor heatup rate limits and low temperature overpressure protection setpoints.

Date of issuance: January 15, 1986.

Effective date: NA-1 within 30 days from date of issuance, NA-2 prior to restart after the forthcoming 5th refueling outage.

Amendment Nos.: 74 and 60.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 30, 1985 (50 FR 31075).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 15, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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.

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

Date of application for amendments: August 9, 1985, as supplemented November 8, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments define the minimum reactor coolant temperature for criticality to be 522°F.

Date of issuance: December 31, 1985.

Effective date: December 31, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 105.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 9, 1985 (50 FR 41257).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 31, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Yankee Atomic Electric Company, Docket No. 50-29, Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Franklin County, Massachusetts

Date of Application for Amendment: July 19, 1985.

Brief Description of Amendment: The amendment deletes the Technical Specification requirements for inspection of control rod shroud tube assemblies and the pressurizer intervals.

Date of Issuance: January 15, 1986.

Effective Date: January 15, 1986.

Amendment No.: 91.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-3. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 9, 1985 (50 FR 41258). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 15, 1986.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Greenfield Community College, 1 College Drive, Greenfield, Massachusetts 01301.

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 February 28, 1986, 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 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). 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).

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

Date of amendment request: October 17, 1985.

Brief description of amendment request: This amendment revises the WNP-2 license by modifying the Technical Specifications to change the Limiting Condition of Operation, 3.3.7.7, to permit Local Power Range Monitor (LPRM) calibration in some instances with fewer than five operable Traversing In-core Probe (TIP) detector channels.

Date of issuance: January 7, 1986.

Amendment No.: 20.

Effective date: October 18, 1985.

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

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

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 7, 1986.

Attorney for the licensee: Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

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

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 23rd day of January, 1986.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Robert M. Bernero,
Director, Division of Boiling Water Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 86-1829 Filed 1-28-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M