Mr. Richard R. Grigg
Chief Nuclear Officer
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street, Room P379
Milwaukee, WI 53201

August 6, 1997

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 - ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS RE: ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE REGARDING LICENSED POWER LEVEL (TAC NOS. M96435 AND M96436)

Dear Mr. Grigg:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. **175** and **179** to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27 for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, respectively. The amendments consist of changes to the licenses and Bases in response to your application dated August 22, 1996, as supplemented on July 14, 1997.

These amendments revise Section 3.A of Facility Operating Licenses DPR-24 and DPR-27 from a licensed power level of 1518 megawatts thermal to 1518.5 megawatts thermal. A similar revision is made to the bases of technical specification (TS) 15.3.1.B, "Pressure/Temperature Limits." These changes make the value of the licensed power level listed in Section 3.A of the license and in the bases of TS 15.3.1.B consistent with the value listed in the balance of the TS and in the final safety analysis report (FSAR). An additional change was made to revise TS 15.3.2 Bases Reference 2 from Revision 2 to Revision 3. The changes are administrative and do not change plant design or operation.

A copy of our related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. The notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:
Linda L. Gundrum, Project Manager
Project Directorate III-1
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266
and 50-301

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. **175** to DPR-24
2. Amendment No. **179** to DPR-27
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See attached page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\WPDOCS\PTBEACH\PTB96435.AMD
To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	PM:PD31	E	LA:PD31	E	BC:TSB		OGC		D:PD31	
NAME	LGundrum:db		CJamerson		WBeckner				JHannon	
DATE	7/17/97		7/17/97		7/24/97		7/25/97		7/31/97	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

August 6, 1997

Mr. Richard R. Grigg
Chief Nuclear Officer
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street, Room P379
Milwaukee, WI 53201

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2 - ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS RE: ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE REGARDING LICENSED POWER LEVEL (TAC NOS. M96435 AND M96436)

Dear Mr. Grigg:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. **175** and **179** to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27 for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, respectively. The amendments consist of changes to the licenses and Bases in response to your application dated August 22, 1996, as supplemented on July 14, 1997.

These amendments revise Section 3.A of Facility Operating Licenses DPR-24 and DPR-27 from a licensed power level of 1518 megawatts thermal to 1518.5 megawatts thermal. A similar revision is made to the bases of technical specification (TS) 15.3.1.B, "Pressure/Temperature Limits." These changes make the value of the licensed power level listed in Section 3.A of the license and in the bases of TS 15.3.1.B consistent with the value listed in the balance of the TS and in the final safety analysis report (FSAR). An additional change was made to revise TS 15.3.2 Bases Reference 2 from Revision 2 to Revision 3. The changes are administrative and do not change plant design or operation.

A copy of our related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. The notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

Linda L. Gundrum

Linda L. Gundrum, Project Manager
Project Directorate III-1
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-266
and 50-301

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. **175** to DPR-24
2. Amendment No. **179** to DPR-27
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

cc:

Ernest L. Blake, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

Mr. Scott A. Patulski
Vice President
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Mr. Ken Duveneck
Town Chairman
Town of Two Creeks
13017 State Highway 42
Mishicot, Wisconsin 54228

Chairman
Public Service Commission
of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7854

Regional Administrator, Region III
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351

Resident Inspector's Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
6612 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

Ms. Sarah Jenkins
Electric Division
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7854

DATED: **August 6, 1997**

AMENDMENT NO. **175** TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-24 - POINT BEACH UNIT NO. 1
AMENDMENT NO. **179** TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-27 - POINT BEACH UNIT NO. 2

Docket File
PUBLIC
PDIII-1 Reading
J. Roe
C. Jamerson
L. Gundrum
OGC
G. Hill (4)
W. Beckner, O13H-3
ACRS
J. McCormick-Barger, RIII
SEDB (TLH3)

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-266

POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 175
License No. DPR-24

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee) dated August 22, 1996, as supplemented on July 14, 1997, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, paragraph 3.A of Facility Operating License No. DPR-24 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   A. Maximum Power Levels

   The licensee is authorized to operate the facility at reactor core power levels not in excess of 1518.5 megawatts thermal.

3. This license amendment is effective immediately upon issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Linda L. Gundrum

Linda L. Gundrum, Project Manager
Project Directorate III-1
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachments: 1. Page 3 of the License*
2. Revised Bases pages 15.3.1-7 and 15.3.1-8

Date of issuance: **August 6, 1997**

*Page 3 of the license is attached, for convenience, for the composite license to reflect this change.

3. This amended license shall be deemed to contain and is subject to the conditions specified in the following Commission regulations: 10 CFR Part 20, Section 30.34 of 10 CFR Part 30, Section 40.41 of 10 CFR Part 40, Sections 50.54 and 50.59 of 10 CFR Part 50, and Section 70.32 of 10 CFR Part 70; and is subject to all applicable provisions of the Act and to the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect; and is subject to the additional conditions specified below:

A. Maximum Power Levels

The licensee is authorized to operate the facility at reactor core power levels not in excess of 1518.5 megawatts thermal.

B. Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 174, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with Technical Specifications.

C. Report

The licensee shall make certain reports in accordance with the requirements of the Technical Specifications.

D. Records

The licensee shall keep facility operating records in accordance with the requirements of the Technical Specifications.

E. Spent Fuel Pool Modification

The licensee is authorized to modify the spent fuel storage pool to increase its storage capacity from 351 to 1502 assemblies as described in licensee's application dated March 21, 1978, as supplemented and amended. In the event that the on-site verification check for poison material in the poison assemblies discloses any missing boron plates, the NRC shall be notified and an on-site test on every poison assembly shall be performed.

of the vessel is computed to be 2.5 x 10^{19} neutrons/cm^2 for 40 years of operation at 1518.5 MWt and 80 percent load factor.[2] This maximum fluence is the exposure expected at the inner reactor vessel wall. However, the neutron fluence used to predict the ΔRT_{NDT} shift is the one-quarter shell thickness neutron exposure. The relationship between fluence at the vessel ID wall and the fluence at the one-quarter and three-quarter shell thickness locations is as presented in Regulatory Guide 1.99 Revision 2, "Radiation Damage to Reactor Vessel Materials." (Reference 6)

Once the fluence is determined, the adjusted reference temperature used in revising the heatup and cooldown curves is obtained by utilizing the method in Section 1.1 of Regulatory Guide 1.99 Revision 2 (Reference 6) for the limiting weld material of both Unit 1 and Unit 2.

The heatup and cooldown curves presented in Figure 15.3.1-1 and 15.3.1-2 were calculated based on the above information and the methods of ASME Code Section III (1974 Edition), Appendix G, "Protection Against Nonductile Failure", and are applicable up to the operational exposure indicated on the figures.

The regulations governing the pressure-temperature limits (10 CFR 50 - Appendix G and ASME Code Section III - Appendix G) do not require additional margins for instrumentation uncertainties be added to the heatup and cooldown curves. This is because the inclusion of instrumentation uncertainties, in addition to other conservatisms in the methods for calculating the pressure temperature limits, is not necessary to protect the vessel from damage.

The actual temperature shift of the vessel material will be established periodically during operation by removing and evaluating reactor vessel material irradiation surveillance specimens installed near the inside wall of the reactor vessel in the core area. Since the neutron spectra at the irradiation samples and vessel inside radius are identified by a specified lead factor, the measured temperature shift for a sample is an excellent indicator of the effects of power operation on the adjacent section of the reactor vessel. If the experimental temperature shift (at the 30 ft-lb level) does not substantiate the predicted shift, new prediction curves and heatup and cooldown curves must be developed.

The pressure-temperature limit lines shown on Figure 15.3.1-1 for reactor criticality and for inservice leak and hydrostatic testing have been provided to assure compliance with the minimum temperature requirements of Appendix G to 10 CFR 50 for reactor criticality and for inservice leak and hydrostatic testing.

The spray should not be used if the temperature difference between the pressurizer and spray fluid is greater than 320 °F. This limit is imposed to maintain the thermal stresses at the pressurizer spray line nozzle below the design limit.

The temperature requirements for the steam generator correspond with the measured NDT for the shell.

The reactor vessel materials surveillance capsule removal schedules have been developed based upon the requirements of the Code of Federal Regulation, Title 10, Part 50, Appendix H, and with consideration of ASTM Standard E-185-82. When the capsule lead factors are considered, the scheduled removal dates accommodate the weld data needs of all the participants in the Babcock and Wilcox Master integrated Reactor Vessel Surveillance Program. Additionally, the schedule will provide plate/forging material data as well as fluence data corresponding to the expiration of the current licenses and of any future license extensions.

References

(1) FSAR, Section 4.1.5
(2) Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-12794, Rev. 3/12795, Rev. 3 |
(3) Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-8743
(4) Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-8738
(5) Babcock & Wilcox, BAW 1803
(6) Regulatory Guide 1.99, Revision 2

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-301

POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 179
License No. DPR-27

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee) dated August 22, 1996, as supplemented on July 14, 1997, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, paragraph 3.A of Facility Operating License No. DPR-27 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   A. Maximum Power Levels

   The licensee is authorized to operate the facility at reactor core power levels not in excess of 1518.5 megawatts thermal.

3. This license amendment is effective immediately upon issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Linda L. Gundrum

Linda L. Gundrum, Project Manager
Project Directorate III-1
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachments: 1. Page 3 of the License**
2. Revised Bases pages 15.3.1-7 and 15.3.1-8

Date of issuance: **August 6, 1997**

**Page 3 of the license is attached, for convenience, for the composite license to reflect this change.

3. This amended license shall be deemed to contain and is subject to the conditions specified in the following Commission regulations: 10 CFR Part 20, Section 30.34 of 10 CFR Part 30, Section 40.41 of 10 CFR Part 40, Sections 50.54 and 50.59 of 10 CFR Part 50, and Section 70.32 of 10 CFR Part 70; and is subject to all applicable provisions of the Act and to the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect; and is subject to the additional conditions specified below:

A. Maximum Power Levels

The licensee is authorized to operate the facility at reactor core power levels not in excess of 1518.5 megawatts thermal.

B. Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 178, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with Technical Specifications.

C. Report

The licensee shall make certain reports in accordance with the requirements of the Technical Specifications.

D. Records

The licensee shall keep facility operating records in accordance with the requirements of the Technical Specifications.

E. Spent Fuel Pool Modification

The licensee is authorized to modify the spent fuel storage pool to increase its storage capacity from 351 to 1502 assemblies as described in licensee's application dated March 21, 1978, as supplemented and amended. In the event that the on-site verification check for poison material in the poison assemblies discloses any missing boron plates, the NRC shall be notified and an on-site test on every poison assembly shall be performed.

of the vessel is computed to be 2.5 x 10^{19} neutrons/cm^2 for 40 years of operation at 1518.5 MWt and 80 percent load factor.[2] This maximum fluence is the exposure expected at the inner reactor vessel wall. However, the neutron fluence used to predict the ΔRT_{NDT} shift is the one-quarter shell thickness neutron exposure. The relationship between fluence at the vessel ID wall and the fluence at the one-quarter and three-quarter shell thickness locations is as presented in Regulatory Guide 1.99 Revision 2, "Radiation Damage to Reactor Vessel Materials." (Reference 6)

Once the fluence is determined, the adjusted reference temperature used in revising the heatup and cooldown curves is obtained by utilizing the method in Section 1.1 of Regulatory Guide 1.99 Revision 2 (Reference 6) for the limiting weld material of both Unit 1 and Unit 2.

The heatup and cooldown curves presented in Figure 15.3.1-1 and 15.3.1-2 were calculated based on the above information and the methods of ASME Code Section III (1974 Edition), Appendix G, "Protection Against Nonductile Failure", and are applicable up to the operational exposure indicated on the figures.

The regulations governing the pressure-temperature limits (10 CFR 50 - Appendix G and ASME Code Section III - Appendix G) do not require additional margins for instrumentation uncertainties be added to the heatup and cooldown curves. This is because the inclusion of instrumentation uncertainties, in addition to other conservatisms in the methods for calculating the pressure temperature limits, is not necessary to protect the vessel from damage.

The actual temperature shift of the vessel material will be established periodically during operation by removing and evaluating reactor vessel material irradiation surveillance specimens installed near the inside wall of the reactor vessel in the core area. Since the neutron spectra at the irradiation samples and vessel inside radius are identified by a specified lead factor, the measured temperature shift for a sample is an excellent indicator of the effects of power operation on the adjacent section of the reactor vessel. If the experimental temperature shift (at the 30 ft-lb level) does not substantiate the predicted shift, new prediction curves and heatup and cooldown curves must be developed.

The pressure-temperature limit lines shown on Figure 15.3.1-1 for reactor criticality and for inservice leak and hydrostatic testing have been provided to assure compliance with the minimum temperature requirements of Appendix G to 10 CFR 50 for reactor criticality and for inservice leak and hydrostatic testing.

The spray should not be used if the temperature difference between the pressurizer and spray fluid is greater than 320 °F. This limit is imposed to maintain the thermal stresses at the pressurizer spray line nozzle below the design limit.

The temperature requirements for the steam generator correspond with the measured NDT for the shell.

The reactor vessel materials surveillance capsule removal schedules have been developed based upon the requirements of the Code of Federal Regulation, Title 10, Part 50, Appendix H, and with consideration of ASTM Standard E-185-82. When the capsule lead factors are considered, the scheduled removal dates accommodate the weld data needs of all the participants in the Babcock and Wilcox Master integrated Reactor Vessel Surveillance Program. Additionally, the schedule will provide plate/forging material data as well as fluence data corresponding to the expiration of the current licenses and of any future license extensions.

References

(1) FSAR, Section 4.1.5
(2) Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-12794, Rev. 3/12795, Rev. 3
(3) Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-8743
(4) Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-8738
(5) Babcock & Wilcox, BAW 1803
(6) Regulatory Guide 1.99, Revision 2

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 175 AND 179 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. DPR-24 AND DPR-27

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-266 AND 50-301

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 22, 1996, as supplemented on July 14, 1997, the Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee) requested amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR 27 for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant (PBNP), Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The proposed amendments would revise Section 3.A of Facility Operating Licenses DPR-24 and DPR-27 from a licensed power level of 1518 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 1518.5 MWt. A similar revision would be made in the bases of Technical Specification (TS) 15.3.1.B. These changes would make the value of the licensed power level listed in Section 3.A of the licenses and in the bases of TS 15.3.1.B consistent with the value listed in the balance of the TS and in the final safety analysis report (FSAR). The licensee states that the changes are administrative and would not change plant design or operation.

The July 14, 1997, supplement provided a corrected bases page and did not affect the staff's no significant hazards considerations determination.

2.0 EVALUATION

The proposed changes to the licensed power level from 1518 MWt to 1518.5 MWt restore consistency between the authorized power level and the analyzed power level. This is an administrative change only, and there are no safety implications resulting from the proposed changes. The analyses, documented in the PBNP Final Facility Description and Safety Analysis Report at the time the operating licenses were issued, were performed at a power level of 1518.5 MWt. The operating licenses were issued based in part on the review of these analyses. The TS Definition 15.1.j, "Rated Power," states "Rated power is here defined as a steady state reactor core output of 1518.5 MWT." The definition has not changed since the original TS were issued. The reason for the introduction of the discrepancy between the licenses and the TS is not documented.

The current FSAR clearly states both units are designed to produce a reactor thermal output of 1518.5 MWt and that all plant safety systems, including containment and engineered safety features, are designed and evaluated for

operation at 1518.5 MWt. Section 1.5.1 of the FSAR states that the "license application power level" is 1518.5 MWt. This power rating is also used as the basis for analyses of postulated accidents described in the FSAR.

Subsequent safety evaluations and analyses to support license amendments were performed based on a power level of 1518.5 MWt. Recent examples include evaluations to support the following amendments:

Amendments 174 and 178 issued July 9, 1997, reevaluated the design-basis large-break coolant accident coincident with a loss of offsite power and a single active failure and reevaluated the resulting radiological consequences based on 1549 MWt (102 percent times reactor thermal power of 1518.5 MWt).

Amendments 173 and 177 issued July 1, 1997, reevaluated new parameters associated with replacement steam generators in Unit 2 and changes in analyses that affect both Units 1 and 2. The analyses were based on a reactor thermal power of 1518.5 MWt.

Amendments 156 and 160 issued October 28, 1994, approved a reduced reactor coolant system raw measured total flow rate limit based on a thermal power of 1518.5 MWt.

Amendments 120 and 123 issued May 8, 1989, incorporated higher core power peaking factors based on a thermal power level of 1518.5 MWt.

Amendments 168 and 172 issued March 20, 1997, revised heatup and cooldown limit curves to 23.6 effective full power years. These amendments used fluence calculations that assumed a power level of 1518 MWt. The licensee stated that the calculations were reviewed to determine the sensitivity to the proposed change in power level. The licensee concluded that the change has a negligible effect on the calculations, and that monitoring of vessel fluence via the cavity dosimetry program will continue to ensure all regulatory requirements will be met. The staff agrees that the proposed change in power level is not significant in relation to other uncertainties used to determine vessel fluence. The licensee submitted a change to the Bases for TS 15.3.1.B, "Pressure/Temperature Limits," which incorporates the 1518.5 MWt power level in the following change, "The maximum integrated fast neutron exposure of the vessel is computed to be 2.5×10^{19} neutrons/cm^2 for 40 years of operation at 1518.5 MWt and 80 percent load factor." This Bases change is consistent with the proposed license changes.

During the review of the proposed amendments, an error was found with the footnote (2) on Basis page 15.3.1-8. The footnote, which references Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-12794, Rev.2/12795, Rev. 2 should have been updated to reflect Revision 3 with the issuance of Amendments 168 and 172. WEPCO's July 14, 1997, transmittal requested that the footnote reflect Revision 3. Since the safety evaluation for Amendments 168 and 172 were based on Revision 3, the staff agrees with the proposed changes to the bases.

Based on the consistent use of an evaluated thermal power level of 1518.5 for design-basis accident analyses and to ensure consistency between the licenses, TS, Bases, and the FSAR, the staff finds the proposed changes acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Wisconsin State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.21, 51.32, and 51.35, an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact has been prepared and published in the *Federal Register* on August 5, 1997 (62 FR 42145).

Accordingly, based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission has determined that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Linda L. Gundrum

Date: **August 6, 1997**