

DISTRIBUTION:
 Docket File
 NRC PDR
 LPDR
 IB#3 File
 JLee

September 9, 1983

DOCKET NO(S). 50-275

Mr. James O. Schuyler
 Vice President - Nuclear Generation
 Department

Pacific Gas & Electric Company
 77 Beale Street, Room 1451
 San Francisco, California 94106

SUBJECT: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY - DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT 1

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

- Notice of Receipt of Application.
- Draft/Final Environmental Statement, 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.
- Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License.
- 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) Monthly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses
Involving No Significant Hazards Consideration, dtd 8/16/83
(See pages 38415 and 38334 regarding your applications of
12/17/82, 7/19/82, 12/29/82 and 5/2/83)

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
 As stated

cc: See next page

8310060509 830909
 PDR ADDCK 05000275
 P PDR

OFFICE ▶	DL:IB#3						
SURNAME ▶	JLee						
DATE ▶	9/9/83						

Diablo Canyon

Mr. J. O. Schuyler, Vice President
Nuclear Power Generation
c/o Nuclear Power Generation, Licensing
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, Room 1435
San Francisco, California 94106

Philip A. Crane, Jr., Esq.
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Post Office Box 7442
San Francisco, California 94120

Mr. Malcolm H. Furbush
Vice President - General Counsel
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Post Office Box 7442
San Francisco, California 94120

Janice E. Kerr, Esq.
California Public Utilities Commission
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Mr. Frederick Eissler, President
Scenic Shoreline Preservation
Conference, Inc.
4623 More Mesa Drive
Santa Barbara, California 93105

Ms. Elizabeth Apfelberg
1415 Cozadero
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Mr. Gordon A. Silver
Ms. Sandra A. Silver
1760 Alisal Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Harry M. Willis, Esq.
Seymour & Willis
601 California Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA 94108

Mr. Richard Hubbard
MHB Technical Associates
Suite K
1725 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, CA 96125

Mr. John Marrs, Managing Editor
San Luis Obispo County Telegram Tribune
1321 Johnson Avenue
P. O. Box 112
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Resident Inspector/Diablo Canyon NPS
c/o US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 369
Avila Beach, California 93424

Ms. Raye Fleming
1920 Mattie Road
Shell Beach, California 93440

Joel Reynolds, Esq.
John R. Phillips, Esq.
Center for Law in the Public Interest
10951 West Pico Boulevard
Third Floor
Los Angeles, California 90064

Paul C. Valentine, Esq.
321 Lytton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94302

Dr. William E. Cooper
Project Manager - 5511
Teledyne Engineering Services
130 Second Avenue
Waltham, Massachusetts 02254

Mr. Dick Blankenburg
Editor & Co-Publisher
South County Publishing Company
P. O. Box 460
Arroyo Grande, California 93420

Norton, Burke, Berry & French, P.C.
2002 E. Osborn Road
P. O. Box 10569
Phoenix, Arizona 85064

Mr. W. C. Gangloff
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
P. O. Box 355
Pittsburg, Pennsylvania 15230

David F. Fleischaker, Esq.
P. O. Box 1178
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101

Arthur C. Gehr, Esq.
Snell & Wilmer
3100 Valley Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85073

Mr. Lee M. Gustafson, Director
Federal Agency Relations
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
1050 17th Street, N. W.
Suite 1180
Washington, D. C. 20036

Regional Administrator - Region V
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1450 Maria Lane
Suite 210
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Dr. Jose Roesset
3506 Duval Road
Austin, Texas 78759

Michael J. Strumwasser, Esq.
Special Council to the Attorney General
State of California
3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 800
Los Angeles 90010

Mr. Thomas H. Harris
San Jose Mercury News
750 Ridder Park Drive
San Jose, California 95190

Mr. Mark Gottlieb
California Energy Commission
1111 Howe Avenue, MS 27
Sacramento, California 95825

Maurice Axelrad, Esq.
Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D. C. 20036

Chairman
San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors
Room 220
County Courthouse Annex
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

California Department of Health
ATTN: Chief, Environmental Radiation
Control Unit
Radiologic Health Section
741 P Street - Room 498
Sacramento, California 95814

Director
Energy Facilities Siting Division
Energy Resources Conservation and
Development Commission
1111 Howe Avenue
Sacramento, California 95825

President
California Public Utilities Commission
California State Building
350 McAllester Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Mr. Joseph O. Ward, Chief
Radiological Health Branch
State Department of Health Services
714 P Street, Office Building #8
Sacramento, California 95814

federal register

**Tuesday
August 23, 1983**

Part III

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

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

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

I. Background

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

This monthly notice includes all amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, since the date of publication of the last monthly notice which was published on July 20, 1983 (48 FR 33076-33103), through August 15, 1983.

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

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

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

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

By September 26, 1983 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. Request 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 to be 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 this 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 becomes 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 to make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

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

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

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so

inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at (800) 325-6000 (in Missouri (800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (*Branch Chief*): petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Executive Legal Director, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petitioner had made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

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

Date of amendment request: October 25, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would modify the frequency for licensee's audits of the Facility Emergency Program from every 24 months to every 12 months.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for making a "no significant hazard considerations" determination by providing certain example (48 FR 14870). One of the examples is a change to make a license conform to the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The proposed change was identified to the licensee in our Generic Letter No. 82-17 dated October 1, 1982, as a needed change to be consistent with the regulations, 10 CFR 50.54(t). The proposed change matches this

example. Another example given by the Commission which also applies is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The frequency of audits required by the licensee would be doubled from the previously required. On these bases, the staff proposes to determine that this change involves no significant hazards considerations.

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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Dates of amendments request: November 16, 1982, as supplemented February 1, 1983 and June 29, 1983.

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendments would consist of Technical Specification changes including two licensee requests and one supplement. Our preliminary review indicates the changes could be made without significant technical or safety implications. The changes fit into three general groups:

1. Most changes would be strictly editorial corrections and changes in nomenclature or numbers of fire hydrants, smoke detectors and isolation sensors located in various tables of the Technical Specifications.

2. Two changes would correct the Technical Specifications to agree with Commission regulations 10 CFR 50.49 and 10 CFR 73.55.

3. Two of the changes would revise organizational charts to reflect current facility and offsite groups. The facility organization would be expanded to add a quality control supervisor and a plant modification supervisor. Other minor changes would be made consistent with the changes in titles. The offsite organization changes would revise one management title to show that the Plant Manager reports directly to higher management. The title of General Manager—Nuclear Generation would become Manager Nuclear Operations and Administration. The Plant Manager would report directly to the offsite Vice-President Nuclear Generation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these

standards considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). Example "(i) A purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature."

Certain of the changes appear to fit into this example: Changing P-4 to P-11 on page ¾ 3-24 would correct an error, as would changing sensor locations of the high energy line break isolation sensors in Table 3.3-10, changing or adding fire detection instrumentation in Table 3.3-12, changing "breaker" to "disconnect device" on page ¾ 5-2 and ¾ 5-4, correcting the approximated reactor coolant system pressure to reflect the actual plant pressure range for RHR system automatic isolation and interlock action, correcting the specifications to show the recently installed 8-inch vent valve which replaced the old 18-inch valve, correcting a table listing fire hydrants to clearly note which hydrants are used or shared between units, and deletion of a test exemption no longer applicable.

The proposed change in the licensee's audit frequency for the Security Plan from every 24 months to every 12 months fits Commission example "(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." Also, since regulation 10 CFR 73.55(g)(4) requires the Technical Specification to be modified, this change fits into Commission example "(vii) A change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations."

Administrative Technical Specification 6.16 are scheduler requirements for qualification of electrical equipment. The Commission has revised the scheduler requirements by regulation 10 CFR 50.49. This change would only correct the Technical Specification by deleting the schedules which are no longer applicable. This change would fit Commission example (vii) stated above.

Technical Specification 7.1 was a test exemption during the augmented low power test program. Since the program was completed on Unit No. 2 during the startup test program prior to Cycle 1 operation the specification is no longer applicable.

The licensee proposed deletion of the Technical Specification 7.1 as an administrative correction consistent

with the Commission example (i) stated above. We agree.

The last two changes would notify the organizational structure of the facility organization and the offsite organization.

(1) The proposed facility organization would expand with new positions of Quality Control Supervisor and Plant Modification Supervisor both intended as efficiency improvements in the areas of quality control and plant modifications at the reactor sites. It is an expansion of the Performance and Planning Group. The licensee has stated the change is administrative. Figure 6.2-2 is in the Administrative Controls part of the Technical Specifications. However, the change might also appropriately fit into Commission example "(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."

(2) The proposed offsite organization changes would allow direct reporting of the plant manager to the headquarters officer responsible for the plant. This direct reporting should enhance nuclear safety by the direct line of communication between the plant manager and the corporate officer of the company directly responsible for nuclear operations. The licensee has stated the change is administrative to correct Technical Specifications based on a corporate organizational change and is consistent with Commission item (i). Although the changes do not strictly fit the cited example, the changes appear to strengthen the organizational structure and would not appear to involve a significant hazards consideration.

Accordingly, based on our preliminary review, the Commission proposes to determine that these changes do 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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Alabama Power Company, Docket No. 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Houston, County, Alabama

Date of amendment request: November 24, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would add requirements to the Technical Specifications which the Commission

required to be added after the first refueling outage. These additions include: (1) a tabulation of containment penetration overcurrent protection devices added per License Condition 2.C.(19)(b), (2) changes to the containment ventilation system to reflect the newly installed 8-inch vent valves added per License Condition 2.C.(17) and (3) a listing of safety-related mechanical snubbers added per Technical Specification Table 3.7-4b notation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for making a no significant hazard determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The example which fits the proposed amendment is "(ii) A Change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: For example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." During the licensing process for Unit 2 certain License Conditions were imposed by the Commission to assure that future changes were made to the design of plant systems. The addition of containment penetration overcurrent protection devices and a smaller containment ventilation vent valve were required by the end of the first refueling outage. The proposed amendment would add the list of overcurrent protection devices and would reflect the smaller 8-inch ventilation valve. In addition, Technical Specification Table 3.7-4b contained a note which required the licensee to provide a list of safety-related mechanical snubbers following the first refueling outage. The licensee has proposed the listing. On the basis that these changes are considered additional restrictions being put into the Technical Specifications, the Commission proposes to determine that the amendment request 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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Alabama Power Company, Docket No. 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Houston, County, Alabama

Date of amendment request: December 10, 1982

Description of amendment request: The amendment would modify - Technical Specifications to delete eight

(8) non-safety related hydraulic snubbers from Table 3.7-4a. The change was proposed as an administrative change by the licensee's application date December 10, 1982.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for making a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The example which the proposed amendment fits is: "(i) A purely administrative change to Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature."

The licensee has stated that the deletion of eight (8) non-safety related hydraulic snubbers from Technical Specification Table 3.7-4a is administrative. We agree. Table 3.7-4a is a 24-page listing of safety related hydraulic snubbers identified by the licensee when the Technical Specifications were developed for issuance of the initial operating license. The licensee has now identified errors in this extensive list of snubbers. Since these snubbers are located on the main steam piping inside the turbine building and are not required for any safety related function, the Technical Specification Table should be corrected. Otherwise, unnecessary surveillance tests and operability criteria are imposed for these non-safety related snubbers. The Commission intends that only safety related snubbers be subjected to these restrictions. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the amendment would 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 the licensee: George F. Trowbridge, Esquire, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: December 30, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The amendments revise two related parts of the Technical Specifications; one for the river water system and the other for the two associated diesel generators (DG's). These DG's provide emergency power to the river water pumps. The river water system provides

makeup water to the seismically designed pond which then provides to both plants the service water and a source of cooling water in case of a loss of coolant accident. Both the river water system and the 100 acre pond are identified as "ultimate heat sink" in the existing Technical Specifications. The amendments would delete the river water system limiting condition for operation and the surveillance tests entirely and would reduce the diesel generator 18 month load test value for two of five diesel generators by about eight percent. The load test value is determined by the maximum calculated accident load which would be reduced by deletion of the river water system as an accident load.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. One of these examples relates to a change which may reduce in some way a safety margin, but the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria specified in the Standard Review Plan. The deletion of Technical Specifications for the river water system would not mean that the river water system with six pumps would be deleted from the facility. But, the Technical Specification requirements would be deleted. The river water pumps would be available as needed to transfer makeup water from the river to the 100 acre seismically designed pond. The pond is the actual ultimate heat sink. The existing limiting condition for operation and the surveillance requirements for the pond would remain in the Technical Specifications. When the pond water level drops below the lower limit, 48 hours is allowed to recover the level or both plants would be in hot shutdown. This requirement remains unchanged.

Thus, the change being made would only bring the Technical Specifications in conformance with our current requirements. The plant as licensed is in conformance with General Design Criteria and specifically conforms to Regulatory Guide 1.27 referenced in Standard Review Plan 9.2.5 when Unit 2 was licensed. The diesel generator load limit change fits the Commission's example of a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications to reduce to upper load limit to a value required after elimination of the river water pumps as emergency loads. The reduction in the 18 month surveillance load limit value by about 8% is

insignificant and is administrative in nature.

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

Attorney for the Licensee: George F. Trowbridge, Esquire, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: April 6, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The change would correct an administrative error in the Technical Specifications by deleting applicability of a footnote for Item 1.e. in Table 3.3-3. The change is being made at the Commissions request to correct the error found during the NRC staff review of multiplant Item B-32, Blocked Safety Injection Signal During Cooldown. The footnote is clearly in error as the logic circuitry is designed not to allow the bypass which the footnote indicates is available in Mode 3. A high differential pressure between steam lines will initiate safety injection, turbine trip and feedwater isolation in Modes 1, 2 and 3. A bypass during Mode 3 is erroneously indicated by a symbol (##) which will be deleted by this amendment.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided examples of amendments not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One of these examples relates to a purely administrative change to correct an error in Technical Specifications. This deletion of the footnote applicability symbol fits the example.

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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Alabama Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Houston County, Alabama

Date of amendment request: May 3, 1983, supplemented July 29, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would modify the Technical Specification surveillance requirements for the auxiliary building and service water batteries. The existing surveillance

requirements were developed by the licensee and approved by the Commission during the licensing of Farley Unit 2. Subsequently, Unit 1 surveillances were made identical to the Unit 2 requirements for consistency. These surveillance requirements include load tests and checks of such things as battery voltage, electrolyte level, specific gravity, and general battery conditions at specified intervals of time to assure continued operability. The licensee's proposed changes would update the surveillances to conform to the newer format of the Commission's Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-0452 Revision 4) based on a more recent IEEE standard than was used earlier. Some minor exceptions to the newer standards are also proposed by the licensee.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards considered not to involve a significant hazards consideration by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). By letter of July 29, 1983, the licensee evaluated the proposed changes and stated that their determination is consistent with example (vi).

This Commission example is "(vi) A change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where 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."

On this basis, the licensee has determined that a significant hazards consideration is not involved in accordance with 10 CFR 50.92. The Commission's preliminary review indicates that the changes would be clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the battery system surveillances and would be in conformance with the latest revision of NUREG-0452 and with the Standard Review Plan. For these reasons, the Commission proposes to determine that the amendment involves no 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, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: June 6, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would modify the Technical Specifications in the Administrative Controls section based on NUREG-0737, Item I.A.1.3. By Generic Letters the Commission advised licensees of the need to establish guidelines for overtime of operating personnel. The proposed amendment would incorporate these guidelines.

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

The licensee states that the change incorporates current practices and reflects commitments made previously. However, the additional restriction to be put into the Technical Specification would assure that personnel who perform safety-related functions would be assigned duties in accordance with Commission approved guidelines of NUREG-0737. Therefore, on the basis, the staff proposes to determine that this change involves no significant hazards considerations.

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, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Alabama Power Company, Docket No. 50-384, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Houston County, Alabama

Date of amendment request: June 17, 1983, supplemented on July 8, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The Technical Specifications would be amended on a one-time basis to extend a required visual inspection of inaccessible hydraulic snubbers for about three months or until the next shutdown of sufficient duration. The visual inspection is a reinspection required six months \pm 25% subsequent to inspections which revealed two inoperable snubbers. During the fourth

refueling outage which ended mid-January 1983 two snubbers were declared inoperable by the licensee. This required repair and would require a subsequent six month reinspection of all inaccessible snubbers. Such reinspection would require plant shutdown to cold conditions. The licensee has requested relief from this Technical Specification requirement until the fifth refueling outage unless a five day shutdown to cold condition occurs in the interim period.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards considered as no significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). The licensee by supplemental application dated July 8, 1983, has stated that the one-time change is consistent with Commission example (vi). Example (vi) is restated here.

"(vi) A change which either may result in some increases 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."

Our preliminary evaluation is that we agree with the licensee's determination which was stated as follows:

Both snubbers that were declared inoperable had extenuating circumstances (loss of fluid by personnel error during inspection on one snubber and mechanical interference on the other snubber) with no evidence of generic failure mechanisms. The snubbers were repaired and retested with satisfactory results. Previous engineering analysis/review has shown that the failure of a single support on a seismic line would not adversely affect the capability of the line to withstand a seismic event (due to design conservatism). Previous inspections have been conducted at each refueling to verify snubber operability and the maximum number of inoperable snubbers identified at any inspection has been 1 or 2 with several inspections identifying no inoperable snubbers. Additionally, the Farley Nuclear Plant site resides in an area where seismic risk has been determined to be minimal by ESSA/Coast and Geodetic Survey. The probability of a seismic event during the extension period of three months is insignificant for the Farley Nuclear Plant site. Although this change

may result in some increase in the consequences of a previously analyzed accident, the results of the change do not violate criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan.

Accordingly, on this basis and on the basis of our preliminary review the Commission proposes to determine that the one-time change 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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Arkansas Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-313, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: March 9, 1979, supplemented September 5, 1980.

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

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas.

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

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Arkansas Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-313, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: October 31, 1980.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would change the Technical Specifications to provide that: (1) The pressurizer electromechanical relief valve (ERV) be operational with a setpoint of 2450 psig or the associated block valve would be closed, and (2) a special report be submitted if the ERV is not operational for more than a 24-hour period.

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 of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The licensee's proposed amendment would provide a new Technical Specification requirement which would provide more stringent operational requirements on the ERV and provide additional reporting requirements concerning the operation of the ERV. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment

does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas.

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Debevoise and Liberman, 1200 17th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Arkansas Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-313, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: August 8, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would change the Technical Specifications to require a delay in the installation in the Davis-Besse 1 (DB-1) reactor of the ANO-1 reactor vessel materials properties capsule ANI-F from prior to the fourth DB-1 cycle to the fifth DB-1 cycle. Additionally, capsule ANI-D would be inserted in DB-1 location YZ rather than WZ, and the capsule ANI-F, which would be scheduled for insertion in the DB-1 reactor prior to the fifth DB-1 cycle, would be inserted in location YX instead of YZ.

This change would allow the Babcock and Wilcox (B&W) Owners Group research capsule DB-LGI to remain in the DB-1 reactor and accumulate neutron fluence equivalent to the fluence at the 1/4T location of a typical B&W 177FA plant at the end of life.

The delay in inserting ANO-F would have no adverse effect on the ANI-1 Reactor Vessel Surveillance Program (RVSP) because it contains only base and Heat Affected Zone materials (no weld metal) which are not expected to affect operating limits of the plant. The ANI-F capsule would be irradiated to a level approximately equivalent to the expected peak fluence at the end of life at the inside surface of the ANO-1 reactor vessel and then held as a standby capsule as specified by 10 CFR 50, Appendix H, and ASTM E-185.

The proposed changes in capsule locations would have no effect on the ANO-1 RVSP as the proposed locations are in the same relative positions to the core as those in the current insertion schedule.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The data from the ANO-1 RVSP provides the basis for the operating limits of the ANO-1 reactor which are related to the safety settings. However, because capsule ANI-F is a spare capsule and does not contain samples of weld material, which is controlling, the data resulting from ANI-F capsule

samples after irradiation in the DB-1 would not change the basis for the operating limits of ANO-1. This information is obtained from other capsules, unaffected by the proposed amendment. Also, since the proposed change in location of the ANI-D capsule would be in the same relative position of the core, there would be no effect on the ANO-1 RVSP. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not provide a relaxation of the bases for limiting safety settings. Furthermore, the amendment has no effect on the present operation of the facility, and thus would not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously considered, or a significant reduction in a margin of safety, nor create the possibility of an accident new and different from an accident previously considered.

On this basis, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room Location: Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas.

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

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Arkansas Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-313 and 50-366, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: October 31, 1980.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the Technical Specifications to incorporate hydrogen/oxygen concentration limitations and hydrogen/oxygen monitoring requirements in the radioactive waste gas systems. The application was submitted in response to an NRC request to incorporate the applicable current staff positions, presented in NUREG-0472, "Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications for PWRs," to ensure compliance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix I. The implementation of the proposed changes is expected to reduce significantly the likelihood of hydrogen explosions in the radioactive waste gas systems.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards include changes that constitute

additional limitations not presently included in the Technical Specifications and that make the license conform to changes in the regulations. Since the proposed changes add requirements and ensure compliance with the regulations in accordance with staff positions, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801.

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., Debevoise and Liberman, 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark, John F. Stolz.

Arkansas Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-313 and 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: February 23, 1983 and April 18, 1983.

Description of amendment request:

The amendments would revise the Technical Specifications to reflect a recent reorganization of the Energy Supply Department of Arkansas Power & Light Company (AP&L) and the position title change of the Assistant Vice President, Nuclear Operations, to the Vice President, Nuclear Operations. The reorganization has resulted in changes in the membership of the AP&L Safety Review Committee (SRC). However, the effectiveness of the independent review and audit function of the SRC would not be reduced as a result of the change in the membership of the SRC in that the appropriate technical disciplines necessary for the noted function would still be represented in the new make-up of the SRC. In addition, the SRC would report to the Vice President, Nuclear Operations, since he has been designated as the AP&L Senior Nuclear Management Representative. The amendments would also correct typographical errors and the proper designation of the ANO General Manager and the Administrator of the NRC Regional Office where noted.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the applications of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications. The change in title of utility management, the correcting of

typographical errors, and the designation of the ANO General Manager and the Administrator of the NRC Regional Office where noted are considered administrative in nature. In addition, the change in the membership of the SRC resulting from the reorganization and the reporting of the SRC to the Vice President, Nuclear Operations, would not reduce the effectiveness of the SRC as discussed in the description of the amendments. Thus, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801.

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., c/o DeBevoise & Liberman, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chiefs: Robert A. Clark and John F. Stolz.

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

Date of amendment request: May 10, 1979, March 11, 1983 and June 29, 1983.

Description of amendment request:

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

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

consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

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

Local Public Document Room

Location: Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas.

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., DeBevoise & Liberman, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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

Date of amendment request: September 17, 1980.

Description of amendment request:

The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications to incorporate a periodic flow test requirement for the emergency feedwater system in order to verify the normal flow path from the emergency feedwater system water source to the steam generators. The periodic flow test would ensure its operability by verification of proper flow path. The proposed amendment was submitted in accordance with the staff's safety evaluation report on the emergency feedwater system dated November 6, 1979 which required the above-mentioned flow test.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards include actions which involve a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not

presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The proposed change matches this example, since the above periodic flow test requirement is not presently included in the Technical Specifications. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., c/o DeBevoise & Liberman, 1200 Seventeenth Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-392, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Date of amendment request: March 15, 1979.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification changes to implement the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g) pertaining to inservice inspection and testing to provide assurance that the structural integrity and operability of systems and components important to safety are maintained. The proposed amendment would add surveillance requirements to the Pilgrim operating license to provide for (a) inservice inspection of safety-related components, and (b) operability testing of safety-related pumps and valves in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable addenda as required by 10 CFR 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the NRC.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One such amendment involves a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations.

The change proposed by the licensee is intended to implement 10 CFR 50.55a(g), which pertains to inservice inspection of safety-related components, and inservice testing of safety-related pumps and valves to assess operational readiness. This amendment, therefore, reflects changes to make the Pilgrim

Nuclear Power Station license conform to changes in the regulations. Since the licensee is presently obligated by these regulations to perform inservice inspection of components and inservice testing of pumps and valves, this license change will only result in very minor changes to facility operations which are clearly in keeping with the regulations.

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: August 30, 1982.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification (TS) changes to allow controlled liquid effluent batch releases from points other than the radwaste facility, such as the neutralizing sump. This change is requested to eliminate the need to physically transport waste through buildings and to reduce the opportunity for and consequences of human error or equipment failure.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazard consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One such amendment involves a change which either may result in some increase in the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all 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 change proposed by the licensee would permit controlled liquid effluent batch releases from points other than the radwaste facility

provided that certain conditions pertaining to dilution flow, sampling, analysis, discharge flow path valve line-up, other simultaneous liquid releases, verification of effluent flow calculations and manning are satisfied. These changes are clearly within all acceptable criteria for batch releases contained in Section 11.5 of the Standard Review Plan (SRP) "Process and Effluent Radiological Monitoring Instrumentation and Sampling Systems" which is the applicable section of the SRP for the systems involved. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to the examples for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: April 5, 1983.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification changes to permit operation with increased safety relief valve (SRV) setpoints to enable an increased pressure differential between operating pressure and SRV pressure setpoints.

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

The licensee has proposed a 20 psi increase in safety relief valve setpoints with a return to normal reactor operating pressure (an increase of 10 psi above the present reduced operation

pressure) to enable a 10 psi increase in the difference between reactor operating pressure and SRV setpoint pressure. This change has been requested because operating data demonstrate that such an increase in pressure difference will reduce the probability of SRV pilot valve leakage.

The proposed change in SRV setpoints affects only those events which result in SRV actuations to limit system pressure. Although the increased setpoint may in some way reduce a safety margin, analyses have demonstrated that the increased setpoints are within acceptable criteria of the Standard Review Plan. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to the examples for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: April 15, 1983.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification (TS) changes to incorporate revised radiological effluent and environmental monitoring limiting conditions for operation, action statements, and surveillance requirements. The proposed changes are in response to NRC requests of July 11, 1978 and November 15, 1978 and supersede in its entirety a licensee submittal of February 21, 1979. The proposed changes are intended to implement the design objectives and requirements of 10 CFR 50.34(a), 10 CFR 50.36a, 10 CFR 20, 10 CFR 50 Appendix A, General Design Criteria 60 and 64 and 40 CFR 190.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One such amendment involves a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very

minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations.

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

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: May 31, 1983.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification changes to (1) reflect an expansion of the operating region of Pilgrim's power/flow map, and (2) provide associated changes in the Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) flux scram and APRM rod block trip settings. These changes would allow operational flexibility by permitting a more rapid return to full power following a brief power reduction.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One such amendment is a change which either may result in some increase in the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all 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 change proposed by the licensee would expand the operating region of Pilgrim's power/flow map and provide associated changes in the APRM flux scram and APRM rod block trip settings. Chapter 3 of the Pilgrim Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) describes the basic operating envelope within which normal reactor operations are conducted. Subsequent analyses were conducted to justify expansion of this operating region utilizing previously employed calculational models. These analyses considered a revised end-of-cycle target exposure distribution which was reflected in a September 1982 Supplemental Reload Licensing Submittal for Cycle 6 operation. These changes therefore reflect the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculation model. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to the examples for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: July 21, 1981.

Description of amendment request: The licensee has proposed changes to the technical specifications in response

to NRC's February 26, 1981 letter from Mr. D. G. Eisenhut which transmitted NUREG-0313, Revision 1 "Technical Report on Material Selection and Processing Guidelines for BWR Coolant Pressure Boundary Piping" (Generic Activity A-42). For the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant (BSEP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L) was asked to identify nonconforming piping and provide a schedule for the replacement of "service sensitive" nonconforming piping. CP&L (the licensee) was requested to propose appropriate technical specifications changes for surveillance and operational leakage.

The changes proposed by the licensee would add a requirement that all ASME Code Class 1 and 2 piping conform to the guidelines stated in NUREG-0313 Revision 1 and impose an additional restriction on leakage from the reactor coolant system. Both of these changes would be additional limiting conditions for operation that are not presently included in the technical specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of amendments which are not likely to involve significant hazards consideration include a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes are encompassed by this example because additional limitations will be added to the Technical Specifications by specifying new Limiting Conditions for Operation. The changes were proposed at the request of the NRC and will specify limitations to assure safe operation of the plant with regard to the integrity of the reactor coolant piping. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to an example which is not likely to involve significant hazards considerations, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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 amendment request: March 16, 1982.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would modify the technical specifications to correct an erroneous instrument number and add requirements regarding the operability, set point response time and surveillance of a time delay relay to be incorporated in the steam line break detection circuitry of the High Pressure Coolant Injection (HPCI) and Reactor Core Isolation Cooling (RCIC) Systems as recommended in Item II.K.3.15 of NUREG-0737, "Clarification of the TMI Action Plan Requirements."

An administrative correction would be made to the existing Technical Specifications (TS) Table 3.3.2-2, Item 4.a.7, HPCI Steam Line Area Temperature-High. Two instrument numbers are listed under this item: 51-dTS-N604C,D is incorrect and redundant and would be deleted; E51-dTS-N604C,D is correct and would remain in the TS. This change would provide consistent reference to this instrument in TS Table 3.3.2-2 when compared to TS Tables 3.3.2-1 and 3.3.2-3.

The purpose of the time delay relay (TDR) modification is to provide a three-second delay in the isolation of the turbine steam supply lines of the high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) and reactor isolation cooling (RCIC) systems anytime a greater than 300 percent steam flow is detected. Such a modification provides prevention of flow spike trips during HPCI/RCIC system startup, as well as provide some level of protection in the event of large flow spikes resulting from transient swings in HPCI/RCIC system operation. The design basis of the modification is to eliminate trips resulting from spurious flow spikes system startup. This improvement in the design of this system was previously approved by the NRC in NUREG-0737. The changes to the technical specifications are necessary administrative follow up actions essential to the implementation of these improvements.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples involving no significant hazards consideration

include "(i) a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature; and, (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 correction of instrument numbers in 3.3.2-2 is a purely administrative change encompassed by example (i) above that would correct an error in the technical specifications.

The addition of technical specifications for the operability, set point response time and surveillance of the time delay relay clearly imposes additional limitations and controls not presently included in the technical specifications and is therefore encompassed by example (ii) above.

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

Local Public Document Room

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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 amendment request: July 29, 1982.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would modify the technical specifications to correctly identify certain relays associated with the plant emergency power supplies and provide correct set point values for actuating these relays.

Following investigation of a reactor scram, the licensee determined Degraded Voltage Surveillance Tests on Unit 1 were not being performed. The licensee's review of a previous modification revealed that incorrect relays were referenced in the plant modification and therefore, the incorrect set point values were incorporated in the technical specifications. Table 3.3.3-2, Item 5.a, describes Balance-of-Plant

(BOP) buses 1C, 1D, 2C, and 2D for Device 27. The correct relay should have been Emergency Buses E-1, E-2, E-3, and E-4, Device 27/59E. The proposed changes to the technical specifications would correct this error and provide correct set point values for actuating the relays.

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

Example (i) encompasses the changes requested to correct the errors in identifying certain relays in the emergency power supplies. Example (ii) applies to the added requirements for these relays including proper set points, surveillance intervals and operability conditions. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to examples for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: January 26, 1983.

Description of amendment request: An amendment to modify the technical specifications to apply to new analog (continuous measuring) instrumentation that has been installed in Unit 1 and will be installed in Unit 2. The analog instrumentation replaces certain pressure switches and will provide

improved performance of trip functions for reactor protection system actuation, containment isolation, reactor core isolation cooling system isolation and emergency core cooling system actuation.

The replacement of pressure switches with analog instrumentation was previously approved by the Commission with the issuance of Amendment No. 26 to License No. DPR-71 for Unit 1 and Amendment No. 50 to License No. DPR-62 for Unit 2 on March 14, 1980. At that time it was decided that appropriate technical specifications would be issued when the instrumentation would be ready for operation. Thus the issuance of these technical specifications is concomitant to our previous action and attendant to the full implementation of improvements in the instrumentation for the Brunswick Units.

The changes to the technical specifications include new instrument numbers, the correction of errors in the existing specifications and editorial changes to incorporate the format of the NRC standard technical specifications. In addition to these administrative changes, the surveillance requirements have been changed to incorporate surveillance intervals developed for the new instrumentation. However, the required response times and set points for the instrumentation will not be changed and the new surveillance requirements together with the new instrumentation is expected to provide a more reliable instrumentation system.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples involving no significant hazards consideration include: "(i) a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications: for example a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature; and, (ii) a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." The bulk of the changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by example (i). The inclusion of new instrument numbers, the correction of errors in the existing specifications and changes in format are all purely administrative changes. The changes in surveillance requirements relate to example (ii). Some of the surveillance intervals have been

decreased and some have been increased as appropriate for each new instrument. However, the overall effect of the changes in technical specifications will be to increase the total surveillance requirements in support of a more reliable instrumentation system. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to examples for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: May 10, 1977.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request proposes a change to the Technical Specifications (TS) to incorporate the inservice inspection testing requirements set forth in Section XI of the ASME, Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, and Addenda as a substitute for the current TS.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14871). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to additional limitations, restrictions, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications (ii); for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. In the case of this amendment, the licensee is requesting to delete their existing requirements for inservice inspection and testing requirements surveillance for Class 1 components only and substituting the requirements contained in the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI and it's Addenda, requiring surveillance of Class 1, 2 & 3 components. This proposed change clearly adds more restrictions and surveillance requirements and matches the guidance quoted. The staff, therefore, proposes to determine that the

amendment does not involve a significant hazard consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Hartsville Memorial Library, Home and Fifth Avenues, Hartsville, South Carolina 29535.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: November 10, 1980 as supplemented February 7, 1983.

Description of amendment request:

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

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The Commission, in a revision to Appendix I, 10 CFR Part 50 required licensees to improve and modify their radiological effluent systems in a manner that would keep releases of radioactive material to unrestricted areas during normal operation as low as is reasonably achievable. In complying with this requirement, it became

necessary to add additional restrictions and controls to the Technical Specifications to assure compliance. This caused the addition of Technical Specifications described above. The staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration since the change constitutes additional restrictions and controls that are not currently included in the Technical Specifications in order to meet the Commission mandated release of "as low as is reasonably achievable."

Local Public Document Room

location: Hartsville Memorial Library, Home and Fifth Avenues, Hartsville, South Carolina 29535.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: December 2, 1980.

Description of amendment request:

This amendment request proposes a change to the Technical Specifications (TS) by adding operability requirements for the Dedicated Shutdown System when the reactor is critical to ensure the operability of the system. This request reflects changes and additions to the plant as a result of the Dedicated Shutdown System.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14871). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to additional limitations, restrictions, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications (ii). This amendment specifically adds TS requirements to ensure the operability of the Dedicated Shutdown System (DSS) when the reactor is critical. The operability of the DSS equipment ensures the ability to safely bring the plant to a hot shutdown condition in the unlikely event that a fire disables the ability to control the plant from the control room or results in the loss of both trains of safeguards equipment. The staff, therefore, proposes to determine that this amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Hartsville Memorial Library, Home and Fifth Avenues, Hartsville, South Carolina 29535.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: January 11, 1983.

Description of amendment request:

This amendment request proposes to change the Technical Specification (TS) regarding containment internal pressure limiting conditions for operation. The current TS 3.6.2 requires that the plant be shutdown if the containment internal pressure exceeds 2 psig for more than 8 hours. The proposed change would require that the plant be shutdown if the containment internal pressure exceeds 1 psig for more than 8 hours.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The basis for the proposed amendment request is the licensee's discovery of an error in the calculation of the containment net free volume used in the original FSAR. At that time the peak accident pressure was calculated to be 37.8 psig. The recalculated value based on the reduced net free containment volume is 40.0 psi as reported in the licensee's updated FSAR.

The containment design pressure is 42 psig. Subtracting from the 42 psig, the 37.8 psig LOCA (peak accident pressure) leaves 4.2 psig allowable pressure in the containment before a postulated LOCA. However, the licensee used 2.0 psig in their current Technical Specifications providing about 2 psig margin.

Subtracting the newly calculated peak accident pressure of 40.0 psi from the design pressure provides an allowable containment pressure prior to a LOCA of 2 psig. The licensee proposes, for the requested amendment change, to allow 1 psig pressure in the containment before a postulated LOCA, thus, providing a margin of 1 psi. The net result of the requested change is an apparent reduction of the margin, by 1 psig in the unlikely event of a LOCA.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of those standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14871). One of these examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to:

A change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all

acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan: for example, a change resulting from the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculational model or design method.

The proposed amendment is directly related to this example because it is within the acceptance criteria of the Standard Review Plan (SRP). The SRP requires that the peak accident pressure be less than the design pressure for the containment. On this basis, the Commission proposes to determine that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-295 and 50-304, Zion Station Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Zion, Illinois

Date of amendments request: February 16, 1979.

Description of amendments request: These amendments would permit operation after approval of changes to the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications that would bring them into compliance with Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 50. It provides new Technical Specification sections defining limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous and solid wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, land use census, and interlaboratory comparison program. This change would also incorporate into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. In addition, some changes would be made in administrative controls, specifically dealing with the process control program and the offsite dose calculation manual. The proposed amendments would remove the current Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications from the Appendix "B" Technical Specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or

controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Zion Benton Public Library District, 2800 Emmaus Avenue, Zion, Illinois 60099.

Attorney for licensee: P. Steptoe, Isham, Lincoln & Beale, Counselors at Law, Three First National Plaza, 51st Floor, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: March 21, 1978.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) by (1) reducing the allowable containment leak rate from 0.25% per day to 0.18% per day; (2) reducing the allowable Reactor Heat Removal System (RHR) leak rate from 6 liters per hour to 3 liters per hour; and (3) require 4 containment air recirculation (CAR) units to be normally operable instead of 3 units whenever the reactor is critical.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). Example (ii) illustrates a proposed action which would not involve a significant hazards consideration. These types of action constitute additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. Each of the above proposed changes constitutes more stringent requirements. The reduction in allowable leak rates reduces the

potential exposure to the public in the event of an accident. Similarly, increasing the number of CAR units decreases the potential for exposure to the public in the event of an accident because each of the CAR units circulates the containment air thru filters which remove radioactive isotopes. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Russell Library, 119 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Attorney for licensee: Day, Berry & Howard, Counselors at Law, One Constitution Plaza, Hartford, Connecticut 06103.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of application for amendment: December 29, 1981.

Description of amendment request: Following the accident at Three Mile Island the NRC promulgated several additional limitations on the operation of nuclear power plants. The changes proposed in this application would incorporate two of these post-Three Mile Island requirements (NUREG 0737 Items II.F.1.1 and II.F.1.2) into the Technical Specifications. Specifically, the proposed change would modify the Technical Specifications to add Limiting Conditions of Operation and reporting requirements concerning the operability of the plant vent noble gas effluent monitor and the main steam line radiation monitor.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The staff proposes to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it clearly adds additional restrictions not currently in the Technical Specifications.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: February 14, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would modify the Technical Specifications to require a minimum of at least 23 feet of water above the reactor pressure vessel flange during movement of control rods or fuel assemblies instead of the current requirement of a minimum 23 feet of water above the reactor core. The additional depth of water specified by this change is necessary to assure sufficient depth to prevent inadvertent exposure of a fuel assembly during transfer. This requested change to the Technical Specifications is in response to the Generic Letter dated August 15, 1980, which notified all licensees that the Standard Technical Specifications were change to reflect this requirement.

The amendment application that transmitted this change request included several issues. This notice relates to only one. The remaining items will be the subject of separate notices.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it adds an additional depth of water to the depth currently specified in the Technical Specifications.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: February 14, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The reactor vessel surveillance program includes six specimen capsules to evaluate radiation damage based on pre-irradiation and post-irradiation testing of specimens. The proposed change to the Interference would relocate the requirements for the testing of these capsules from the Miscellaneous Inspections of Section 4.2 in the Technical Specifications to the Limiting Conditions for Operation in Section 3.1.B of the Technical Specifications. No changes to the testing program itself are proposed.

The amendment application that transmitted this change request included several issues. This notice relates to only one. The remaining items will be the subject of separate notices.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes of a purely administrative nature. The staff proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it consists of an administrative change that does not alter the requirements of the current Technical Specification.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: February 14, 1983.

Description of amendment request: By letter dated July 28, 1980, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission requested the Consolidated Edison propose Technical Specifications for the Containment Purge System as a means of gaining further reduction in the consequences of an accident involving the handling of reactor fuel inside of the containment building. Based on subsequent discussions, the Regulatory Staff concluded that an equivalent reduction could be realized by increasing the minimum required waiting time after shutdown before fuel could be moved from the present 90 hours to greater than 130 hours. This application proposes to

change the Technical Specification to require that no movement of reactor fuel be made unless the reactor has been subcritical for at least 131 hours.

The amendment application that transmitted this change request included several issues. This notice relates to only one. The remaining items will be the subject of separate notices.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it entails the addition of a more limiting requirement.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: February 14, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would amend the Technical Specifications to incorporate requirements for redundant decay heat removal capability during all modes of plant operation. This proposed change was directly requested by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Generic Letter dated June 11, 1980. The basis for the Commission's request was founded in a number of events that have occurred at operating PWR facilities where decay heat removal capability has been seriously degraded due to inadequate administrative controls utilized when the plants were in shutdown modes of operation. The additional administrative controls proposed in this change would ensure that proper means are available to provide redundant methods of decay heat removal.

The amendment application that transmitted this change request included several issues. This notice relates to

only one. The remaining items will be the subject of separate notices.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it consists of an additional limitation on the operation of the facility not currently in the Technical Specifications.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: March 23, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes contained in this application would revise the Technical Specifications to clarify the minimum conditions required for operability of the Boron injection tank (BIT). Specifically, the single minimum required liquid volume would be replaced by a curve which would establish a pressure/liquid volume relationship for determining BIT operability. In addition, specific limiting conditions for operation (LCOs) and surveillance requirements would be established for BIT parameters and required instrumentation channels. The requested changes are the result of Consolidated Edison's followup review of the Reportable Occurrence reported as LER-82-009/OIT-0.

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

pressure of the Boron Injection Tank is recorded every four hours in the Indian Point 2 Central Control Room Logs. The operator is directed to identify on the log every instance in which the pressure was less than 70 psig or greater than 95 psig. Between May 23, 1981, when Unit 2 returned to service from a refueling outage, and November 24, 1981, there were four isolated instances in which the recorded pressure was outside the specified range.

A probable consequence of the above was that less than 1000 gallons of boric acid solution could have been injected into the Reactor Coolant System when required during the periods of reduced nitrogen pressure.

The corrective measures provided by this amendment request are being proposed to prevent operation of the plant in a manner less conservative than assumed in the Safety Analysis Report, and constitute an additional control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: April 1, 1983.

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

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

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: August 14, 1980.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would incorporate a function testing requirement for the trip mechanism of the fuel transfer cask safety sling into Technical Specifications. This test, which is done prior to starting refueling, is currently enforced by a plant maintenance procedure. The change would make the test a requirement in the Technical Specifications. The test checks the operability of the trip mechanism which activates the safety sling designed to catch the fuel transfer cask in the event of a failure of the crane rigging.

Basis for proposed 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 14670, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (ii) of actions involving no significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

This amendment would incorporate the functional test of the trip mechanism on the fuel transfer cask safety sling into the Technical Specifications. On this basis the staff proposes to determine that this amendment would involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Charlevoix Public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: July 20, 1981.

Description of amendment request: Proposed changes would incorporate requirements for operability, testing, and inspection of the mechanical snubbers on the Reactor Depressurization System (RDS) into the Technical Specifications (TS). The current TS do not contain such requirements.

These changes do not involve the addition of snubbers to the plant; the mechanical snubbers on the RDS have been in place for several years. There are no other mechanical snubbers on safety related equipment at Big Rock Point.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The amendment would add requirements for operability, visual inspections and periodic testing of mechanical snubbers to the TS to ensure that these devices are operable. These snubbers are attached to piping and equipment in the RDS to provide restraint during a seismic or other event which initiates dynamic loads, yet allow slow motion such as that produced by thermal expansion. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether license amendment involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples which were published in the Federal Register on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14670). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration is a change that constitutes an additional

limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications, such as a more stringent surveillance requirement.

The amendment request, discussed above, fits this example. On this basis, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested action involving no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Charlevoix Public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: December 15, 1981.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would approve Technical Specifications (TSs) which would incorporate description and operating requirements for Stack Gas Monitoring System into the Technical Specifications. This system is being installed and made operational to meet the guidance of NUREG-0737, Item II.F.1 (1) and (2), "Additional Accident Monitoring Instrumentation (Noble Gas Effluent Monitor and Sampling and Analysis of Plant Effluents)." This system provides the capability to monitor effluent release rates several orders of magnitude above normal rates for accident situations.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14670, April 6, 1983). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to changes that constitute an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The Stack Gas Monitoring System is a new system at Big Rock Point which will replace and upgrade the present effluent monitoring system. The new system was designed to meet the guidance of NUREG-0737, Item II.F.1 (1) and (2), which is described above. The proposed changes incorporate operating requirements for this system into the Big Rock Point Technical Specifications and; therefore, constitute an additional limitation. On this basis the staff proposes to determine that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Charlevoix Public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: March 10, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would incorporate the description, operating requirements, and surveillance requirements for the containment pressure monitor and the containment water level monitor into the plant Technical Specifications. These monitors are being installed and made operational at Big Rock Point to meet the guidance of Part (4) and (5) of Item II.F.1, "Additional Accident Monitoring Instrumentation," in NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements." Part (4) of Item II.F.1 requires containment pressure monitoring instrumentation with the appropriate range for accident conditions. Part (5) of Item II.F.1 requires containment water level (sump level) monitoring instrumentation with the appropriate range for accident conditions.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14671, April 6, 1983). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to changes that constitute additional limitations, restrictions, or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes would add operating and surveillance requirements for the containment pressure monitor and the containment water level monitor to the Technical Specifications. These monitors are to be installed and made operational to meet the guidance of NUREG-0737. On this basis the staff proposes to determine that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Charlevoix Public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company,

212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: January 28, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would increase Pa, the containment vessel reduced test pressure, from 10 psig to not less than 11.5 psig. This change was recommended by the NRC in a letter dated November 23, 1982 and will make Pa consistent with the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Pa is the containment vessel reduced test pressure. Changing Pa from 10 psig to not less than 11.5 psig was recommended by the NRC in a letter dated November 23, 1982. This change would bring the Technical Specifications into conformance with the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 which stipulates the value of Pa.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14671, April 6, 1983). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The proposed increase in Pa to meet the requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 constitutes a more stringent surveillance requirement. On this basis the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Charlevoix Public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: March 12, 1979.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would approve changes to the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications which would bring them

into compliance with Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 50.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed new Technical Specifications section would define limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; concentration, dose and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, land use census, and interlaboratory comparison program. This change would also incorporate into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. In addition, some changes would be made in administrative controls, specifically dealing with the process control program and the offsite dose calculation manual.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Kalamazoo Public Library, 315 South Rose Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49006.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: March 1, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would reduce the set-point for Containment High Pressure from 5 psig to 4 psig. This set point actuates the reactor trip and the engineered safety features of safety

injection, containment spray, containment isolation and containment air coolers-accident mode.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed reduction in high pressure setpoints is a more stringent restriction and control which matches example (ii) published in the Federal Register on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). It is being implemented in response to NUREG-0737, Item II.E.4.2, position 5.

On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that this amendment would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Kalamazoo Public Library, 315 South Rose Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49006.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: June 25, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would make an administrative change to the Technical Specifications to correct the rated load for the emergency diesel generators to 750 amps. at 2400 volts which is the nameplate rating for the generator, rather than the presently specified 2500 Kw.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed amendment would correct a technical error by specifying the diesel generator rating in amperes and volts rather than kilowatts which depends upon the power factor of the test load. This change fits example (i) of the amendment not considered likely to involve a significant hazards consideration published in the Federal Register on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870) in that it involves a purely administrative change to correct an error. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that this amendment would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Kalamazoo Public Library, 315 South Rose Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49006.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

census, and interlaboratory comparison program. These provisions would also incorporate into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. Moreover, some of the Technical Specifications would involve administrative controls dealing with the requirements for the Radiological Environmental Operating Report.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the technical specifications. The license changes proposed here fall within this example. Specifically, the Commission, in a revision to Appendix I, 10 CFR Part 50 required licensees to improve and modify their radiological effluent systems in a manner that would keep releases of radiological material to unrestricted areas during normal operation as low as is reasonably achievable. In complying with this requirement it became necessary to add additional restrictions and controls to the Technical Specifications to assure compliance. This caused the need for the Technical Specifications described above to be proposed. This staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration since the change constitutes additional restrictions and controls that are not currently included in the Technical Specifications in order to meet the Commission's requirements related to "as low as is reasonably achievable."

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: February 7, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change revises the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1 Technical Specifications, Appendix A to incorporate the applicable NUREG-0737

changes recommended by Generic Letter 82-16.

The change to Section 6.2.2. "Facility Staff" is an administrative requirement to limit the working hours of plant personnel who perform safety related functions. This change is recommended by NUREG-0737, Item I.A.1.3.

The change to Section 6.9.1.5 "Annual Reports" incorporates an administrative requirement to include all challenges to the Pressurizer Power Operated Relief Valves (PORV's) or Pressurizer Safety Valves in the annual report. The change to Section 6.9.1.8 "Prompt Notification With Written Followup" incorporates an administrative requirement to report any failure of the pressurizer PORV's or Pressurizer Safety Valves within 24 hours and provide a written followup within 14 days. These changes are recommended by NUREG-0737, Item II.K.3.3.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14871). One of such involving no significant hazards considerations is one that constitute an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed change matches the example.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: December 16, 1982.

Description of amendment request: An Amendment (No. 61) was granted to permit operation of the unit with less than 75% of the incore flux detector thimbles functional. It was stated in that Amendment that the change would be temporary, and was applicable only to Fuel Cycle No. 3. The subject fuel cycle is over, and the staff would restore the Technical Specifications to what they were before Amendment No. 61. Specifically, operation of the unit with less than 75% of the thimbles functional will no longer be permitted.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these

standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14871). One of the examples involving no significant hazards considerations is one that "constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications." The above-mentioned restoration matches the example.

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

Attorney for the Licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esquire, Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: March 18, 1977 and July 1, 1977.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would add a new specification to the St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 1 (St. Lucie 1) technical specifications to specify inservice inspection and inservice testing requirements. Specifically, the new specification calls for the inservice of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 pumps and valves to be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASM Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and Applicable Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50.55a(g).

In addition specific inspection and testing surveillance intervals are specified based upon Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and Applicable Addenda (Code). In applying this new specification, certain of the technical specifications are deleted because they are covered by the Code or revised to meet the requirements of the Code.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to changes to make a license conform to changes in the regulations where the license changes result in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations (vii). In this case, the staff, in its letter of January 14, 1977, requested that the technical specifications of St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 1 be amended to revise

inservice inspection and testing programs in accordance with 10 CFR 50.55a(g). In response to that request the licensee proposed changes to the technical specifications in their letters of March 18, 1977 and July 1, 1977. The requested changes consist of a new specification that calls for the inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 pumps and valves to be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and Applicable Addenda (Code) as required by 10 CFR 50.55a(g). In addition, specific inspection and testing surveillance intervals are specified, based upon the Code. In applying this new specification, certain of the technical specifications are deleted because they are covered by the Code or revised to meet the requirements of the Code. These changes result in very minor changes to facility operations and are clearly in keeping with existing regulations. The changes proposed for St. Lucie 1 will also make the technical specifications similar to those previously approved for the operation of St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 2. On this basis, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Indian River Junior College Library, 3209 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, Florida 33450.

Attorney for the Licensee: Harold F. Esq., Lowenstein, Newman, Reis, and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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

Date of amendment request: January 20, 1983.

Description of amendment request:

The amendment would permit operation after numerical changes in the safety limits on shutdown margin and moderator coefficient limits are approved in conjunction with cycle 6 reload. The fuel element composition of the cycle 6 core will change from its current composition of Combustion Engineering assemblies to a combination of Exxon and Combustion Engineering assemblies. A low radial leakage fuel management plan has been developed that results in scatter-loading of the fresh fuel, as well as the exposed fuel, throughout the core. In addition to the changes made in the loading pattern a revised steam line break analysis has been performed and is contained in the supporting documents of this

application. The effect of these changes allows the proposed change in the shutdown margin requirement from equal to or greater than 5.0% delta k/k to equal to or greater than 3.6% delta k/k and to change the moderator temperature coefficient limits from less positive than 0.5×10^{-4} delta k/k/°F for less than 70% of rated thermal power and less negative than -2.2×10^{-4} delta k/k/°F at rated thermal power to less positive than 0.7×10^{-4} delta k/k/°F for less than 70% of rated thermal power and less negative than -2.8×10^{-4} delta k/k/°F at rated thermal power. These changes are proposed in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated January 20, 1983.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). Two of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration are: (1) for a nuclear power reactor, a change resulting from a nuclear reactor core reloading, if no fuel assemblies significantly different from those found previously acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at the facility in question are involved. This assumes that no significant changes are made to the acceptance criteria for the technical specifications, that the analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance with the technical specifications and regulations are not significantly changed, and that NRC had previously found such methods acceptable (iii); and (2) 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 (vi).

The composition of the fuel elements making up the cycle 6 core does not involve fuel assemblies significantly different from those previously found acceptable at St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 1 (St. Lucie 1), specifically those previously reviewed and approved for cycle 5. The neutronic characteristics of cycle 6 are similar to those of cycle 5 (Example iii). The proposed change would reduce the shutdown margin from 5.0% to 3.6% delta k/k. Since the shutdown margin is an intrinsic property of the reactor system and is not connected with any accident initiator,

the probability of any accident is unchanged by a change in the shutdown margin. The design basis event requiring the highest shutdown margin at St. Lucie 1 is the Hot Zero Power Main Steam Line Break. In performing the analysis for cycle 6, Exxon Nuclear Corporation (Exxon) vendor for the new cycle 6 fuel elements, was instructed to establish shutdown margin requirements that would lead to consequences no worse than those determined in the cycle 5 analysis performed by Combustion Engineering. Achievement of comparable consequences with a reduced shutdown margin is the result of differences in the calculation methodology used by the two vendors and documented in the application. This change in the shutdown margin does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of limiting accident from those previously evaluated since no modification will be made to St. Lucie 1 configuration or the manner in which it will be operated. The acceptance criterion for St. Lucie 1 for determining the adequacy of the shutdown margin is the requirement that there be no Departure from Nucleate Boiling after a Main Steam Line Break. The latest analysis performed by Exxon shows that no fuel failures are expected and that this criterion is met. Therefore, there appears to be no significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed amendment raises the maximum positive value for the Moderator Temperature Coefficient (Coefficient) at 70% of rated power and lowers the most negative value of the Coefficient at rated power. As is the case for the shutdown margin, the Coefficient is a property of the reactor system and not connected with any accident initiator. The Exxon analysis using Coefficient values fixed at the new proposed limits resulted in consequences that show no significant changes when compared to the cycle 5 analysis prepared by Combustion Engineering. Since there is no modification being made to St. Lucie 1 or its operation, there is no creation of any new or different kind of accident not previously evaluated. Since the licensee's reanalysis of the limiting accidents at the new limits result in no appreciable increase in the consequences, the margin of safety does not appear to be significantly reduced (Example (vii) of 10 CFR 50.92). On the basis, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Indian River Junior College

Library, 2109 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, Florida 33450.

Attorney for licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esq., Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point Plant, Units Nos. 3 and 4, Dade County, Florida

Date of amendment request: July 11, 1978.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specifications would be revised to add motor operated valves 863-A and 863-B to the existing list of valves required to have their power removed. These valves are installed in parallel and provide a crosstie from the discharge of the residual heat removal pumps to the system. The valves are closed during normal operation and remain closed upon initial Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) injection phase; the valves will have power removed from their motor operators by locking open the circuit breakers in the appropriate motor control centers. Power will be restored to the valve operators to accomplish the switchover from the ECCS injection mode to the recirculation mode. The request also includes provisions to allow restoration of power for a limited time to comply with the Technical Specification surveillance requirements.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether license amendments involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of these examples relate to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the plant Technical Specifications. This amendment is directly related to the example in that the inclusion of the valves (863-A and 863-B) is in accordance with the staff's position as an effective method to protect against single failure. Since these proposed changes add requirements in accordance with staff positions, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental and Urban Affairs Library, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199.

Attorney for licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue,

N.W., Suite 1214, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point Plant, Unit Nos. 3 and 4, Dade County, Florida

Date of amendment request: May 14, 1981.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would add new requirements for operability, visual inspections and periodic testing of mechanical snubbers to ensure that these devices are operable. Snubbers are attached to piping and equipment to provide restraint during a seismic or other event which initiates dynamic loads, yet allow slow motion such as that produced by thermal expansion. The amendment would also make revisions to the requirements for testing and inspection of hydraulic snubbers in accordance with current criteria and more clearly define the acceptance criteria for visual inspection and functional testing.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether license amendments involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples which were published in the *Federal Register* on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The licensee proposed the amendment in accordance with the current staff criteria provided in the Standard Technical Specifications addressing safety-related snubbers. The amendment request, discussed above, fits this example. On this basis the Commission proposes to determine that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental and Urban Affairs Library, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199.

Attorney for licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1214, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point Plant, Unit Nos. 3 and 4, Dade County, Florida

Date of amendments request: August 6, 1982.

Description of amendments request: These amendments involve changes to the Technical Specifications which will incorporate setpoints, surveillance requirements and limiting conditions of operation for the undervoltage protection systems for safety-related equipment.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether license amendments involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of these examples relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the plant Technical Specifications. These amendments fall directly within that example in that the additional restrictions imposed by the amendments are for modifications and new equipment installed to meet the current NRC criteria and requirements pertaining to degraded grid voltage protection. Since the proposed changes add requirements to ensure compliance with the regulations in accordance with staff positions, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental and Urban Affairs Library, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199.

Attorney for the licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Ross and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1214, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-251, Turkey Point Plant, Unit Nos. 50-250 and 3 and 4, Dade County, Florida

Date of amendment request: September 10, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed license amendments would provide new Technical Specification provisions which would define limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; concentration, dose and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid

wastes; total does; and radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, land use census, and interlaboratory comparison program. These provisions would also incorporate into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. Moreover, some of the Technical Specifications would involve administrative controls, specifically dealing with the process control program and offsite dose calculation manual.

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

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

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental and Urban Affairs Library, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199.

Attorney for the licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Ross and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1214, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point Plant, Unit Nos. 3 and 4, Dade County, Florida

Date of amendments request: December 29, 1982.

Description of amendments request: These amendments would revise and

add new requirements to the plant Technical Specifications for items required by NUREG-0737, Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements, for implementation by December 31, 1981. The amendments request includes: (1) additional Limiting Conditions of Operation for Purge Isolation; (2) adds setpoints for high containment radioactivity; (3) the surveillance requirements for Turbine Trip (Auto Stop Oil Pressure Switches) have been added and the basis for reactor trip on turbine trip provided; and (4) the additional requirement for prompt reporting of pressurizer power operated relief valves failures and safety value to the NRC.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether amendments involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of these examples is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed amendments are in response to Generic Letter 82.16, dated September 20, 1982, which requested that all PWR licensees review their Technical Specifications to verify they were consistent with the guidelines provided or request amendments as necessary. Since the proposed amendments add requirements or conditions in accordance with staff positions to ensure compliance with regulations, these proposed changes fall within the above example of a change not likely to involve significant hazards consideration and the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental and Urban Affairs Library, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199.

Attorney for licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1214, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point Plant, Unit Nos. 3 and 4, Dade County, Florida

Date of amendment request: May 5, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment request the deletion of non-radiological Environmental Technical Specifications (Appendix B) which address terrestrial,

biological and physical monitoring programs. The justification for the requested deletions are based on the results of eight years of studies and the conclusions drawn.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The amendments would delete the non-radiological monitoring programs related to terrestrial, biological and physical monitoring. The amendments would not change any current limitations related to the operation of the plants. Since no operational limitations are being changed, the staff proposes to determine that the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, do not create the possibility of a new or different accident from any accident previously evaluated and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The staff, therefore, proposes to determine that the amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental and Urban Affairs Library, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199.

Attorney for licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1214, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Florida Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251, Turkey Point Plant, Unit Nos. 3 and 4, Dade County, Florida

Date of amendments request: May 13, 1983.

Description of amendments request: These amendments involve Technical Specification changes which will incorporate an additional requirement for a monthly walkdown of all accessible safety-related flowpaths. The proposed change requires verifying that each accessible valve (manual, power operated or automatic) is in its correct position and verify the availability of power to those components related to the operability of the designated flowpaths.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether license amendments involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently

included in the plant Technical Specifications. These amendments are directly related to the example in that an additional restriction would be added to provide increased assurance of the availability of safety-related systems. This proposed change is in support of a commitment to the NRC staff and is consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse plants. Since the application is in response to NRC staff request, incorporates current requirements, will provide additional assurance of safety-related system availability, and constitutes additional limitations and restrictions not currently contained in the license, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental and Urban Affairs Library, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199.

Attorney for licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1214, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: December 11, 1979.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment requests Technical Specification (TS) changes and additions required for the Inservice Inspection (ISI) Program.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The ISI Program utilizes the Non-Destructive Examination methods to determine structural integrity of power plant components. The proposed changes to TS add additional inspection requirements by including Class 2 and 3 components as well as Class 1. The proposed TS additions would require inservice inspection of the reactor coolant system in accordance with the requirements of the Edition and Addenda of Section XI of the ASME Code as specified in 10 CFR 50.551. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for no significant hazards considerations determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples of action likely to involve no significant hazards considerations is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The proposed amendment, therefore, falls within the category of example (ii) because it involves an additional control not previously included in the TS. On this basis, the NRC staff proposes to find that this license amendment does not involve significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company, Docket No. 50-316, D. C. Cook Unit No. 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: September 22, 1978.

Description of amendment request: This amendment for the Donald C. Cook Plant, Unit 2, involves an analysis to investigate the long-term containment temperature and pressure response to a postulated steam line break using the LOTIC-3 computer code. This analysis is in response to License Condition 2.C(3)(g) which was the subject of License Amendment No. 6 issued on June 16, 1978. Having presented the required reanalysis to the approved version of LOTIC-3, the licensee's proposal would remove the license condition as having been satisfied by the analysis provided.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: One of the Commission's examples (48 FR 14870) involving no significant hazards relates to a relief granted upon demonstration of acceptable operation from an operating restriction that was imposed because acceptable operation was not yet demonstrated. The proposed removal of the license condition is similar to the example in that the licensee has now performed (or demonstrated) a detailed computer analysis (or operation) and has fulfilled the requirements to the criteria previously found acceptable to the NRC. The License Amendment No. 6 issued on June 16, 1978 also found that the existing analysis results at that time involved no significant hazards consideration but that the revised reanalysis to meet the updated staffs approval of LOTIC-3 would be necessary. Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Maude Reston Palenske

Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: April 8, 1983.

Description of amendment request: These amendments for the Donald C. Cook Plants involve adding statements to the Technical Specifications which would limit overtime worked by plant staff members in accordance with the NRC Policy Statement (Generic Letter No. 82-12 issued on June 15, 1982) and would require an annual report of all challenges to the pressurizer power operated relief valves or safety valves. These Technical Specification changes are in response to NRC Generic Letter 82-16 issued September 20, 1982, and cover Technical Specifications for TMI Action Items from NUREG-0737 which were to be implemented by December 31, 1981.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing examples of amendments that are likely to not involve a significant hazards consideration. These were published in the *Federal Register* on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). One of the examples involving no significant hazards considerations relates to changes that constitute additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The changes proposed by these amendments are directly related to this example. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: November 30, 1978.

Description of amendment request: Revises the Technical Specification (TS) to include a program for verification of sensor response time in the Reactor Protection System to ensure that protective instrumentation will function within the prescribed time limits and is in response to an NRC request during the review of the licensee's application for an operating license.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration: exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: "(ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." The proposed amendment is an example of an amendment that is considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration in that the change constitutes additional limitations, restrictions, or controls not presently included in the Technical Specification and is thus similar to Example (ii) of 48 FR 14870 cited above.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Esquire, Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: November 10, 1981.

Description of amendment request: An amendment to modify the Technical Specification (TS) pertaining to six miscellaneous matters: the first, adds a paragraph under Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements to provide a reference to the Accident Monitoring Instrumentation tables; the second, proposes to add a specific Recirculation

Pump Trip (RPT) system trip level setting (response time) and delete the note "that the trip level setting would be determined by testing" to ensure the trip level setting is within the design criteria; the third, adds a 30 day reporting requirement to the Fire Suppression System Technical Specification to make it consistent with the wording of other similar sections; the fourth, changes a position title from Assistant Vice President-Nuclear to Director, Nuclear Generation for the purpose of organizational streamlining; the fifth, proposes alternatives to the requirements of High Radiation Areas concerning barriers, devices, signals and controls to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 20.203. The licensee currently complies with the regulation; however, the proposed changes are more explicit, thus better clarifying the requirements and would enhance the licensee's ability to comply with the regulation; and the sixth, adds a reference to the Fire Protection Systems for which Special Reports shall be submitted to make it consistent with other similar sections.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples involving no significant hazards consideration include "(i) a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature; and, (ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by these examples in that: the first proposed change regarding a reference to the Accident Monitoring Instrumentation tables is intended to achieve consistency throughout the specification and is therefore similar to Example (i); the second proposed change concerns the RPT system trip level setting (response time) and is intended to provide a more stringent surveillance requirement and is thus similar to Example (ii); the third proposed change revises the section on Special Reports to include the requirement "within 30 days" to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications and is thus similar to Example (i); the fourth proposed change is a position title change and is considered a change in

nomenclature because no position responsibilities have been altered and is thus similar to Example (i); the fifth proposed change concerns alternative to High Radiation Area requirements in 10 CFR 20.203 to which the licensee currently complies, but is intended to provide additional restriction and controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications and is thus similar to Example (ii); the sixth proposed change concerns adding a reference to the Fire Protection Systems Special Reports section and is intended to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications and is thus similar to Example (i). Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to examples for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Esquire, Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: April 6, 1983.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification (TS) changes to incorporate revised radiological effluent and environmental monitoring limiting conditions for operation, action statements, and surveillance requirements. The proposed changes are intended to implement the design objectives and requirements of 10 CFR 50.34(a), 10 CFR 50.36a, 10 CFR 20, 10 CFR 50 Appendix A-General Design Criteria 60 and 64, and 40 CFR 190.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One such example involves a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations.

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

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Esquire, Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Lowenstein, Newman, Reis and Axelrad, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: October 7, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes to the technical Specifications provide additional assurance that the purge air supply, exhaust and bypass valves will operate to assure containment isolation in the event of an in-containment accident. These changes require regular testing and surveillance to obtain this assurance. Specifically, leakage integrity tests would be performed on the containment purge and vent isolation

valves at 3 month intervals to identify excessive degradation of the resilient seats for these valves. It also specifies intervals for valve seat inspection and replacement.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Prior to this application for amendment, there were no technical specifications covering the testing and surveillance of the purge air valves. Hence, adoption of this specification would constitute additional limitation, restriction or control not presently include in the technical specifications. This type of change matches example (ii) (48 FR 14870) of examples of amendments not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. Hence the Commission proposes to determine that this change involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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

Date of amendment request: February 18, 1983.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would allow the licensee to use the new YAEC-1 critical heat flux correlation as a basis for plant operation. YAEC-1 is an approved critical heat flux correlation. In implementing this new correlation, certain parameters of the reactor protective system and certain limiting conditions for operation will be modified. Actual plant operating margins will be broadened slightly because of the greater accuracy of the YAEC-1 correlation. However, both the YAEC-1 correlation and W-3, the existing correlation, provide a 95 percent probability that the departure from nucleate boiling heat flux is not exceeded in operation. The amendment would also correct a typographical error and a discrepancy in reporting inspection results. The latter are purely administrative changes, correcting minor errors made in previous licensing actions.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The use of the YAEC-1 critical heat flux correlation does not represent a relaxation of safety limits, or the bases and criteria used to determine these limits. Since both correlations provide the fundamental assurance that the departure from nucleate boiling heat

flux is not exceeded with a 95 percent probability level. Hence safety margins remain unchanged from when the plant was licensed.

The remainder of this change is purely administrative in that it corrects a misspelled word and a change accidentally omitted in Amendment No. 68. The Commission has provided examples of certain types of changes in 48 FR 14870 which are not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. An example of such a change is (i), a purely administrative change. The remainder of this change fits this criteria. Therefore, we propose to determine that these changes have no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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

Date of amendment request: April 8, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change is a revision to the Administrative Controls Section of Maine Yankee's Technical Specifications which improves and clarifies the section. The change would incorporate over thirty individual changes to this section.

One of these changes would relocate a requirement from Section 5.7 to the Safety Limits Section (2.0) of the Technical Specifications. It also upgrades this requirement to be consistent with 10 CFR 50.36. This upgrading makes the safety limit more restrictive since it requires the plant to be placed in hot shutdown in lieu of hot standby when a safety limit is violated.

The balance of the proposed change is purely administrative in nature. It does not involve safety system settings, limiting conditions for operation or surveillance considerations. Specifically these proposed changes cover:

—*Organization.*—Would clarify definitions and reflect offsite organizational changes. No loss of organizational quality is involved.

—*Facility Staff Qualifications.*—Would upgrade requirements for and provide flexibility in specifying staff qualifications.

—*Training.*—Would change specification to reflect current practice and for consistency with Appendix R and Standard Technical Specifications.

—*Review and Audit.*—Would allow the Plant Operations Review Committee to use subcommittees for routine reviews of procedures and other matters not central to plant safety. However, responsibility for the reviews would remain with the complete committee.

—*Safety Limit Violations.*—Would revise the specification to reflect the addition of Specification 2.0.

—*Procedures.*—Would specify management controls on changing instructions associated with design changes.

—*Reporting Requirements.*—Would update and make this section more internally consistent.

—*Record Retention and High Radiation Areas.*—Would make this section more internally consistent.

In addition, one section would be deleted as no longer applicable. A summary of these proposed changes is contained in the licensee's application for amendment dated April 8, 1983.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). Purely administrative changes to Technical Specifications are explicitly considered not likely to involve significant hazards.

Changes that constitute an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications match the example (ii) (48 FR 14870) of the examples considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations.

The proposed changes presented here fall into these categories. The safety limit to be transferred to Section 2.0 would be made restrictive by requiring the plant to be in hot shutdown versus hot standby.

The remaining proposed changes are purely administrative in nature. Even where these changes propose changes to the structure of an organization or the way it functions, they are effectively administrative in that the quality of the organization or the work they produce does not significantly affect plant safety. These changes do not change plant safety.

They represent changes similar to example (i) (48 FR 14870) of the examples the Commission has provided that are not likely to involve significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, Wiscasset, Maine 04578.

Attorney for licensee: J. A. Ritsher, Esq., Ropes & Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

National Bureau of Standards, Docket No. 50-184, Gaithersburg, Maryland

Date of amendment request: May 5, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would incorporate into the license the Commission-approved Physical Security Plan. The Plan provides for the protection of special nuclear material of moderate strategic significance.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). The proposed amendment is similar to Example (ii), "A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications; . . ." in that amendment would add a license condition (both technical specifications and license conditions are requirements of the license) to incorporate the Commission-approved Physical Security Plan into the license. The Physical Security Plan provides for the protection of special nuclear material of moderate strategic significance. (The Physical Security Plan consists of Safeguards Information of the type specified in 10 CFR 73.21 and accordingly is withheld from public disclosure.) On this basis, the Commission proposes to determine that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: None.

Attorney for licensee: Allen J. Farrar, Administration Building 1128, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.

NRC Branch Chief: Cecil O. Thomas.

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

Date of amendment request: June 9, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would permit operation after approval of changes to the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications that assure compliance with Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 10. The amendment provides new Technical Specification sections defining limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; concentration, dose and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists

of a monitoring program, land use census, and interlaboratory comparison program. This change also incorporates into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. In addition, some changes were made in administrative controls, specifically dealing with the process control program and the offsite dose calculation manual. The amendment is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated June 9, 1982.

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

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

Local Public Document Room location: Auburn Public Library, 188 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68304.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: March 3, 1977.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would make changes to

the Technical Specification to modify the list of Reactor Coolant System Isolation Valves and Primary Containment Isolation Valves as well as other provisions of the license to achieve conformance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix J. The proposed change is in response to an NRC request dated August 7, 1975 that asked the licensee to review their containment leakage program and provide a plan for achieving compliance with Appendix J.

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

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

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: March 22, 1978.

Description of amendment request: An amendment to the Technical Specifications adding Limiting Conditions for Operation, surveillance requirements, and changes to the bases for the Fire Protection Program at the facility. The proposed change was submitted at NRC's request using guidance provided by NRC. The change is intended to bring the Technical Specification in concert with the fire protection program by listing additional detectors installed, clarifying reporting requirements, and specifying requirements for newly installed fire protection systems.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include:

(1) A purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature.

(ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement.

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by these examples in that: (1) They would provide administrative clarity by correcting the numbering system and typographical errors; (2) they would provide Limiting Conditions for Operation and surveillance requirements for newly installed fire protection equipment.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esquire, Conner & Wetterhahn, Suite

1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: March 22, 1978.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would make changes to the Technical Specification to the listed isolation valves for the nitrogen gas make-up lines to the drywell and suppression chamber for Containment Atmosphere Dilution (CAD) and Gas Analyzer Systems. The amendment further clarifies when and for what purpose the particular valves are to be used. The changes are required to incorporate in the Specifications the above mentioned valves which were added with the installation of these systems.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: " * * *(ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example in that the proposed change would add Limiting Conditions for Operation and surveillance requirements on the nitrogen make-up lines for the CAD and Gas Analyzer isolation valves that previously had no specifications imposed, and is thus similar to the example described above.

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: March 22, 1978 and May 2, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would make changes to the Technical Specifications to: (1) accommodate shifts in transition temperature for the reactor pressure vessel materials that were induced by radiation damage. These shifts are accounted by revisions of the plant pressure-temperature limits for heating up and cooling down the reactor vessel. Periodic review and adjustment, if necessary, of the curves from the in-situ surveillance sample test results are required by 10 CFR 50, Appendices G and H; and (2) to revise the surveillance coupon program for the facility since one of three reactor vessel material sample containers was inadvertently misplaced during a refueling outage. The proposed change would delete the requirement for a third, standby capsule. Industry surveillance data will be used to supplement the test results obtained from the facility surveillance program. This constitutes an integrated surveillance program. Integrated surveillance programs are acceptable under the provisions of 10 CFR 50, Appendices G and H.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration includes a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations.

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example in that: (1) the change to the pressure-temperature limits are similar to example above because the regulations in 10 CFR 50, Appendices G and H required updating of pressure-temperature limits based on the surveillance program. The proposed license change would result in very minor changes to the facility operation clearly in keeping with the regulations; and (2) the change to the surveillance program is similar to the example above because provisions are incorporated in 10 CFR 50, Appendices G and H for

relief from the number of surveillance capsules required if the licensee used an integrated surveillance program utilizing results from other facilities. The proposed change would not affect facility operation in that the information obtained from the integrated surveillance program would provide more information than could be obtained from the third standby capsule and is clearly in keeping with the regulations. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves a proposed change that is similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: April 14, 1980 superseded by March 20, 1981.

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

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: ". . . (ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example in that the proposed change would add Limiting Conditions for

Operation and surveillance requirements on existing and newly installed snubbers, and is thus similar to the example described above.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esq., Conner & Watterhahn, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: April 18, 1980 superseded by April 21, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would make changes to the Administrative Controls (Section 6.0) of the Technical Specifications to: (1) Accommodate an increase and improved staff in the on-site organization, correct title changes in the organization and reflect the strengthening of the Quality Assurance (QA) function by elevation of the Manager of QA to a Vice President reporting directly to the President; (2) include changes for the frequency of audits related to the Safeguards Contingency Plan and Emergency Preparedness program from every 2 years to annually; (3) change the provisions for entering and controlling entry to high radiation areas by imposing additional conditions similar to those included in current Standard Technical Specifications for BWRs; and (4) correct a typographical error with regard to the provisions for the fire brigade staff.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The following were included in the examples as actions involving no significant hazards consideration: (i) a purely administrative change to the technical specification, (ii) a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the technical specifications,

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

Date of amendment request: August 30, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add to the Technical Specifications a requirement for an operable vent path from the reactor vessel and pressurizer to the containment. It would also add the surveillance testing requirements to verify its operability.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: This proposed amendment would add to the Technical Specifications (TSs) a requirement that the Primary Coolant Gas Vent System required by NUREG-0737, Item II.B.1 be operable and verified to be operable by periodic testing. This proposed amendment fits example (ii) of the examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations published in the *Federal Register* (48 FR 14670, April 6, 1983), in that it adds additional limitations and requirements not presently in the TSs. Therefore, the Commission proposes to find that this amendment would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Kalamazoo Public Library, 315 South Rose Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49006.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: March 14, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add periodic station battery service and discharge tests to the Technical Specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed change constitutes a more stringent surveillance requirement which is one of the examples (ii) published in the *Federal Register* (48 FR 14670, April 6, 1983) that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. It also conforms to present licesing requirements as given in Standard Technical Specifications. Therefore, we have determined that this proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Kalamazoo Public Library, 315 South Rose Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49006.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of application for amendment: December 8, 1981.

Description: The proposed amendment requests Technical Specifications (TS) changes of four general types: (1) incorporation of additional limitations to protect against degraded grid voltage and pipe cracking and new requirements to facilitate fire protection and inservice inspection, (2) revision of existing TS's reflecting changes in plant organization and other administrative changes not affecting safety, (3) revision of the existing TS's on electrical power systems to be consistent with the STS format, and (4) modification of the fuel inventory and fuel change-out requirements of the Emergency Service Water Supply System (ESWSS) engines.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Further description of the Item 1 changes follows. The licensee would install a second level of undervoltage relaying equipment to protect safety related electrical equipment from failures caused by degraded grid voltage. In response to NUREG-0313 (BWR Pipe-cracking) the licensee would implement augmented inservice inspection and leak detection of austenitic stainless steel piping that is susceptible to intergranular stress-corrosion cracking. In response to a previously issued fire protection safety evaluation and license amendment, the licensee has proposed Technical Specifications to implement most fire protection modifications evaluated in the Fire Protection Safety Evaluation, dated July 27, 1979 (License Amendment 17). Also, the licensee proposed Technical Specifications which would implement additional inservice inspection and inservice testing requirements in accordance with current ASME code criteria, to demonstrate the physical integrity of piping and the operability of pumps and valves; except where relief has been granted by the NRC. Thus, it can be seen that the Technical Specifications proposed above would incorporate additional operating limitations not currently

present in the La Crosse Technical Specifications.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (ii) of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. On this basis, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the application for the above changes does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Changes proposed in Item 2 include purely administrative changes, such as making the Standard Technical Specification Definitions applicable for all parts of the La Crosse Technical Specifications; deleting a blank page which contained no Technical Specifications; deleting a redundant requirement; since a single specification is sufficient; and deleting an ambiguous specification which might possibly be misinterpreted, since the necessary requirement is stated more clearly in a separate specification.

The Commission's guidance (48 FR 14870) states that one example (i) involving no significant hazards consideration is a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specification, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. On this basis, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the application for the Item (2) changes does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Changes to the plant personnel organization were also proposed by the licensee which modified the organizational framework but did not reduce the number of people actually on-site. The NRC has reviewed these changes and has found that they are acceptable under current licensing criteria. These changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, do not create the possibility of a new or different reduction in a margin of safety. On this basis, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the proposed plant organizational changes do not involve significant hazards considerations.

Item 3 changes include a complete revision of the existing Technical Specifications on electrical power systems to conform to the Standard Technical Specification format. The proposed specifications will be reviewed to ensure that existing safety

margins for electrical power systems are not degraded and, whenever possible, will be compared to Standard Technical Specifications to ensure that existing safety margins are consistent with current licensing criteria. These changes will not decrease safety margins and in many cases more conservative limitations would be imposed. Thus, these changes are administrative in nature but also impose additional limitations. The Commission's guidance (48 FR 14870) provides examples which indicate that both of these types of changes will likely involve no significant hazards considerations. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the Item (3) change involve no significant hazards considerations.

The changes discussed in Item 4 above would reduce by 20% the required amount of fuel in ESWSS engines to account for changes in volume due to ambient temperature changes and would require that ESWSS fuel be changed out twice a year (instead of quarterly) since available fuel volatility is only changed twice a year. To compensate for these modifications, the licensee has proposed the each ESWSS engine be started and run at each fuel change-out to consume and replenish all old fuel that could not be drained from the engine. In addition, the licensee has committed to implement written emergency procedures which will describe how additional fuel may be obtained if the ESWSS is needed to flood the containment building. Although the reduction in fuel inventory and frequency of fuel replacement may slightly impact the availability of the ESWSS engines, the licensee's proposed measures will adequately compensate for the reduction and the changes will not have a significant effect on plant safety. Accordingly, these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the application for the changes in Item (4) does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for license: O. S. Heistand, Jr., Morgan, Lewis, and Backius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: June 9, 1982.

Description of amendment request: Proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) would require quarterly testing of containment ventilation (purge) valves to detect excessive degradation of the resilient seats.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As a result of Multi-Plant Action B-24 (Containment Purge and Vent Review), the NRC staff requested that the licensee propose such a technical specification. This testing should be required in addition to the valve leakage tests that are currently required at each refueling outage. The proposed amendment would require quarterly testing of the 20" containment ventilation valves in order to detect possible gross degradation of the resilient valve seats.

The Commission has provided guidance for determining whether proposed changes involve significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (ii) of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The requested action herein imposed additional surveillance requirements not presently included in the license and, thus, is within the purview of this example. On this basis, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: April 4, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The request for technical specification (TS) changes would incorporate NUREG-0737 TMI requirements which would restrict overtime of certain plant personnel and would result in the

licensee reporting all indicated operations and failures to reclose of primary system safety valves for pressure relief purposes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: NRC Generic Letter 83-02 requested that BWR licensees review their Technical Specifications to determine if they were consistent with BWR Model Technical Specifications provided for NUREG-0737 TMI Action Plan Requirements. Dairyland Power responded to this request and submitted an amendment request to add two specifications. The proposed Technical Specifications would add requirements to (1) restrict overtime of certain plant personnel when performing duties which may affect the safety of the public and (2) report all indicated operations and failures to reclose (if any) of primary system safety valves for pressure relief purposes.

The Commission has provided guidance for making these determinations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (ii) of actions involving no significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The requested action fits this example. On this basis, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the application for the above changes does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: June 8, 1983, which supersedes application dated September 15, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed license amendment would provide new Technical Specification provisions which would define limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; concentration, dose and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, land use

(iii) a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulation, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operation clearly in keeping with the regulations.

The changes proposed in the application are encompassed by the above stated examples as follows: (1) The change is similar to examples (i) and (ii) above in that the organizational structure is more restrictive because it more specifically defines the organization and strengthens the QA function and is administrative because it corrects the organizational titles; (2) the change is similar to examples (ii) and (iii) above in that the proposed audit frequencies are necessary to bring the Technical Specifications into conformance with 10 CFR 50.54(5) and 10 CFR 73.40d and is more restrictive since it increases the required audit frequencies; (3) the change in the radiation protection provisions is similar to example (ii) above in that additional limitations similar to those in Standard Technical Specifications are to be adopted; and (4) the change to the fire brigade staff is for the correction of a typographical error and, therefore, administrative.

Based on the above, the staff proposed to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: May 20, 1980.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would make changes to the Technical Specification regarding the use of the term "operable" as it applies to safety systems in power reactors. The proposed change includes a definition of "operable" as well as a section on operability requirements in the Limiting Conditions for Operation and surveillance section of the Technical Specification. In particular, the proposed change requires the normal or emergency power source as well as the safety system itself to be operable or the unit be placed in a condition required for the individual system itself. The proposed change was in response to

a generic letter issued to all licensees on April 10, 1980 on Multi-Plant Item D-17. The letter provided proposed revised Technical Specifications for each licensee, and requested that they be adopted.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: ". . . (ii) A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example in that the proposed change is more restrictive because it states a previously implicit requirement for support systems to be functional and provides a reference to the action statements for Limiting Conditions of Operation for each particular safety system.

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: October 22, 1982.

Description of amendment request: Approvals of three unrelated changes are requested:

1. Revise Technical Specification 3.1.3.3 Action b to allow startup and power operation, including mode changes, with one inoperable reed switch position indicator channel per control element assembly (CEA) group, provided the associated CEAs can be moved to the full out position and confirmed to be in that position.

2. Revise Technical Specification 3.5.1 Limiting Condition for Operation b to expand the allowable volume band for the safety injection tanks (SIT) from 1107-1170 to 1080-1190 cubic feet, in order to provide greater operating flexibility.

3. Revise Technical Specifications 3.6.1.3 relative to containment air locks and 3.6.1.1 relative to containment integrity to clarify the applicability of containment integrity requirements when the containment air lock seal is inoperable. TS 3.6.1.3 presently allows operation of the unit to continue for 24 hours after an air lock door is found to be inoperable. The proposed changes in TS 3.6.1.3 would allow unit operation to continue with an air lock door inoperable until performance of the next required overall air lock leakage test provided the operable air lock door is locked within 24 hours and is verified to be locked closed at least once per 31 days. In addition, a footnote would be added to the TS 3.6.1.1 Action statement to make clear that "operation within the time allowance of the TS 3.6.1.3 Action statements does not constitute a loss of containment integrity."

To be consistent with Standard Technical Specifications, TS 3.6.1.1 would also be modified by changing the ACTION statement to require the unit to be in hot standby within 6 hours, and then in cold shutdown within the next 30 hours, instead of simply requiring that the unit be in cold shutdown within 36 hours, following the first hour without primary containment integrity. An addition to the related surveillance requirement TS 4.6.1.1 would require verification that a combined penetration leakage rate is not exceeded after each closing of a penetration subject to type B testing (except the containment air lock).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance (48 FR 14870) in the form of examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. These examples are applicable to the proposed changes in the following manner:

1. The revision of TS 3.1.3.3 action b is encompassed by example (vi) which applies 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." Since the Technical Specifications

presently do not allow changing the reactor operating modes if the remedial measures of a TS action statement (i.e., equipment inoperable) are implemented, startup of the reactor with an inoperable reed switch position indicating channel is prohibited. The proposed change would allow startup and mode changes and may in some minor way reduce a safety margin. However, such operation would not be of greater concern than full-power operation with an inoperable channel, which is presently permitted under TS 3.1.3.3. Further, the CEA "full-in and "full-out" limit switches provide an independent means of determining the CEA positions when they are at either of those positions, as they are required to be if an associated position indicating channel becomes inoperative.

2. Example (vi) also applies to the proposed revision of TS 3.5.1 since lowering the SIT volume lower limit from 1107 to 1080 cubic feet would slightly reduce the volume of borated water available from this source to cover the core following a loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). However, the proposed limits were used in the Millstone Unit 2 Cycle 5 LOCA analysis in 1982 and the results were found to meet the Commission's acceptance criteria for emergency core cooling system (10 CFR 50.46). The proposed limits were also used in the licensee's Cycle 6 LOCA analysis, which assumes an increase from 9.4% to 15.3% of steam generator tubes plugged, and our preliminary assessment of it indicates only a 10°F increase in the calculated peak clad temperature to 2055°F. This is well below the limit of 2200°F imposed by 10 CFR 50.46.

3. Example (vi), described above, applies to the changes in TS 3.6.1.3 and 3.6.1.1 as they would allow continued operation beyond 24 hours after an airlock door is found inoperable. This may in some way reduce a safety margin, but the Commission staff regards this possibility as extremely unlikely since the inoperable door would be closed and the operable airlock door must be locked closed before such continued operation is permitted. The other changes in TS 3.6.1.1 and 4.6.1.1 are similar to Commission example (ii) which applies to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The proposed requirements of TS 3.6.1.1 and 4.6.1.1 are additional limitations not presently in the Technical Specifications.

Based on the above, the Commission proposes to determine that the

requested action does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for Licensee: William H. Cuddy, Esquire, Day, Berry and Howard, One Constitution Plaza, Hartford, Connecticut 06103.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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

Date of amendment request: November 22, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications to bring them into compliance with Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 50. They would provide new Technical Specification sections defining limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; concentration, dose and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, a land use census, and an interlaboratory comparison program. The procedures to be followed and the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements would be stated in the Licensee's Radiological Effluent Monitoring and Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (REMOCM).

The amendments would also incorporate the revised radiological specifications into Appendix A of the Technical Specifications and remove those in Appendix B.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission, in a revision to Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 50, required licensees to improve and modify their radiological effluent systems in a manner that would keep releases of radioactive material to unrestricted areas during normal operation as low as is reasonably achievable. In complying with this requirement, it is necessary to provide additional restrictions and controls in the Technical Specifications to assure compliance. The proposed amendments would meet this objective by adding the Technical Specification sections described above.

The Commission has provided guidance in the form of examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). Example

(ii) regarding a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the technical specifications is clearly applicable to these proposed amendments. The NRC staff therefore proposes to determine that this application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: William H. Cuddy, Esq., Day, Berry & Howard, One Constitution Plaza, Waterford, Connecticut 06103.

NRC Branch Chiefs: Robert A. Clark, Dennis Crutchfield.

Northern States Power Company, Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: January 30, 1976 as revised May 4, 1976 as further revised on September 2, 1977 and supplemented on March 20, 1978.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements to incorporate the requirements of Appendix J on the lead tight integrity of the primary reactor containment and systems and components which penetrate the containment. The proposed changes were requested by the NRC of all licensees to bring them into conformance with Section 50.54(o) and Appendix J of 10 CFR Part 50 "Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing for Water-Cooled Power Reactors."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870).

The examples of actions which involve no significant hazards consideration include a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The changes proposed in this application for amendment are encompassed by this example because restrictions would be added to conform to the Rules and Regulations of the Commission. The published Section 50.54(o) and Appendix J of 10 CFR Part 50 ensure that system and components which penetrate the containment are tested on a regular

interval and the leak-tight integrity of the primary reactor containment is ensured.

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

Local Public Document Room

location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

**Northern States Power Company,
Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear
Generating Plant, Wright County,
Minnesota**

Date of amendment request: May 15, 1980.

Description of amendment request: Request for an amendment to the Technical Specifications to modify the definition of the term "Operable" as it applies to the single-failure criterion for safety systems. The proposed change was in response to NRC's April 10, 1980 letter, which was sent to all licensees, requesting that they revise the definition of "Operable" consistent with guidance issued by the NRC. The NRC has proposed a revised definition that is more restrictive in that it extends the definition to include systems that are associated with the system in question.

The current Technical Specification define a system or component as "Operable" "when it is capable of performing its intended function in its required manner." The proposed changes will preserve the single-failure criterion by requiring all redundant components of safety related systems to be "Operable." When the required redundancy is not maintained, either due to equipment failure or maintenance outage, action is required, within a specified time, to change the operating mode of the plant to place it in a safe condition. These provisions would assure that no set of equipment outages would be allowed to persist that would result in the facility being in an unprotected condition.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR

14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include actions which are changes that constitute an additional limitation, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example because the guidance provided by the NRC for the revised definition of the term "Operable" is more restrictive in that the operability of systems associated with the system in question must also now be considered.

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

*Local Public Document Room
location:* Environmental Conservation Library Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

**Northern States Power Company,
Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear
Generating Plant, Wright County,
Minnesota.**

Date of amendment request: September 24, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The revisions to the Technical Specifications would increase the allowable deviation in the trip setting of the temperature switches in the main steam line tunnel from 2" to 10°F. The current Technical Specifications specify a trip setpoint of 200°F, with an allowable deviation of 2°F. The proposed changes would authorize an increase of the allowable deviation to 10°F, but would not change the "as left" setpoint of 200°F. The licensee has requested the proposed changes because the licensee considers the current deviation to be overly restrictive, resulting in unnecessary reportable events.

To justify an increase in the "as-found" setpoint for these switches, the amendment is supported by a report which was prepared by the licensee's consultant, EDS Nuclear, Inc., and was attached to the September 24, 1982 application. The report concludes that a small break of 5 to 10 gpm is sufficient to increase the tunnel temperature to 212°F. Since the licensee will maintain the "as left" setpoint at 200°F and is

only proposing to change the allowable deviation to 10°F, the "as-found" setting is likely to be below 212°F. At a temperature of 212" or less, the analysis shows that the main steam line tunnel temperature switches would isolate and limit releases of radioactivity before the requirements of 10 CFR Part 100 are exceeded.

Other changes proposed in the September 24, 1982 application are being handled by separate action.

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. The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include (vi) a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan.

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example because a deviation of 10 degrees in the positive direction does constitute a relaxation of the current Technical Specification limit, and thus, may reduce in some way a safety margin. However, the staff's criteria require that the licensee have the capability to detect a postulated break within the temperature increase. Temperature monitoring instrumentations is provided in the main steam line tunnel to detect leaks in this area. Trips are provided on this instrumentation and, when exceeded, will isolate the reactor. For small breaks, the temperature monitoring switches must give the isolation trip signal before the limits of 10 CFR Part 100 are exceeded. The instrument's setpoint must detect small leaks of 5 to 10 gpm and for large breaks, it is a back-up to high steam flow instrumentation. Because the licensee has submitted information which concludes that the main steam line tunnel temperature would increase to 212 degrees as a result of a postulated break, the deviation proposed by the licensee when combined with the setpoint, remains within the scope of the acceptance criteria specified in 10 CFR Part 100.

At Monticello, a total of 16 switches are located in the main steam line tunnel with 1 out of 2 taken twice logic, providing the safety function.

Furthermore, the licensee states that the temperature switch array is in adequate proximity to the piping to sense high temperature without the necessity of the discharged fluid heating the entire main steam line tunnel to 212°F. The probability of all 16 switches failing at once is very unlikely especially since only 1 out of 2 (taken twice) are needed to provide the trip function. The proposed change will minimize the reporting occurrences to the Commission.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

**Northern States Power Company,
Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear
Generating Plant, Wright County,
Minnesota**

Date of amendment request:
September 24, 1982.

Description of amendment request:
The amendment would add new Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements for Residual Heat Removal System (RHR) in the Shutdown Cooling Mode. This proposed change was made in response to an NRC request and will specify isolation setpoints to protect the low pressure piping which supplies water to cool the reactor when it is cooling down or shutdown. These setpoints will permit injection of cooling water only when reactor vessel pressure is less than the RHR cut-in permissive setpoint.

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

The proposed changes are encompassed by this example because additional limitations will be added to

the Technical Specifications by specifying Limiting Conditions for Operations and Surveillance Requirements for the RHR Shutdown Cooling System. The proposed changes were made at the request of the NRC and will specify limitations to protect the system from high pressures.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

**Northern States Power Company,
Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear
Generating Plant, Wright County,
Minnesota**

Date of amendment request:
September 24, 1982.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications would clarify the Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements associated with jet pump operability. The licensee states that the proposed surveillance program would provide additional assurance that jet pump degradation will be detected before actual jet pump failure. The proposed changes would prescribe a program to monitor various parameters, such as core flow, core plate differential pressure, recirculation pump flow and speed, so the acceptability of jet pump performance can be clearly determined. The proposed Limiting Conditions for Operation contain the minimum acceptable standards, and when they are not met, the reactor would be shut down within 24 hours because an inoperable jet pump may present a hazard in the event of a large break accident by reducing the capability of reflooding the core. Other proposed changes requested in this application will be noticed separately.

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. The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration

involve (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 changes in this application for amendment are encompassed by this example because the revisions to the Technical Specifications would clarify the Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements associated with jet pump operability. The licensee states that the proposed surveillance program would provide additional assurance that jet pump degradation will be detected before actual jet pump failure. By being a better diagnostic tool, the proposed changes would add more control for plant operations.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

**Northern States Power Company,
Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear
Generating Plant, Wright County,
Minnesota**

Date of amendment request: February 15, 1983.

Description of amendment request:
The amendment would add new Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements for the Turbine Bypass Valves and the Feedwater/Turbine Trip on high water level. The turbine bypass valves mitigate the pressure transient following turbine trips and are assumed, in the reload analysis, to function during a feedwater controller failure. The feedwater/turbine trip on high reactor water level mitigates the event of feedwater controller failure and is assumed to function during that transient. The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications were requested of the licensee in a Safety Evaluation from the NRC, dated December 6, 1982, in order to assure the operability of systems for which the licensee took credit in its analyses.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include actions which are changes that constitute an additional limitation or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example because additional limitations would be added for the turbine bypass valves and the Feedwater/Turbine trip on high water level (in conformance to the request made by the staff to assure the operability of these systems). Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to the examples for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al. Docket 50-275, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, San Luis Obispo, California

Date of amendment request: December 17, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The application requests Technical Specification Appendix A of the Operating License be revised to increase the frequency of audit from 24 months to 12 months for auditing the Emergency Plan, the Security Plan and their associated procedures.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The NSHC determination was based upon matching the amendment request to the example (vii) of paragraph 50.92. The requested change in Technical Specifications constitutes "A change to make a license conform to change in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations." The proposed amendment will modify the Technical Specifications to conform with changes in Section 50.50

(t) and 73.40 (d) of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations referred to in example (vii).

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

Attorneys for Licensee: Philip A. Crane, Jr., Esq., Pacific Gas & Electric Company, 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, California 94106 and Norton, Burke, Berry & French P. C. Attn: Bruce Norton, Esq., 2002 East Osborn Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85106.

NRC Branch Chief: George W. Knighton.

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

Date of amendment request: May 26, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The amendment request involves a proposed revision to Technical Specification Table 3.2.C (Instrumentation That Initiates Control Rod Blocks) which would increase the minimum number of required operable instrument channels for the Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) Rod Block Trip System from two to four and the Intermediate Range Monitor (IRM) Rod Block Trip System from three to six. These changes involve six specific control rod withdrawal blocks which are intended to inhibit control rod withdrawal when an unsafe condition is being approached by a specific monitored parameter. The amendment request also involves a proposed revision to the "Action" statement governing the above Rod Block Systems which would add a provision that permits restoring an inoperable channel to operable status within seven days before placing the inoperable channel in the tripped condition. Both of the above revisions conform to the BWR Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-0123, Revision 3).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether license amendments involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions involving no significant hazards consideration is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently

included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed change requesting an increase in the required minimum number of operable instrument channels for both the APRM and IRM Rod Block Trip Systems is in accordance with the BWR Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-0123, Revision 3) and constitutes additional limitations, restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications. On this basis, the Commission proposes to determine that this change involves no significant hazards considerations.

The proposed change to the "Action" statement fits another Commission example (vi) of an action not involving a significant hazards consideration; namely, a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. The proposed revision would permit keeping an inoperable channel in a non-tripped condition for up to seven days in contrast to the current requirements of placing the inoperable channel in a tripped condition within one hour. However, as discussed above, the proposed revision would also increase the minimum number of required operable channels. For this reason and the fact that the changes are in accordance with the BWR Standard Technical Specifications, which are recognized by the NRC staff as an acceptable means of implementing NRC requirements, the NRC staff proposed to determine this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

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

Date of amendment request: October 15, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would require an external visual examination of the

suppression chamber whenever the local suppression pool temperature exceeds 200°F coincident with relief valve operation. The new limits reflect the completed modification of the Safety Relief Valve discharge to incorporate the T-quencher design which test data has shown to provide effective steam condensation at elevated suppression pool local temperatures. The proposed amendment would also revise operability and surveillance requirements to reflect modifications to the suppression pool temperature monitoring system in accordance with criteria of Appendix A of NUREG-0661, "Mark I Containment Long Term Program." The proposed operability and surveillance requirements provide for an instrument calibration frequency of once per operating cycle and an instrument check of once each day consistent with standards approved in the BWR Standard Technical Specification. In addition, several editorial type changes are requested for Section 3.7.A.1.C in the interest of clarification. Finally, the proposed amendment requests the deletion of certain specifications and footnotes in the Unit 3 Technical Specifications. These changes pertain to a previous amendment which referenced certain modifications which have now been completed, therefore, making these references and footnotes obsolete.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether license amendments involve significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples which were published in the *Federal Register* on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (vi) of an action involving no significant hazards considerations is a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. The proposed amendment would increase the local suppression pool temperature limit from 160° to 200°F coincident with relief valve operation before requiring an external visual examination of the suppression chamber. This change is a result of the change from ramshead discharge devices to T-quenchers which is part of the Mark I Long Term Program. The above changes are in accordance with the criteria of Appendix A of NUREG-0661 which provide the Commission's

guidance in restoring the originally intended design safety margins to Mark I suppression chambers. Because NUREG-0661 represents the Commission's position with respect to establishing the margins of safety in the Mark I Containment design and is, therefore, similar to the Standard Review Plans, the Commission proposes to determine that this change involves no significant hazards considerations.

The proposed change to revise operability and surveillance requirements to reflect Mark I Long Term Modifications to the suppression pool temperature system would decrease instrument calibration frequency from once per six months to once per operating cycle and the instrument check from once each shift to once each day. These proposed changes appear also to fit the example (vi) of an action involving no significant hazards considerations which was presented above. The operability and surveillance requirements proposed by the licensees are in accordance with the BWR Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-0123, Revision 3). The Standard Technical Specifications are recognized by the Commission as an acceptable means of implementing NRC requirements and are, therefore, similar to the Standard Review Plans. On this basis, the Commission proposed to determine that these changes involve no significant hazards considerations.

Another example (i) of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to amendments involving a purely administrative change; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes to delete obsolete footnotes and specifications for Unit 3 because of completed modifications fit this example. The editorial changes requested for both Units in Section 3.7.A.1.C are also purely administrative changes. On this basis, the Commission proposes to determine that these changes involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

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

Date of amendment request:
November 29, 1982

Description of amendment request: The amendments would permit operation after approval of changes to the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications that bring them into compliance with Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 50. The amendments provide new Technical Specification sections defining limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; concentration, dose and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, land use census, and interlaboratory comparison program. These changes would also incorporate into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. In addition, some changes would be made in administrative controls, specifically dealing with the process control program and the offsite dose calculation manual. The amendments are in accordance with the licensees' application for amendment dated November 29, 1982.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The Commission, in a revision to Appendix I, 10 CFR Part 50 required licensees to improve and modify their radiological effluent systems in a manner that would keep releases of radioactive material to unrestricted areas during normal operation as low as is reasonably achievable. In complying with this requirement it became necessary to add additional restrictions and controls to the Technical Specifications to assure compliance. This caused the addition of Technical Specifications described above.

The staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration since

the change constitutes additional restrictions and controls that are not currently included in the Technical Specifications in order to meet the Commission mandated release of "as low as is reasonably achievable."

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-276, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania.

Date of amendment request: April 4, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The current Technical Specification (TSs) require that both redundant isolation valves on the High Pressure Coolant Injection (HPCI) turbine exhaust drain line receive all three Group 4 isolation signals; however, one valve receives only two signals. The purpose of HPCI is to provide high pressure emergency core cooling capability. The proposed change to the TSs would provide a statement in the Notes For Table 3.7.1 indicating that one of the HPCI steam line exhaust drain valves does not actuate upon receipt of one of the Group 4 isolation signals; namely, the HPCI steam line low pressure signal. Isolation of the HPCI steam exhaust drain line by the third signal, the HPCI steam line low pressure signal, is, however, provided by the HPCI turbine exhaust vacuum breaker isolation valve (Table 3.7.1). The current TSs do not reflect the use of three isolation valves to provide all isolation features. The proposed amendment would provide clarification of this isolation trip feature on the HPCI system.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether license amendments involve significant hazards consideration by providing certain examples which were published in the *Federal Register* on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). This particular amendment request does not precisely fit any of the examples provided in the *Federal Register*. However, it appears that the use of the HPCI turbine exhaust vacuum

breaker isolation valve which does isolate on the HPCI steam line low pressure signal will provide the equivalent isolation features for the HPCI steam exhaust drain line as originally outlined in Table 3.7.1. This is accomplished by relying on a third isolation valve associated with the HPCI turbine exhaust vacuum breaker. The licensee indicates that this design meets the isolation criteria of 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, General Design Criteria. In addition, the licensee states that only two signals would be necessary to isolate the HPCI system on a HPCI line break. These two signals, HPCI steam line high flow and HPCI steam line space high temperature (the first two Group 4 isolation signals), satisfy the requirements for initiating signal diversity for all postulated line break scenarios. Therefore, it would appear that the HPCI low steam line pressure signal is not required to ensure isolation of the system in the event of a line break. Based upon the apparent equivalence provided by the use of a third isolation valve and the need of only two isolation signals to satisfy isolation requirements, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request 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, and therefore proposes to determine that the amendment request 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.

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

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

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

Date of amendment request: July 20, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise paragraph 2.A of the operating license to indicate that the facility is now described in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). At present, this paragraph states that the facility is described in the FSAR, as supplemented and amended by Amendments 1 through 26. With the issuance of a new NRC regulation

requiring that FSARs for power reactors be updated annually (10 CFR 50.71(e)), this paragraph is now out-of-date, since the facility is now described by the Updated FSAR.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples which were published in the *Federal Register* on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a purely administrative change to technical specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. Another example of an action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations.

The proposed change is similar to both examples. First, the action would be administrative in nature, since the regulations for making changes to the facility, or its procedures or tests, are not altered in any way by the new requirement to periodically update the FSAR. Thus, the Updated FSAR describes changes to the facility which have either received prior NRC approval, where required, or describes changes which have been made which do not require approval, as permitted by 10 CFR 50.59. The change referencing the Updated FSAR does not result in any revision to the way facility operations are conducted.

Second, the proposed change is similar to the example involving a regulation. Whereas the change is not required by a regulation, it was the regulation, and the licensee's compliance with it, that caused para. 2.A of the license to be out-of-date by its submittal of the Updated FSAR.

Since the proposed change is similar to two examples that are considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration, the staff proposes to determine that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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: June 4, 1982 and February 18, 1983.

Description of amendment request: An amendment to the Technical Specifications regarding the licensee's management organization structure. Section 6, Administrative Controls, of the Technical Specifications and Appendix B, Environmental Technical Specifications, contain information and descriptions of the licensee's management organization. The licensee proposes to modify these specifications in the following manner to reflect current licensee organization: (1) Change the name of the Procedures and Performance Department to Quality Assurance and Reliability. The new department assumes all old department functions and, in addition, is responsible for performing audits and appraisals of the security program; (2) revise the title of the Senior Vice President—Nuclear Generation to that of Executive Vice President—Nuclear Generation to indicate the appropriate corporate title commensurate with the authority and responsibilities of the position; (3) correct a title change which was inadvertently not changed in a previously approved Commission action (see Amendment No. 60 to License No. DPR-59); (4) add two newly created positions under the President and Chief Operating Officer. The new positions are: First Executive Vice President and Chief Development Officer and First Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer. All corporate financial and administrative responsibilities will be shared amongst the three First Executive Vice Presidents; and (5) revise the position of the Security and Safety Superintendent into two separate positions: Security Supervisor and Safety and Fire Protection Superintendent.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: (i) A purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature; and (ii) a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or

control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The changes proposed in the applications for amendment are encompassed by this example in that: the licensee has realigned and renamed the Procedures and Performance Department to focus on quality assurance, system reliability, safety security, and to extend the overall evaluative capabilities of the department. The new department assumes all old departmental functions and, in addition, performs audits and appraisals of the security program. This change is considered administrative because the name change is a change in nomenclature. The licensee's proposed revision which it states focuses management control on quality assurance matters and expands its evaluative capabilities is considered an additional management control not presently included in the Technical Specifications; (2) the revision of the title of the Senior Vice President—Nuclear Generation to Executive Vice President—Nuclear Generation is an administrative change only since it is a change in nomenclature with no change in the authorities or responsibilities of the position; (3) the correction of a previously approved title change is administrative since it corrects an error; (4) the addition of two newly created positions under the President and Chief Operating Officer is administrative since it reflects the current licensee organization. Since it also reflects the delegation of corporate financial and administrative responsibilities amongst the now three First Executive Vice Presidents, it also constitutes an additional control not presently included in the specification; and (5) the revision of the position of the Security and Safety Superintendent into two separate positions—Security Supervisor and Safety and Fire Protection Superintendent—is administrative since it is a change in nomenclature. It also constitutes an additional management control not presently included in the specifications since the revision would reduce the span of control for each of the newly created positions. Thus, the proposed changes described above are either administrative changes or constitute additional controls not presently included in the specifications and are thereby similar to the examples cited above.

Therefore, since the applications for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to examples for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for

amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: April 29, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The licensee requested Technical Specifications (TS) changes to the incorporate revised radiological effluent and environmental monitoring limiting conditions for operation, action statements, and surveillance requirements. The proposed changes are in response to NRC requests of July 11, 1978 and November 15, 1978. The proposed changes are intended to implement the design objectives and requirements of 10 CFR 50.34(a), 10 CFR 50.36a, 10 CFR 20, 10 CFR 50 Appendix A, General Design Criteria 60 and 64 and 40 CFR 190.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870): One such amendment involves a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations.

The change proposed by the licensee is intended to implement: 10 CFR 50.34(a), which pertains to Design Objectives for equipment to control releases of radioactive materials in effluent from nuclear power reactors; 10 CFR 50.36a, which pertains to technical specifications of effluents from nuclear power reactors; 10 CFR 20, which pertains, in part, to the controlled release of radioactive materials in liquid and gaseous effluents; 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, General Design Criteria 60, which pertains to control of releases of radioactive materials to the environment and 64, which pertains to monitoring radioactivity releases; and 40 CFR 190, which pertains to radiation doses to the

public from operation associated with the entire uranium fuel cycle. This amendment, therefore, reflects changes to make the FitzPatrick license conform to changes in the regulations. Since the licensee is presently obligated by these regulations to control and limit offsite releases of radioactive materials to levels which are as low as is reasonably achievable, this license change will only result in very minor changes to facility operations which are clearly in keeping with the regulations.

Therefore, since the applications for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to examples for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: November 24, 1981.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the testing requirements for hydraulic shock suppressors (snubbers) and add requirements for mechanical snubber operability and testing. The proposed changes were made in response to an NRC request to upgrade the testing requirements for all safety-related snubbers to ensure a higher degree of operability. The changes involve: clarifying the frequency for visual inspections, stating the requirements for functional testing of snubbers which visually appear inoperable, the inclusion of a formula for the selection of representative sample sizes, the clarifying of the testing acceptance criteria, and revising the method of snubber listing to incorporate more information.

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

additional limitations or restrictions in the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes revise sections of the Technical Specifications related to hydraulic snubbers to clarify requirements and include additional testing, and incorporate both operability and testing requirements for mechanical snubbers. Since the requested changes upgrade the requirements for hydraulic snubbers and add requirements for mechanical snubbers, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: May 3, 1983.

Description of amendment request: Prior to the resumption of power operation in May 1983 the licensee was required to propose improvements in balance of plant secondary water chemistry control. (Amendment No 47 published in the Federal Register on June 3, 1983 (48 FR 25030). The need for extensive repairs to the Indian Point, Unit No. 3, steam generators had been attributed to corrosion fatigue and improvements in chemistry control were deemed necessary to minimize further steam generator degradation.

The proposed steam generator chemistry controls are more restrictive than those used previously and are considered interim in nature. The licensee has committed to inform the NRC of the status of a long term program to improve balance of plant chemistry by January 1984.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. This license amendment request proposes more limiting chemistry control Technical Specifications than those previously used at Indian Point. This proposed change clearly adds more

restrictions and surveillance requirements and matches the guidance quoted. The staff, therefore, propose to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: June 1, 1983.

Description of amendment request: In November 1980 the NRC Staff developed NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," to provide a comprehensive and integrated plan to improve safety at power reactors. Subsequently, plant modifications were made at Indian Point and the NRC requested that the licensee submit Technical Specifications to ensure the operability and effectiveness of these improvements. By letter dated June 1, 1983, the licensee submitted the applicable license amendment request.

The licensee's submittal proposed Technical Specifications for the following NUREG-0737 items: (1) II.E.4.2.8 "Containment Isolation Dependability," and II.K.3.3., "Reporting Safety Valve and Relief Valve Failures and Challenges." For both of these items the licensee's submittal indicates compliance with NUREG-0737 and, therefore, is considered an improvement in plant safety.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. This proposed change clearly adds more restrictions and surveillance requirements and matches the guidance quoted. The staff, therefore, proposes to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library,

100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: June 3, 1983.

Description of amendment request: Prior to resuming power operation in May 1983 the licensee was required to install certain fire protection plant modifications. These modifications were interim in nature pending final resolution of permanent modifications as required by 10 CFR 50, Appendix R. Interim alternate power supply modifications were completed prior to plant startup. The licensee's amendment request proposes that appropriate surveillance requirements and limiting conditions of operation be incorporated into the plant's Technical Specifications in order to ensure the operability of modifications during plant operation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the plant's Technical Specifications. The existing Indian Point Technical Specifications indicate the required surveillance, testing and limiting conditions of operation for the Emergency Power System. The licensee's proposed amendment does not modify the existing emergency power supply Technical Specifications. The proposed Technical Specifications relate to the new alternative power supply only and are in addition to the existing Technical Specifications. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it constitutes additional limitations not currently included in the Technical Specifications.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of application for amendment: June 17, 1983.

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

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

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

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library 100

Martine Avenue, White Plans, New York 10601.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: October 5, 1982.

Description of amendments request: Changes the Technical Specifications for Unit 1 and Unit 2 regarding performance of a Reactor Coolant System Water inventory balance, to be identical to provide consistency between the unit Technical Specifications. The specification will now read: "Performance of a Reactor Coolant System water inventory balance at least once per 72 hours during steady state operation. The provisions of Specification 4.0.4 are not applicable for entry into Mode 4."

The phrase "during steady operation" in the first sentence was added to the Unit 1 specification.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance as to the application of the standards for a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of action involving no significant hazards include actions which involve a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The changes included in this application add limitations to each of the paragraphs to clarify the intent of the specifications, i.e., a phrase from the Unit 1 specification was added to the Unit 2 specification and a sentence from the Unit 2 specification was added to the Unit 1 specification. Since the proposed changes add limitations to clarify existing requirements, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 12 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: Proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) which would add additional requirements for operability, testing and inspections of all snubbers in use at the plant.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The amendment would add additional requirements for operability, visual inspections and periodic testing of snubbers to ensure that these devices are operable. Snubbers are attached to piping and equipment to provide restraint during a seismic or other event which initiated dynamic loads, yet allow slow motion such as that produced by thermal expansion. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether license amendments involve no significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples which were published in the Federal Register on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications, such as a more stringent surveillance requirement.

The amendment request, discussed above, fits this example. On this basis, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby, and MacRae, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: September 28, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes involve reorganization for the plant staff. Over the past 12 years, the functions of Cost Control Coordinator, Administrative Computer Systems Analyst, Technical Computer Systems Analyst, Technical Projects Supervisor, Technical Assistant for Operational Assessment, Fire Protection and Safety Coordinator, and Emergency Planning Group have been

added. These functions typically have reported directly to the office of the Plant Superintendent, resulting in approximately 12 organizational sections reporting to the Plant Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent.

The proposed Technical Specification change would approve reorganization in the plant staff into six major functional sections. These functional sections would include an Administrative Section, a Health Physics and Chemistry Section, a Maintenance Section, an Operations Section, a Nuclear Assurance Section and a Technical Section. The composition of the Plant Operations Review Committee, Section 6.5.1.2, would be changed to be consistent with the proposed organizational change. Additionally, at the corporate level, the title of Manager Security would be changed to Director of Security.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards for conclusions regarding no significant hazards considerations by providing examples (49 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). These examples are not applicable to the issues addressed in this application. Our basis for concluding that the standards are met with respect to the no significant hazards considerations is that the changes will increase the efficiency of the organization by reducing the number of functions reporting to the Plant Superintendent thus allowing him to concentrate his efforts on the major plant actions and delegate more routine matters to his immediate subordinates. No functions will be deleted. In addition, the new organization will consolidate complimentary functions under a single functional section. For example, reporting to the Administrative Manager will be the functions of Cost Coordinator, Administrative Computer Systems Analyst, and the function of the Office Supervisor. These support functions will form a cohesive organization assisting in the plant administrative controls implementation.

Reporting to the Nuclear Assurance Manager will be the Operational Assessment Engineer (formerly the Technical Assistant for Operational Assessment), the Quality Control Engineer, and the Fire Protection and Safety Coordinator. Also within this section the function of the Quality Control Inspection Supervisor, reporting to the Quality Control Engineer, will be established to coordinate the inspection activities of quality control on plant and project jobs. The Quality Control

Engineer will continue to report to the Superintendent regarding station activities affecting quality and that these activities are in accordance with approved drawings, specifications, and procedures. Since the independence and responsibilities of the Quality Control Engineer and the corresponding reporting relationships remain unaltered, the revised station organization will not diminish or weaken the effectiveness of the Quality Control Organization. This change will consolidate those staff functions concerned with the assurance of implementing the operational, quality and regulatory requirements of the administrative controls into an independent section.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

Southern California Edison Company, Docket No. 50-208, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1, San Diego County, California

Date of amendment request: October 20, 1978.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the surveillance requirements for the station battery. These revisions would: (1) Reduce the allowable minimum specific gravity of the Pilot Cell from 1.20 to 1.19, (2) reduce the allowable minimum Pilot Cell Voltage from 2.17 volts to 2.05 volts, (3) modify the minimum overall Battery Voltage from 125 volts to 2.17 times the number of battery cells in service, (4) establish a minimum average cell voltage of 2.17 volts under float charge, (5) establish a minimum average cell specific gravity of 1.20, (6) revise the interval for testing the battery chargers from once per refueling shutdown to at least once per 60 months, and (7) modify the minimum current supplied by 125 volt DC Bus No. 2 and MOV 850C uninterruptible power supply battery chargers.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee's October 20, 1978 application states that operating experience with certain portions of Technical Specification 4.4, Emergency Power System Periodic Testing, has made it apparent that some of the current surveillance requirements are

unnecessarily restrictive and do not contribute to the safe operation of the facility. SCE further stated that the battery manufacturer has concurred with each of the specific requested changes. The licensee also stated that the proposed changes would assure the ability of the battery to meet the criteria for operational functions during the course of a design basic accident while allowing reasonable flexibility for maintenance and surveillance activities. On this basis the staff proposes to determine that these changes involve no significant hazards consideration because 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 previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

Attorney for licensee: Charles R. Kocher, Assistant General Counsel, James Beoletto, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: September 12, 1979 and March 30, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The licensee's proposed amendment dated September 12, 1979 would incorporate radiological effluent technical specifications necessary to implement the requirement of Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50 into the Appendix A Technical Specifications. The licensee's proposed amendment dated March 30, 1983 would revise the San Onofre Unit Technical Specifications to incorporate calculational methods that would more accurately establish limits of liquid and gaseous effluents in unrestricted areas than the existing specifications and to provide requirements to sample for iodine and particulate activity to maintain a more accurate account of these types of radioactivity released to the environs, in accordance with 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed amendment proposed by letter dated September 12, 1979 would provide new Technical Specification sections defining limiting conditions for

operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; dose and treatment of liquid and gaseous wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, land use census, and interlaboratory calibration program. This change also incorporates into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. In addition changes would be made in administrative controls, specifically dealing with the offsite dose calculational manual. This proposed amendment would also supersede and delete the existing radiological environmental monitoring Technical Specifications from the Appendix B Technical Specifications.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards considerations relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

With regard to the proposed amendment dated September 12, 1979, the Commission, in a revision to Appendix I, 10 CFR Part 50 required licensees to improve and modify their radiological effluent systems in a manner that would keep releases of radioactive material to unrestricted areas during normal operation as low as is reasonably achievable. In complying with this requirement it became necessary to add additional restrictions and controls to the Technical Specifications to assure compliance. This caused the proposed addition of Technical Specifications described above. The proposed amendment falls within the category of the cited example.

The proposed amendment dated March 30, 1983 would provide new, more accurate calculational methods for establishing liquid and gaseous limits in unrestricted areas and would add requirements to sample for iodine and particulate activity. This proposed amendment also falls within the category of the cited example. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested actions involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: San Clemente Branch Library, 242 Avenida Del Mar, San Clemente, California 92676.

Attorney for licensee: Charles R. Kocher, Assistant General Counsel, James Beoletto, Esquire, Southern

California Edison Company, Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: April 4, 1980.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications to add limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for fire protection features that have been installed in accordance with the NRC's Fire Protection Safety Evaluation Report dated July 19, 1979.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning their application of standards of no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (ii) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement.

The licensee's proposed amendment would add limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed amendment, therefore, falls within the category of the cited example and would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Charles R. Kocher, Assistant General Counsel, James Beoletto, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: December 1, 1980.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would add limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements to the Technical Specifications to provide for redundancy in Decay Heat Removal

Capability in all modes of operation. During startup and power operation, all three reactor coolant loops and their associated steam generators and reactor coolant pumps would be required to be in operation. Specifications regarding Decay Heat Removal Capability for Hot Standby, Hot and Cold Shutdown, and Refueling Modes are also proposed.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards of no significant hazard consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions likely to involve no significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The proposed amendment adds more stringent limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements and, therefore, falls within the category of the cited example. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Charles R. Kocher, Assistant General Counsel, James Beoletto, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of amendment request: August 11, 1982 with revisions dated September 13, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment involves two principal sets of changes. The first change would exclude tritium from the definition of \bar{E} used in calculating the specific activity limit of the reactor coolant in accordance with Technical Specification 3.1.1.A.2. Because tritium emits only relatively low energy betas (0.01 86MeV), excluding tritium from the definition of \bar{E} would raise the value of \bar{E} and reduce the allowable limit for maximum specific activity as calculated from $100/\bar{E}$. The second set of changes applies to Table 4.1.2 of the Technical Specifications and would: (1) modify the frequency for performing reactor coolant and secondary coolant gross activity determinations from three times per

week at intervals no less than 30 hours, to once every 72 hours, (2) add the operational modes during which the sampling frequencies for reactor coolant and secondary coolant apply, and (3) make administrative changes that would add a footnote referencing the definition of \bar{E} , correct the numbering of two existing footnotes, and add the specific activity limit, $100/\bar{E}\mu\text{Ci/gm}$, for completeness.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). Three of the examples of action likely to involve no significant hazards consideration are: (i) A purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature; (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; (vi) A change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan: for example, a change resulting from the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculational model or design method.

The exclusion of tritium from the definition of \bar{E} results in a lower allowable limit for specific activity as calculated from $100/\bar{E}$. Tritium activity will continue to be measured as part of the weekly gross activity determination. Example (ii) above is applicable to this proposed change.

The proposed change regarding the frequency for performing reactor coolant and secondary coolant gross activity determinations from three times per week to once every 72 hours is a slight relaxation of the current Technical Specification requirements; however, the proposed frequency is consistent with the provisions of the Westinghouse Technical Specifications, NUREG-0452, Revision 4. Standard Review Plan Section 16.0 indicates that a proposed Technical Specification is acceptable if it is similar to those developed by the staff as Standard Technical Specifications for plants of a similar design. This proposed change is within all acceptable criteria with regard to sampling frequency and example (vi)

above is applicable to this proposed change.

With regard to the addition of operational modes during which the sampling frequencies apply, there is no change with regard to gross activity determination for reactor coolant because all six operational modes are indicated. The proposed changes requiring: (1) isotopic analysis for Dose Equivalent I-131 concentration for reactor coolant and spectroscopic for \bar{E} determination, both only during Mode 1, and (2) secondary coolant gross activity determination and isotopic analysis for Dose Equivalent I-131 concentration, both only during Modes 1, 2, 3, and 4, are consistent with the provisions of the Westinghouse Standard Technical Specifications, NUREG-0452, Revision 4. This proposed change is within all acceptable criteria and example (vi) above is applicable to this proposed change. The administrative changes are of the type described in example (i), above.

Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Charles R. Kocher, Assistant General Counsel, James Beoletto, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770.

NRC Branch Chief: Dennis M. Crutchfield.

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

Date of Amendment request: March 15, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would change the Technical Specification required frequencies for auditing the Physical Security Plan and Site Radiological Emergency Plan to once per twelve months. This change would make the Technical Specifications consistent with 10 CFR 50.54(t).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. One example is a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The

Commission proposes to determine that the amendment is a change that is not safety related.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

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

Date of amendment request: March 15, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would change the Technical Specifications to delete the cable spreading room from the list of areas that require the low pressure carbon dioxide system to be operable. The primary source of fire protection in the cable spreading room is provided by the preaction sprinkler system. The backup protection is provided by hose stations in the area. The fire protection system, without the carbon dioxide system, meets the requirements of the NRC Standard Review Plan.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions likely to involve no 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. Accordingly, the Commission proposed to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

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

Date of amendment request: March 16, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would change the Technical Specifications regarding responsibility for issuing the annual management directive outlining control room command. The amendments would relieve the General Manager from the requirement for signing the management directives and assign this responsibility to the Director of the licensee's Division of Nuclear Power.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: This change is considered administrative in nature. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (45 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions likely to involve no significant hazards consideration relates to purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

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

Date of amendment request: June 15, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would revise the diesel generator surveillance requirement. The proposed surveillance requirements for the diesel generators would reflect the actual as-designed logic that exists for the Sequoyah Units 1 and 2. The present design protects the diesel generator from a sustained overcurrent condition when in parallel with offsite power. It does not have, however, the added feature of returning to a standby status if a safety injection signal occurs while in the test mode

(parallel to offsite power). For this reason, the present surveillance tests cannot be fully carried out.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed amendments involve no significant hazards consideration based on the examples cited in 48 FR 14870. One of the examples 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.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

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

Date of amendment request: March 17, 1978.

Description of amendment request: Modification of the Technical Specifications: (1) To require that only one relief valve actuate at the lowest setting called for in the Technical Specifications, this change is to avoid the simultaneous actuation of more than one safety relief valve at a time; (2) to correct the snubber surveillance list by changing several snubber locations and deleting certain snubbers from the "especially difficult to remove" list. The snubbers have been modified to allow easy removal; and (3) to change the format of the trip level settings for low reactor pressure to be consistent with format of other trip level settings in the Technical Specifications.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards include actions which involve a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The changes included in this application add limitations not presently included in the Technical

Specifications. The proposed change adds words to the Technical Specifications requiring that reactor coolant system relief valves be set to ensure that only one relief valve will actuate at the lowest setting thereby avoiding more than one relief valve actuation simultaneously. The present Technical Specifications allow the relief valves to be set in the above manner, but the proposed Technical Specifications would require it.

The correction of the snubbers surveillance list corrects the description of several snubber locations and deletes several snubbers from the "especially difficult to remove" list, thereby requiring additional testing for those snubbers.

Another example of an action involving no significant hazards considerations is "a purely administrative change to technical specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature."

The change in the format of the trip level setting for low reactor pressure is a change to achieve consistency and is purely administrative.

Since the proposed changes are purely administrative or add limitations not presently included to the Technical Specifications, the staff proposes to determine that the application 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 & Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: January 30, 1979 as supplemented January 18, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The licensee has requested Technical Specification changes in accordance with 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(5) which requires amendments to Technical Specifications to conform to the updated inservice inspection and testing program for safety class components mandated by Section 50.55a.

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

standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The proposed amendment would incorporate an additional testing requirement in accordance with the Commission's regulations regarding inservice testing programs. In addition, the proposed amendment matches an example of an action involving no significant hazards consideration in that the proposed change will make the license conform to the Commission's regulations. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the 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: Mr. John A. Ritscher, Esquire, Ropes & Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: February 13, 1979 as supplemented January 24, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The licensee has requested changes to the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications that bring them into compliance with Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 50. The amendment provides new Technical Specification sections defining limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring; concentration, dose and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid wastes; total dose; radiological environmental monitoring that consists of a monitoring program, land use census, and interlaboratory comparison program. This change also incorporates into the Technical Specifications the bases that support the operation and surveillance requirements. In addition, some changes were made in administrative controls, specifically dealing with the process control program and the offsite dose calculation manual. The amendment is in accordance with licensee's application for amendment dated February 13, 1979 as supplemented January 24, 1983.

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 of the examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards considerations relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the technical specifications.

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: December 29, 1981.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would add Technical Specifications requiring calibration, functional tests, and instrument checks at specified frequencies for the noble gas effluent monitor and requiring reactor shutdown if the noble gas effluent monitor cannot be returned to service within 30 days. The proposed change was submitted in response to a staff request to propose Technical Specifications pertaining to the high range noble gas effluent monitor required to be installed by Item II.F.1 of NUREG-0737, Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements.

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

concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). An example of a change involving no significant hazards consideration is "a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications; for example a more stringent surveillance requirement." The changes included in this application add limitations requiring stack noble gas monitor operability and requiring stack noble gas effluent monitor surveillance. Since the proposed changes add limitations not presently included in the Technical Specifications, the staff proposes to determine that the application 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 & Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: May 20, 1983.

Description of amendment request: Modification of the Technical Specifications to delete some snubbers and add other snubbers to the snubber surveillance list. The snubbers were removed or added from the list as a result of modifications required by the Mark I containment program which has been approved by the Commission.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed change to the Technical Specifications would delete certain snubbers and add other snubbers to the list of snubbers requiring routine surveillance. These snubbers were removed and added from the list as a result of the deletion and addition of snubbers during modifications required by the Mark I containment program. Seismic and hydrodynamic analysis for the modified system configuration allowed removal of those snubbers that were removed and required addition of those snubbers that were added.

Since this change is being made to correct the Technical Specifications to reflect current system configuration, it will not result in any significant effect on any analyzed accident or postulated accident in the updated Final Safety Analysis Report. Additionally, since the snubbers which were deleted from the

surveillance list were no longer needed or installed and the snubbers which were added were required under the Commission approved Mark I containment program, no significant reduction in a margin of safety would result from this change. For the same reasons this change would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment request does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: May 26, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The licensee has requested that the requirement for an annual conduct of an exercise of the emergency plan be deleted from the Technical Specifications because the requirement is redundant with the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.

The licensee has proposed this change in order to eliminate the need to seek NRC approval for one-time changes to the Technical Specifications regarding the schedule for annual emergency drills and to negate the potential for conflict between the requirements of 10 CFR and the provisions of the specifications. The licensee will remain obligated by the regulation to conduct annual drills.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for conclusions regarding "significant hazards considerations" (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards include actions which are purely administrative changes to the Technical Specifications. By letter dated December 16, 1982 the licensee requested one-time relief from the 10 CFR 50 Appendix E and Technical Specification requirements for the annual conduct of an exercise of the emergency plan. On March 1, 1983 an exemption was given granting relief from the 10 CFR Appendix E requirement. On May 26, 1983 the licensee proposed deletion of the

requirement for an annual exercise from the Technical Specifications to remove the potential for conflict between the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix E and the Technical Specifications. The requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix E will remain in effect, so the requirements of the Technical Specifications are redundant to 10 CFR Appendix E, and removal of a redundant requirement is purely administrative.

Because this change is purely administrative, the staff proposes to determine that the application 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 Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: May 26, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would make changes to the Technical Specifications to accommodate shifts in transition temperature for the reactor pressure vessel materials that were induced by radiation damage. These shifts are accounted for by revision of the plant pressure-temperature limits for heating up and cooling down the reactor vessel. Periodic review and adjustment, if necessary, of the curves to account for the effects of irradiation are required by 10 CFR 50, Appendices G & H.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: "A change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations."

The changes to the pressure-temperature limits are similar to the example above because the regulations in 10 CFR 50, Appendices G & H require updating of pressure-temperature limits based on the surveillance program. The proposed license change would result in

very minor changes to the facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment request does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Domenici B. Vassallo.

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

Date of amendment request: December 30, 1982; supplemented April 25, 1983; July 6, 1983 and July 11, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The requested amendment would implement Phase II of a plant Upgrade Program which would increase steam pressure to maximize the electrical output at the currently licensed reactor thermal rating of 2775 Megawatts thermal (MWT). The request would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to allow operation with a Reactor Coolant System (RCS) Average Temperature (T_{AV}) of 587.8 degrees Fahrenheit ($^{\circ}F$) as opposed to the currently approved RCS T_{AV} of 582.8 $^{\circ}F$. In addition to increasing the RCS T_{AV} by 5 $^{\circ}F$, the net reactor coolant pump heat input has been determined to be 12 MWT instead of 10 MWT, and this 2 MWT increase changes the currently approved Nuclear Steam Supply System (NSSS) rating from 2785 MWT to 2787 MWT. As stated above, the currently licensed reactor thermal rating of 2775 MWT remains unchanged. This 5 $^{\circ}F$ increase in the RCS T_{AV} would provide an increase in the secondary side steam pressure of 32 pounds per square inch (psi) resulting in a higher secondary cycle thermal efficiency and approximately a 3 MW electrical increase in output.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: One of the Commission's examples (48 FR 14870) involving no significant hazards relates to a requested 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 calculation model or design method. This example is applicable to this amendment request.

The licensee's proposed change does not require any hardware modifications to the NSSS. However, to implement the proposed changes, the licensee has submitted accident analyses of the NSSS systems and components to verify that the proposed change is in conformance with the regulatory codes, standards and design criteria which were in effect at the time the North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2 (NA-1&2) received full-power operating licenses.

The safety evaluation supporting the licensee's proposed changes included the scope of the NSSS Accident Analyses and other accident analyses specified in chapter 15 of the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) for NA-1&2. The safety evaluation also addressed the Balance of Plant (BOP) and the NSSS/BOP Interfaces as well as the Turbine Generator System. It is specifically noted that a reanalysis of the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) performance and the Loss-of-Coolant (LOCA)—ECCS analysis was made to verify that the proposed changes and the analytical techniques used were in full compliance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix K. The results of the licensee's safety evaluation supporting the change in the RCS T_{AV} from 582.8 to 587.8 $^{\circ}F$ and the 2 $^{\circ}F$ increase in the reactor coolant pump heat input and NSSS thermal rating indicate that these changes can be accommodated with margin to already approved FSAR safety limits and that the results of the change are clearly within the Commission's Standards and design criteria previously reviewed and approved for NA-1&2.

Therefore, based on the above, the Commission proposes to determine that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

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

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq; Hunton, Williams, Gay and Gibson, P.O. Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23212.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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

Date of application for amendment: March 18, 1982; supplemented June 24, 1982 and July 1, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) reflect the reorganization within the Nuclear Operations Department, Quality Assurance department, Emergency Planning, and security Department. In addition the proposed changes add the requirement to retain records for at least five years when the Station Emergency Plan and Station Security and implementing procedures are annually audited.

At present, the corporate organizational structure specified in the TS indicates that the Nuclear Station Manager reports to the Manager-Nuclear Operations and Maintenance, who in turn reports to the Vice President-Nuclear Operations. As a result of the proposed revisions, the Vice President-Nuclear Operations will have responsibility for the supervision of the Nuclear Station Managers in the operation and maintenance of the company's operational nuclear units.

The proposed changes delete the position of Manager-Nuclear Operations and Maintenance and renames the Manager, Nuclear Technical Services, to the Manager, Nuclear Operations Support. The Manager, Nuclear Operations Support, will carry out his old responsibilities plus the responsibilities of the Manager-Nuclear Operations and Maintenance. The new responsibilities that transfer to the Manager, Nuclear Operations Support, are Emergency Planning, Training, and Operations and Maintenance Support. In addition the Director, Administrative Services, will report directly to the Vice President-Nuclear Operations. These proposed changes maintain and enhance the direct communications between the Vice President-Nuclear Operations and the Nuclear Power Station Managers.

The proposed changes also reflect reorganizational changes in the Quality Assurance Program. The title of Nuclear Power Station Resident Quality Control Engineer is being changed to Nuclear Power Station Manager, Quality Assurance, who will report to the Executive Manager, Quality Assurance. The appointment of a Nuclear Power Station Manager, Quality Assurance, who reports directly to the Executive Manager, Quality Assurance, will provide added attention to plant quality assurance and enhance quality assurance for plant operations and direct liaison with the corporate quality assurance staff.

Also, the proposed changes reflect the addition of the Director-Emergency Planning to the Nuclear Operations Department. The Director-Emergency

Planning will report to the Manager, Nuclear Operations Support, which will aid the Nuclear Operations Department in planning for any emergency situation at the station nuclear units and thus enhance safe operation of the nuclear power station.

The proposed change also reflects a change in the present title of the Executive Vice President-Power to Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer.

Other changes proposed would specify that the Senior Vice President-Power Operations would sign the management directive on Shift Supervisors' responsibilities and issue the directive to all station personnel on an annual basis. Previously and as presently specified in the TS, the signing of this management directive on Shift Supervisors has been the responsibility of the Executive Vice President-Power. Thus, the proposed change would provide higher corporate responsibility in preparing the annual directive for the responsibilities of the Control Room command function of the Shift Supervisors. Another change proposed would have the Station Security Supervisor reporting directly to the Director, Nuclear Security, at the corporate office.

Finally, the proposed changes would add TS 6.10.1.i and 6.10.1.j to Specification 6.10 to conform to 10 CFR 50.54(t) and 10 CFR 73.46g(6), respectively, which stipulate the retention of records at least five years when the Station Emergency Plan and Station Security Plan, respectively, are audited on an annual basis.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples which were published in the *Federal Register* on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). Examples of actions not likely to involve significant hazard consideration include actions specified as (i) purely administrative changes to the Technical Specifications, and (ii) changes that constitute an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The changes proposed in the application for amendment fall within the scope of these examples. The proposed changes in the corporate structure are administrative in nature and fall within the scope of example (i). It is noted that these proposed changes will not compromise any loss of high level management of nuclear safety. Rather, the proposed changes enhance managerial attention of safety activities of the nuclear units since the plant

managers now report directly to a Vice-President. Also, the appointment of a Nuclear Power Station Manager, Quality Assurance, and a Director-Emergency Planning to the Nuclear Operations Department provide increased visible attention to these functions. In addition, the proposed changes assign greater corporate responsibility and attention in the preparation of the directive defining the Control Room command function of the Shift Supervisors.

Finally, the proposed changes requiring that records be retained for at least five years with respect to Emergency Planning and Station Security falls within the scope of example (ii) since this record retention is specified in 10 CFR 50.54(t) and 10 CFR 73.46g(6), and thus imposes an additional restriction or control. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that these changes involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin Esq., Hunton, Williams, Gay and Gibson, P.O. Box 535, Richmond, Virginia 23212.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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

Date of amendment request: February 14, 1979, as supplemented September 21, 1982.

Description of amendment request: The amendment revises Technical Specifications 4.0, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, and 4.11 to add Surveillance Requirements to ensure that inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 pumps and valves and inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 components will be performed in accordance with a periodically updated version of Section XI of the ASME Boiler and pressure Vessel Code and Addenda.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing examples (48 FR 14870). One of these examples relates to changes that constitute an additional limitation restriction, or control. The licensee has submitted a revised pump and valve Inservice Testing Program for Units 1 and 2. The Technical Specification changes are requested to ensure the revised Program is in

accordance with the applicable ASME Code and Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50.55, "Codes and Standards". Since the proposed changes add requirements to ensure compliance with the regulations, these changes fall within example (ii) of actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations and, on this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: September 21, 1981 as supplemented April 13, 1982 and June 14, 1983.

Description of amendment request: These amendments propose to revise Technical Specifications 3.21 and 4.18 to reflect added fire protection systems. These changes add additional components and systems with limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements.

These changes represent upgrading and installation of new fire protection systems required by the Fire Protection Safety Evaluation Report dated September 19, 1979.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards include actions which involve a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. These changes fall into that category since additional limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements are proposed. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: January 10, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The proposed Technical Specification change for Surry Units 1 and 2 revises Tables 3.8-1 and 3.8-2 to add limiting conditions for operation and correct errors for containment isolation valves.

Two air-operated Phase I trip valves were installed on the Post-Accident Sample System return lines. These valves will reduce radiation levels outside containment should post-accident samples be required to be withdrawn from the reactor coolant system and containment sump. These modifications are required to meet the provisions of NUREG-0737, II.B.3, Post-Accident Sampling.

Manual isolation valves in the hydrogen analyzer system were replaced with ten (10) remote-manual valves (GW series valves) to upgrade the system. The remote-manual valves replaced manual valves located in high radiation areas which are inaccessible in post-accident conditions. The remote-manual valves will reduce personnel exposure following an accident.

One air operated trip valve was replaced with two direct acting solenoid valves in the Residual Heat Removal Sample line providing double isolation to increase assurance of reliable operation during accident conditions. The valves will be normally closed and receive a Phase I signal to ensure they are tripped closed on a safety injection signal. These modifications are required to meet the provisions of NUREG-0737, II.B.3, Post-Accident Sampling.

New instrumentation replaced the servomanometer and valves in the leakage monitoring detection system used in Type "A" testing. The servomanometer and two air operated trip valves, no longer needed, were removed and the lines were capped to prevent leakage through these lines.

This change also proposes to correct certain typographical errors and administrative errors such as wrong valve numbers.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include actions which involve a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or

control not presently included in the Technical Specifications and actions which are administrative in nature; for example, correction of errors. The proposed changes fall into these categories except for the case where trip valves were removed. In this case, new instrumentation compensated for the removal of the valves. Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

Date of amendment request: June 16, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would add additional Accident Monitoring Instrumentation and Reactor Vessel Head Vents in accordance with the requirements of NUREG-0737, Item II.F.1 and II.B.1, respectively. The Accident Monitoring Instrumentation Items added are: Noble Gas Effluent Monitors—II.F.1.1, Containment High Range Radiation Monitors—II.F.1.3, Containment Pressure Monitors—II.F.1.4, Containment Water Level Monitors—II.F.1.5, Containment Hydrogen Monitors—II.F.1.6, and Reactor Vessel Head Vent—II.B.1. A description of each follows:

Noble gas effluent monitors with an upper range capacity of 10^5 uCi/cc (Xe-133) have been installed. The monitors have the capability to detect and measure concentrations of noble gas fission products in plant gaseous effluents during and following an accident. The monitors have a digital readout in the control room to provide the operator and emergency planning agencies with information on plant releases of noble gases during and following an accident.

Containment High-Range Radiation Monitors, with a maximum range of 10^7 R/hr have been installed. The monitors provide the capability to detect and measure the radiation level within the reactor containment during and following an accident. The two high-range monitors are placed in separate areas of the containment to provide independent measurements and will

"view" a large fraction of containment volume.

Containment Pressure Monitors that provide a continuous indication in the control room of containment pressure have been installed. Measurement and indication capability ranges from three times the design pressure of the containment to 5 psia.

Containment Water Level Monitors that provide continuous indication of containment water level have been installed and the monitors have a readout in the control room. A narrow range monitor is installed to cover the range of water from the bottom to the top of the containment sump. The wide range monitor is installed to cover the range of water from the bottom of the containment to the equivalent to a 600,000 gallon capacity. Containment Hydrogen Monitors that provide indication of hydrogen concentration in the containment atmosphere have been installed and indication is provided in the control room. Measurement capability is provided over the range of 0 to 10% hydrogen concentration under both positive and negative ambient pressure.

NUREG-0737, Item II.B.1, required the installation of the Reactor Vessel Head Vent (RVHV) whose function is to remove non-condensable gases from the reactor vessel head. The Reactor Vessel Head Vent is designed with redundant safety grade vent paths.

The Reactor Vessel Head Vent System will extend the reactor coolant pressure boundary to and including the $\frac{3}{8}$ in. orifices in the Reactor Vessel Head Vent. The system is designed, fabricated, and installed in accordance with the requirements of FSAR Section 5, and all applicable codes, as part of the Reactor Coolant System.

These amendment would change Technical Specifications 3.1, 3.7 and 4.1 to incorporate limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for the instrumentation discussed.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards include actions which involve a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The changes requested fall in this category.

The addition of additional Accident Monitoring Instrumentation (NUREG-0737, II.F.1) increases the overall plant margin of safety by providing

monitoring of potential radioactive release paths and provides a means to monitor hydrogen buildup in containment, radiation levels in containment, and containment pressure and water levels. In no case is the information provided by these monitoring systems used to initiate automatic activation of any plant safety systems.

Loss of reactor coolant resulting from vent failure is categorized as being a loss of coolant accident which is fully bounded by previous evaluations, while a failure downstream of the $\frac{1}{2}$ in. orifices is within the capacity of the normal reactor coolant makeup system. System design provides for manual initiation or termination of venting effective with the single failure criteria.

Since these changes incorporate present NRC staff positions and are additional requirements, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Michael Maupin, Hunton and Williams, Post Office Box 1555, Richmond, Virginia 23213.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Units 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: June 4, 1976 as modified January 28, 1980.

Description of amendment: The amendments would permit operation after approval of changes to the plant's Technical Specifications (TS) that bring them into compliance with Appendix I, 10 CFR 50, and 10 CFR 50.36a and 50.34a. These proposed T.S. are intended to ensure that releases of radioactive material to unrestricted areas during normal operation remain as low as is reasonably achievable. Specifically, the proposed T.S. define limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring. Additional environmental sampling locations have been added to the present sampling locations. Additional managerial review responsibilities and reporting requirements have been added relating to radioactive releases. A site plan figure depicting the site exclusion area boundary has been added and the definition of channel check has been changed to more closely follow the recommended definition contained in

NUREG-0472, "Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications for PWRs."

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

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

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

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

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

Date of amendment request: April 19, 1983.

Description of amendment request: Request for modification of licenses DPR-24 and DPR-27 Technical Specifications for fire protection provisions as listed below. The proposed changes 1-6 reflect upgrading and improvements in the fire protection system, condense and clarify the meaning of certain technical specifications, and make editorial changes. Proposed changes 7 and 8 are relaxations to current Technical Specification requirements.

(1) Where a technical specification stated that a component should be "operable at rated capacity," this has been reworded to state that the component shall be "operable." Operable as defined in the technical specifications includes performance of function as defined in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). The FSAR describes the component function and rated capacity.

(2) "Once per day" has been changed to "once every 24 hours" regarding demonstration of component operability.

(3) New tables have been provided to identify existing hose stations and additional water sprinkling systems.

(4) New limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements have been added for new automatic suppression systems and fire detection systems.

(5) The surveillance requirements for the water sprinkler system have been revised to reflect the requirements of a wet pipe rather than dry pipe system.

(6) Test frequencies for fire hose station hydrostatic tests and fire detection tests have been modified to be consistent with the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) codes.

(7) The time period to achieve cold shutdown with an inoperable fire pump has been relaxed from 30 hours to 48 hours of the time required to reach hot shutdown.

(8) The requirement for establishing fire watch inspection has been relaxed to twice per shift when certain fire protection systems are inoperable.

By letter dated July 26, 1983, the NRC informed the licensee that of requested items 7 and 8 above were being denied, therefore while listed for continuity they are not covered by the staff's proposed finding of no significant hazards.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples. Some of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relate to a purely administrative change to technical specifications (i), a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications (ii), and 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 (vi). Proposed Changes 1, 2, 3, and 5 above match example (i) as purely administrative changes. Proposed Change 4 matches example (ii) as an additional restriction not presently in the technical specifications, corresponding to limiting conditions of operation and surveillance requirements for new system upgrades. Proposed change 6 matches example (vi) as a relaxation of an existing requirement that is within the acceptable criteria, that being the NFPA code requirements. For the above reasons the staff proposes

to determine that the amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Joseph P. Mann Public Library, 1516 16th Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket No. 50-266, Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit No. 1, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: July 5, 1983.

Description of amendment request:

Changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) to allow Point Beach Unit 1, currently restricted to operation at 2000 psia, to operate at either 2000 psia or 2250 psia following steam generator replacement. This flexibility of operation is currently allowed for Unit 2 by amendment dated April 29, 1980. The specific changes to the TS necessary to permit operation in the proposed manner are (1) defining the overtemperature delta T reactor trip equation for each operation condition; (2) defining a low pressure reactor trip for each operation condition to allow adequate operating margin; (3) defining an operational reactor pressure limit for each operating condition; and (4) defining system leak testing pressure for each operating condition.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration relates to relief granted from an operating restriction that was imposed because construction was not complete, when that construction has been completed satisfactorily (v). Restriction of operation of Point Beach Unit 1 from 2250 psia to 2000 psia was imposed by the Commission's Confirmatory Order of November 30, 1979 as modified January 3, 1980. The Safety Evaluation approving operation at 2000 psia was appended to that January 3, 1980 modification to the original Order. The restriction was imposed to reduce differential pressure across the steam generator tubes and was required by the NRC to provide continued assurance that the health and safety of the public would not be endangered by operation of Point Beach Unit 1. The degraded condition of the steam generator tubes was the basis for

Commission's imposition of this Order. Wisconsin Electric Power Company plans to replace the Point Beach Unit 1 steam generators during the fall 1983 refueling outage. As stated in the NRC staff's Safety Evaluation of July 15, 1983, the new steam generators will have structural integrity at least equal to the original condition of the existing steam generators which were designed for operation at 2250 psia. Following completion of the steam generator replacement, the restriction to operation at 2000 psia will no longer be necessary. Therefore, the requested amendment matches the Commission's example (v) of actions involving no significant hazards consideration and the NRC staff, therefore proposes to determine that the requested amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Joseph P. Mann Library, 1516 16th Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

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

NRC Branch Chief: Robert A. Clark.

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-385, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendment: December 20, 1982.

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendment consists of Technical Specification changes to 24 pages. These changes are mostly administrative in nature, that is, they consist of word changes or clarifications which are made without technical or safety implication. Four of the page changes do involve some technical detail; the radwaste tank limit is revised to provide consistency with other specifications regarding liquid effluent limits, the fire hose hydrostatic test is changed from 200 psig to 250 psig to conform to 10 CFR 50 Appendix R, the allowable reactivity insertion is changed in a non conservative direction but within the limits of the FSAR analysis, and the containment purge limit has been subsequently negated by a commitment by the licensee to close the valve. The five pages related to the reactor coolant system leakage limit, and the condensate storage tank water level have been completed in Amendment 49 issued on April 29, 1983. (Pages 3.1-11, 3.1-13, 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 4.8-1.)

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: A preliminary review of the proposed amendment indicated that most of the

changes remaining to be acted on are administrative in nature. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The administrative pages fit within the scope of no significant hazards consideration example i, that is, a change which is purely administrative for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error or a change in nomenclature. Those that do involve technical or safety implications are as follows: (1) The radwaste limit (p. 3.9-3) is reworded to provide consistency with other specifications regarding liquid effluent limits and to be consistent with the Standard Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications. This is outside the scope of significant hazards example vi, that is, it is not a change to Technical Specifications or other NRC approval involving a significant unreviewed safety question and it is within the scope of no significant hazards example i, in that it is a change to provide consistency throughout the Technical Specifications; (2) The fire hose hydrostatic test (p. 4.15-3) is raised from 200 psig to 250 psig in accord with Appendix R to 10 CFR 50. This is within the scope of no significant hazards example vii, since it is a change to make the licensee conform to changes in the regulations, when the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations; (3) The reactivity insertion limit (p. 6-17) is changed in a less conservative direction but within the limit of the FSAR analysis. This is similar to no significant hazards example vi, in that it is a change which may reduce in some way a safety margin but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with regard to the system or component as specified in the approved FSAR. The request for the containment purge limit (p. 6-27) has been negated by a commitment (March 8, 1983 letter) by the licensee to keep the containment purge valves closed.

Local Public Document Room

location: Kewaunee Public Library, 822 Juneau Street, Kewaunee, Wisconsin 54216.

Attorney for licensee: Foley and Lardner, First Wisconsin Center, 777 E Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

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

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

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

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

Date of amendment request: May 3, 1983, supplemented June 14, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would change the Technical Specifications to revise the limiting conditions for operation for the reactor cavity level monitoring instrumentation. Specifically, the amendment would permit power operation with any two of the three presently installed reactor cavity level monitoring devices operable. Currently, the Technical Specifications require that the reactor cavity continuous level monitor and one of the two installed independent level alarms be operable prior to bringing the reactor above cold shutdown.

Date of publication individual notice in "Federal Register": July 28, 1983, 48 FR 34368.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 29, 1983.

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

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

Date of amendment request: December 20, 1982.

Description: The proposed amendment would approve changes to the Administrative Controls Section of the Technical Specifications involving the areas of guidelines for working hours and an auxiliary operator being added to the minimum shift crew.

Date of Publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 25, 1983 48 FR 33779.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 24, 1983.

Local Public Document Room location: Charlevoix Public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

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

Date of amendment request: July 20, 1982, as revised September 16, 1982 and November 12, 1982.

Description: The proposed amendment would reflect the institution of the new "Nuclear Activities Plant Organization (NAPO)."

Date of Publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 28, 1983 (48 FR 34369).

Expiration date of individual notice: August 29, 1983.

Local Public Document Room location: Charlevoix Public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

Duke Power Company, Docket No. 50-269, Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: May 19, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment relates to the Cycle 8 reload and involves numerical changes to the core protection safety limits, the protective system maximum allowable setpoints, and the rod position limits. These limits take into account the incorporation of: (1) four Mark BZ demonstration fuel assemblies for a second cycle of irradiation; and (2) five gadolinia lead test assemblies as part of the batch of fresh fuel used in the reload.

Date of Publication of individual notice: August 1, 1983.

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

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

Date of amendment request: January 14, 1983, as supplemented January 20, July 6, and July 14, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would change the Crystal River Unit 3 Technical Specifications to increase the time interval between certain functional tests of engineered safeguards logic circuits on an interim basis until appropriate

control circuit modifications can be made at Crystal River Unit 3. Specifically, the frequency of the channel functional test of the manual actuation portion of the engineered safeguards system would be changed from monthly to once each 18 months during plant shutdown. In addition, the scope of channel functional testing of several automatic actuation logic circuits would be revised to prevent undesirable operation of certain components during plant power operation. Alternate tests of these circuits would be specified which would accomplish the intended purpose of the testing but would result in eliminating undesirable consequences of performing the testing.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 25, 1983, 48 FR 33782.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 24, 1983.

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

General Public Utilities Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50-320, Three Mile Island Unit 2, Londonderry Township Dauphin County

Date of amendment request: May 27, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would delete Section 2.E(3) of the facilities operating license in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated May 27, 1983. This deletion would remove the requirement to maintain reserve water tankage at TMI-2.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 18, 1983; 48 FR 32707.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 17, 1983.

Local Public Document Room Location: State Library of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, PA 17126.

Metropolitan Edison Company, Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, and GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 8, 1981.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would modify the Technical Specification applicable to operability requirements and inservice surveillance of safety-related hydraulic snubbers (shock suppressors). The changes would clarify the wording of certain of the

specification provisions, and add requirements for (1) certain engineering evaluations in the event a snubber is found to be inoperable, (2) snubber operability when the plant is in cold shutdown or refueling, (3) visual inspection acceptance criteria, (4) functional testing and acceptance criteria, and (5) record keeping.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 21, 1983, 48 FR 33383.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 22, 1983.

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

Metropolitan Edison Company, Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, and GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: January 26, 1982.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would add to the Technical Specifications limiting conditions of operation and surveillance requirements for a Hydrogen Recombiner System, in accordance with the NRC staff's recommended requirements for restart of Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 21, 1983, 48 FR 33379.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 22, 1983.

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

Metropolitan Edison Company, Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, and GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: January 21, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would permit increasing by 50 psig, the Reactor Coolant System pressure at or below which the High Pressure Injection (from 1725 psig to 1775 psig), Low Pressure Injection (from 875 psig to 925 psig), and Reactor Building isolation (from 1725 psig to 1775 psig) actuation signals may be bypassed during plant cooldown and

depressurization. The setpoints for actuation of these systems during operation and the Reactor Coolant System pressure above which the bypass is automatically removed (when system pressure is increasing) remain unchanged.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 21, 1983, 48 FR 33385.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 22, 1983.

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

Metropolitan Edison Company, Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, and GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: March 9, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would add four snubbers supporting safety-related piping to the list of Safety Related Snubbers and delete three snubbers which previously supported safety-related piping from the list of Safety Related Snubbers. These changes are required because of piping modifications and additions to plant piping made in response to NRC Bulletin 79-14 and to upgrading the pressurizer pressure relief piping. The addition of and the elimination of certain snubbers is consistent with these piping changes.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 21, 1983, 48 FR 33380.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 22, 1983.

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

Metropolitan Edison Company, Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, and GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 20, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would make four revisions to the Technical Specifications. First, it would revise the Technical Specifications to offset a potential non-conservatism in the prediction of peak cladding temperature

during a loss of coolant accident (LOCA). The potential non-conservatism had been previously discovered and reported by the facility vendor. Second, it would revise the centerline fuel melt limit in the Technical Specifications for Cycle 5 operation from 19.6 kw/ft to 20.15 kw/ft. The 19.6 kw/ft limit was for Cycle 4 operation and was incorrectly retained for Cycle 5 operation.

Third, the proposed amendment would reduce the reactor protection system flux to pump trip setpoint for two pump operation from 91 percent (%) to 55 percent (%) of rated power. This reduction is based upon a vendor recommendation and will provide a common basis for future vendor analyses. Fourth, it would revise the quadrant tilt instrumentation requirements with respect to the preferred order of use of the three detector systems. The allowable quadrant tilt limits remain unchanged.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 21, 1983, 48 FR 33382.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 22, 1983.

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

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

Date of amendment request: June 3, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would permit repairing degraded steam generator tubes by installing metal sleeves in such tubes rather than removing them from service by plugging them.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 28, 1983, 48 FR 34372.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 29, 1983.

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

Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Red Wing, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: June 10, 1983.

Brief Description of amendment: The amendments would permit a change of the sodium hydroxide concentration in the spray additive tank of the

containment spray system from the existing 30% by weight to a range of 9% to 11% by weight, inclusive. In addition, the amendments would permit the concentration to be out of specification limits for a period not to exceed 72 hours.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 14, 1983, 48 FR 32241.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 15, 1983.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: June 24, 1983.

Brief Description of amendment: The amendments would change the limit of the core local heat flux ratio F_0^N from 2.21 to 2.32, allowing a localized linear heat generation rate increase from 14.31 to 15.02 kw/ft which includes a 1.02 factor for power uncertainty. In addition the definition of F_0^N would be changed from a neutron flux comparison to a heat flux comparison derived from measured neutron flux and fuel enrichment. The amendments would not consider the increase in peak fuel pellet exposure from 51 to 55 GWD/MTU until additional information is received from the licensee. This matter will be the subject of a separate notice.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: August 3, 1983, 48 FR 35200.

Expiration date of individual notice: September 2, 1983.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al. Docket No. 50-275, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, San Luis Obispo, California

Date of application amendment for: July 19, 1982.

Brief Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Diablo Canyon Physical Security Plan to eliminate certain vital access controls that exceed current regulatory requirements.

Date of publication of individual notice: August 18, 1983.

Expiration date of individual notice: September 19, 1983.

Local Public Document Room location: California Polytechnic State

University, Library, Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Docket No. 50-275, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, San Luis Obispo, California

Date of application for amendment: December 29, 1982.

Brief Description of amendment request: In accordance with the licensee's request of December 29, 1982, the amendment would change the Technical Specifications to accommodate the installation of two new inverters and associated buses to satisfy electrical loads associated with NUREG-0737 requirements.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 22, 1983.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 22, 1983.

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

Pacific Gas & Electric Company et al., Docket No. 50-275, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, San Luis Obispo, California

Date of application for amendment: May 2, 1983.

Brief Description of amendment request: The amendment would result in certain changes of the Technical Specification on the containment isolation system.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: August 18, 1983.

Expiration date of individual notice: September 19, 1983.

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

Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al. Docket No. 50-275, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, San Luis Obispo County, California

Date of application for amendment: June 23, 1983.

Brief Description of amendment request: In accordance with the licensee's request of June 23, 1982 and supplemental letter dated July 26, 1983, the amendment would change the Technical Specifications regarding the response time for containment spray initiation.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: August 18, 1983.

Expiration date of individual notice: September 19, 1983.

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

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: January 31, 1983.

Brief Description of amendment request: The amendment would approve Revision 2 to the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station Fire Protection Review Report and change License Condition 2.C.(6) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-14 to require the licensee to maintain and implement the provisions of such approved Fire Protection Review Report in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated January 31, 1983.

Date of publication of individual notice: July 29, 1983.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 29, 1983.

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

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: February 3, 1983.

Brief Description of amendment request: The amendment would change Technical Specification 3.2.2 and Tables 2.2.1-1 and 3.3.6-2 to allow the expansion of the operating region of the power/flow map for the initial fuel cycle in accordance with the licensee's application for an amendment dated February 3, 1983.

Date of publication of individual notice: July 29, 1983.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 29, 1983.

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

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: May 4, 1983.

Brief Description of amendment request: The amendment would correct typographical errors in Technical Specification Table 4.11.2.1.2-1, Radioactive Gaseous Waste Sampling and Analysis Program, and in Section 8, Electrical Power Systems. The amendment would also correct nomenclature in Table 4.8.1.1.2-2, Unit 1 and Common Diesel Generator Loading Timers, and add a footnote to Table 3.8.4.1-1, Primary Containment Penetration Conductor Overcurrent Protective Devices, to clarify that each number under the "Circuit Breaker Location" column represents two breakers in series. Additionally, the amendment would delete a non-applicable requirement in Technical Specification 4.7.2.b.1, correct an inconsistency between Technical Specification Table 4.4.6.1.3-1 and 10 CFR 50 Appendix H with regard to the withdrawal schedule associated with the reactor vessel material surveillance program, and change the allowable value for the Reactor Vessel Level—High trip in Technical Specification Table 3.3.9-2 in accordance with the licensee's application for an amendment dated May 4, 1983.

Date of publication of individual notice: July 18, 1983.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 17, 1983.

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

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: July 7, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The license has proposed to modify the Technical Specifications pertaining to the Scram Discharge Volume (SDV) system to support modifications made to the system during the current refueling outage. The modifications currently underway will replace the single scram discharge instrument volume with redundant instrument volumes, improve hydraulic coupling, include redundant vent and drain valves and level instruments for each instrument volume, add diverse automatic scram instrumentations and add early high water level detection instrumentation. In support of these modifications and consistent with guidance provided by the staff in a generic safety evaluation on long-term SDV modifications, the license has proposed certain changes to the Technical Specifications for the SDV

system to add limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for the newly installed components and instrumentation.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 28, 1983, 48 FR 33951.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 25, 1983.

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

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

Date of amendment requests: January 27, 1983.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments would modify plant systems and Technical Specifications to provide for semi-automatic switchover of safety injection systems from the Refueling Water Storage Tank (RWST) to Recirculation Mode following a loss-of-coolant accident in accordance with the licensee's application for amendments dated January 27, 1983.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: August 2, 1983 (48 FR 35054).

Expiration date of individual notice: September 2, 1983.

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

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

Date of amendment request: December 14, 1982.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment involves changes in the core design for the 6th reload cycle to include 40 axial blanket assemblies with modified end fittings, shortened burnable poison stack height and gray axial power shaping rods. In addition, the margin to core fuel melt for the last two fuel batches (7 and 8) was calculated using the TACO 2 code.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: June 23, 1983, 48 FR 28764.

Expiration date of individual notice: July 25, 1983.

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

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

Date of amendment request: February 17, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment involves changes to the Technical Specifications to incorporate a number of NUREG-0737 items which were scheduled for implementation by December 31, 1981. The proposed changes are (1) adding trip setting limits and surveillance requirements for the anticipatory reactor trip; (2) adding limiting conditions for operation (LCOs) and surveillance requirements for the Reactor Coolant System high point vents, the Post Accident Sampling System, the accident monitoring instrumentation and the meteorological instruments; (3) adding LCOs for the Reactor Building purge valves; and (4) adding reporting requirements for the primary system safety and relief valves.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: June 23, 1983, 48 FR 28765.

Expiration date of individual notice: July 25, 1983.

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

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-250, 50-280 and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of amendment request: June 13, 1983.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments would revise the Technical Specifications of the operating licenses to change the required surveillance interval for testing the Standby Gas Treatment System for once per year to once per operating cycle to be consistent with the requirements in the BWR Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-0123).

The proposed change would also require concurrent demonstration of the operability of the Standby Gas Treatment System with the Primary Containment Isolation logic circuitry rather than testing of the Standby Gas Treatment System alone. The change would resolve ambiguities in the present wording of the specifications regarding the scope and frequency of the testing.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 15, 1983, 48 FR 32418.

Expiration date of individual notice: August 7, 1983.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendment: June 15, 1983, July 1, 1983, July 27, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: One amendment would delay by approximately 12 months the completion of four items identified in the Sequoyah Unit 2 license. The licensee cannot complete the four items within the planned 74 day outage for refueling and maintenance that began on July 15, 1983, and maintain a high degree of quality of the other scheduled work as well as the safety of Unit 1 that will be operating during the Unit 2 outage. The manpower levels during the outage period were reviewed to assure that maximum trades and labor personnel limits had been properly established and that priorities of work were consistent with the overall requirements for safe plant operations. All delayed items are to be completed prior to restart after the second reload on Unit 2. Compensatory measures have been taken such that the delays involve no significant hazards consideration. The items are:

(a) A post accident sampling system is required that has the capability to promptly obtain and perform radioisotopic and chemical analysis of reactor coolant and containment atmosphere without excessive exposure to plant personnel. During this period for completing system modifications and equipment installation, sampling stations and interim procedures have been established to provide an acceptable level of primary coolant system activity measurements in the unlikely event a degraded core condition should occur.

(b) Additional instrumentation is required that will accomplish particulate, iodine and noble gas monitoring inside containment during the course of an accident. Procurement of high range monitors for an in-containment usage delayed the completion of the system design with the effect of delaying installation of equipment by the end of the current outage period. Interim acceptable measures are in effect whereby out-of-containment monitors are utilized to provide an adequate correlation of the outside containment radiation readings with in-containment radiation levels

that are possible during the course of an accident.

(c) Additional instrumentation or controls are required to supplement existing instrumentation in order to provide unambiguous, easy-to-interpret indication of inadequate core cooling. A reactor vessel level indicator needs to be installed. The reactor vessel level indicator and its associated instrumentation is part of the inadequate core cooling detection system that are being developed as a generic effort through the Westinghouse owners' group. An important aspect of this item is the emergency procedures for the utilization on the system and the training of operators. Procedures and training are expected to be completed at the time of the installation of the Sequoyah reactor vessel level indicator. Additional procedures are needed for Sequoyah since this plant has an upper head injection system which does not exist for most Westinghouse plants. Important elements of the inadequate core cooling detection system are already installed and operational which provide a satisfactory level of detection for the interim period. These are the primary coolant saturation monitors and the backup displays of the incore thermocouple temperature readouts up to the high temperature that could occur during an accident.

(d) Upgrading the emergency support facilities is required in order to fully comply with guidelines established by the NRC. The Technical Support Center (TSC) is operational and it has the same habitability requirements as the main control room with adequate communications and data input for handling emergency situations. The safety parameter display system has not been installed in the main control room; the TSC will not receive this type of improved data input until the installation of the system is complete. The TSC facilities continue to be adequate for full power operations.

Another amendment would change the technical specifications for Unit 2 to accommodate cycle 2 fuel reload operations and other improvements to plant operations. For this reload, sixty-eight new fuel assemblies will replace spent fuel from the first cycle. The new assemblies are the same as the assemblies in place, except for minor grid modifications to minimize interactions of grid spacing during fuel handling. Also some new burnable absorber rods will be utilized in cycle 2 that have been previously accepted for use in other nuclear plants. As part of this fuel reload a number of technical specification changes to improve plant operations are also requested, which

were considered and found acceptable for Unit 1 operations. Consideration will also be given for changing the limits on the upper and lower compartment temperatures (based on new LOCA analysis), removing operating restrictions on control rod operations, and adding requirements on the hydrogen control system. Limiting conditions for purge supply and exhaust lines will be considered at a later time.

Another amendment would change the Unit 2 Technical Specifications regarding the testing of containment protective fuses from a destructive type of testing to visual inspection. Every 18 months, 10% of the protective fuses are to be tested to ensure their integrity. At Sequoyah there are three types of protective fuses: 6900 and 480 volt fuses crimped inline and 480 volt fuses located in clip type holders. Removal of the fuses for testing may compromise cable and holder integrity. Unit 1 Technical Specifications have been modified to permit visual inspection.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: August 15, 1983, 48 FR 36930.

Expiration date of individual notice: September 14, 1983.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Bicentennial Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401.

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

Date of amendment request: October 14, 1982.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would revise setpoints for the pressurizer code safety valves and pilot operated relief valve (PORV).

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: June 23, 1983, 48 FR 28766.

Expiration date of individual notice: July 25, 1983.

Local Public Document Room

Location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

Date of amendment request: January 12, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would add surveillance of certain special interest steam generator tubes and visual inspections of the

internal auxiliary feedwater distributor, attachment welds, and thermal sleeves.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: August 2, 1983, 48 FR 35047.

Expiration date of individual notice: September 2, 1983.

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

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

Date of amendment request: July 5, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would permit loading of new fuel and shuffling of existing fuel and control rods for Cycle 4 operation. The loading includes 48 new fuel assemblies and the reinsertion of 37 previously discharged fuel assemblies. There are no mechanical design changes for the reload. Cross-core shuffling is limited to eight fuel assemblies to minimize carry-over effects from flux tilts encountered in earlier cycles. The planned duration of Cycle 4 operation is 240 effective full power days.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: August 4, 1983, 48 FR 35541.

Expiration date of individual notice: September 6, 1983.

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

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

Date of amendment request: May 2, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments would revise the Technical Specifications to change the existing fractional power multiplier from 0.2 to 0.3 for both units and to restore the control rod insertion limits to pre-cycle 7 valves Unit 1.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 14, 1983 (48 FR 32245).

Expiration date of individual notice: August 15, 1983.

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

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

During the 30-day period since publication of the last monthly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in 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 were published in the *Federal Register* as indicated. No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following this notice.

Unless indicated otherwise, the Commission has determined that the issuance of the amendments will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to 10 CFR § 51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with issuance of the amendments. If the Commission has prepared an Environmental Impact Appraisal related to these actions, it is so indicated. If indicated, this notice constitutes a negative declaration and indicates that the Commission has concluded that an environmental impact statement is not warranted because there will be no environmental impact is not warranted because there will be no environmental impact attributable to the action beyond that which has been predicted and described in the Commission's Final Environmental Statement for the facility.

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 Impact Appraisals as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717, H Street NW., and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

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

Date of application for amendments: June 20, 1983, supplemented June 29, 1983

Brief description of amendments: The amendments would correct an administrative error in the Technical Specifications relating to testing and inspection of the river water system which would require unnecessary shutdown of both units for the tests. The changes would delete the words "during shutdown" from Technical Specification 4.7.5.b so that these tests and inspections could be conducted during operation.

Date of issuance: August 2, 1983.

Effective date: August 2, 1983.

Amendments No. 32 and No. 24.

Facilities Operating Licenses Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 12, 1983 (48 FR 32110) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 2, 1983. No significant hazards consideration comments were received.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: April 27, 1983.

Brief description of amendments: Changed the Technical Specifications to (1) reflect new on-site organization, (2) revise surveillance for sealed sources (conformance with Combustion Engineering Standard Technical Specifications), and (3) deleted a snubber from the surveillance list (snubber was removed)—Unit 1 only.

Date of issuance: July 19, 1983.

Effective date: July 19, 1983.

Amendment Nos.: 85 and 68.

Facility Operating License Nos.: DPR-53 and DPR-69

Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 10, 1983, 48 FR 26927.

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

No significant hazards consideration comments were received.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: April 20, 1983, as revised April 22, 1983

Description: The amendment approves Technical Specification changes which revise core thermal limits to accommodate the H-3 fuel.

Date of issuance: August 11, 1983.

Effective date: August 11, 1983.

Amendment No.: 59.

Facility Operating License No.: DPR-6.

Amendment revised the *Technical Specifications*.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 22, 1983 (48 FR 28577)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation. No public or State comments were received with respect to the Commission's proposed determination that the amendment would involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Charlevoix Public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

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

Date of application for amendment: May 27, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment approves Technical Specification changes which institute a procedure for use during start-up in the event that neutron source strength is too low to provide the maximum specified count rate.

Date of issuance: August 11, 1983.

Effective date: August 11, 1983.

Amendment No.: 60.

Facility Operating License No.: DPR-6.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 6, 1983 (48 FR 31124) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in the Safety Evaluation. No public or State comments were received with respect to the Commission's proposed determination that the requested action would involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Charlevoix public Library, 107 Clinton Street, Charlevoix, Michigan 49720.

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 amendment: April 18, 1983, as revised May 4, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revise the setpoint and its tolerance for the Upper Head Injection (UHI) accumulator automatic isolation.

Date of issuance: July 26, 1983.

Effective date: July 26, 1983.

Amendment No. 23 for Unit 1 and 4 for Unit 2.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-9 for Unit 1 and NPF-17 for Unit 2.

Amendment revised the *Technical Specifications*.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 16, 1983 (48 FR 27621).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a *Safety Evaluation dated July 26, 1983.*

No significant hazards consideration comments received *No.*

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

Duke Power Company, Docket No. 50-269, Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendment: May 19, 1983, as supplemented July 13, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment relates to the Cycle 8 reload and involves numerical changes to the core protection safety limits, the protective system maximum allowable setpoints, and the rod position limits. These limits take into account the incorporation of: (1) four Mark BZ demonstration fuel assemblies for a second cycle of irradiation; and (2) five gadolinia lead test assemblies as part of the batch of fresh fuel used in the reload.

Date of issuance: August 3, 1983.

Effective date: August 3, 1983.

Amendment No.: 122, 122 and 119.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-38.

Amendment revised the Common Technical Specifications for Oconee Units 1, 2 and 3.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 30, 1983, 48 FR 30224.

This Notice stated that we proposed a no significant hazards consideration determination for the licensee's May 19, 1983 amendment request concerning the Cycle 8 fuel reload for Oconee Unit 1. A supplemental letter related to this amendment request dated July 13, 1983 was received after issuance of the Notice, and was, therefore, not

considered in the Notice. The supplemental letter, however, did not affect our proposed determination as stated in the Notice for the reason that the information submitted in this letter revised the proposed Technical Specifications to reflect the implementation of NUREG-0630 cladding rupture and swelling models into the loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA) analysis as requested by the NRC staff. The effect of this implementation is that it imposes a more restrictive LOCA limit on the plant with regard to peak linear heat rates at various core elevations.

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received *No.*

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

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

Date of application for amendment: May 20, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment replaced the existing non-radiological Environmental Technical Specifications (Appendix B) with an NRC-approved Environmental Protection Plan (EPP). The only requirement changed related to ecological monitoring; the EPP requires continued vegetation monitoring.

Date of Issuance: August 10, 1983.

Effective Date: August 10, 1983.

Amendment No.: 35.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-34.

Amendment revised the Appendix B Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 22, 1983 (48 FR 28562).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in an Environmental Impact Appraisal dated August 10, 1983.

No significant hazards consideration comments received? *No.*

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

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

Date of application for amendment: December 14, 1982.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment involves changes in the core

design for the 6th reload cycle to include 40 axial blanket assemblies with modified end fittings, shortened burnable poison stack height and gray axial power shaping rods. In addition, the margin to core fuel melt for the last two fuel batches (7 and 8) was calculated using the TACO 2 code.

Date of issuance: August 3, 1983.

Effective Date: August 3, 1983.

Amendment No. 48.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54.

Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: June 23, 1983, 48 FR 28764

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 3, 1983.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Sacramento City-County Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California.

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

Date of applicaiton of amendment:

February 17, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment involves changes to the TSS to incorporate a number of NUREG-0737 items as specified in our Generic Letter 82-16 dated September 20, 1982. The changes: (1) Add trip setting limits and surveillance requirements for the anticipatory reactor trip; (2) add limiting conditions for operation (LCOs) and surveillance requirements for the Reactor Building purge valves; (3) add reporting requirements for the primary system safety and relief valves; (4) add a policy statement on shift manning overtime limits; and (5) add the Reactor Building hydrogen sample line and the hydrogen recombiner penetration as components requiring local leak rate testing.

This amendment includes a portion of the items covered in the Notice identified below. The remaining items will be the subject of future Commission action.

Date of issuance: August 3, 1983.

Effective Date: August 3, 1983.

Amendment No. 49.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54.

Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: June 23, 1983, 48 FR 28765.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 3, 1983.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF
AMENDMENT TO FACILITY
OPERATING LICENSE AND FINAL
DETERMINATION OF NO
SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION AND
OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING
(EXIGENT OR EMERGENCY
CIRCUMSTANCES)**

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

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual 30-day Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing. For exigent circumstances, a press release seeking public comment as to the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination was used, and the State was consulted by telephone. In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant, a shorter public comment period (less than 30 days) has been offered and the State consulted by telephone whenever possible.

Under its regulations, the Commission may issue and make an amendment immediately effective, notwithstanding the pendency before it of a request for a hearing from any person, in advance of the holding and completion of any required hearing, where it has determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved.

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action.

Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

Unless indicated otherwise, the Commission has determined that the issuance of the amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with issuance of the amendment. If the Commission has prepared an Environmental Impact Appraisal related to the action, it is so indicated. If indicated, this notice constitutes a negative declaration and indicates that the Commission has concluded that an environmental impact statement is not warranted because there will be no environmental impact attributable to the action beyond that which has been predicted and described in the Commission's Final Environmental Statement for the facility.

For further details with respect to the action see: (1) The application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License, (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Impact Appraisal, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document room for the particular facilities involved.

A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention Director, Division of Licensing.

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendments. By September 26, 1983, 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 wish to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic

Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

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

No later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

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

Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at (800) 325-6000 (in Missouri (800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (*Branch Chief*): petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Executive Legal Director, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petitioner has made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

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

Date of application for amendment: June 24, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment provides the option of using a roving fire watch patrol in lieu of a continuous fire watch when required by a non-functional fire barrier penetration. Use of this option requires verification that fire detectors are operational.

Date of Issuance: July 19, 1983.

Effective Date: July 19, 1983.

Amendment No.: 65.

Facility Operating License No.: DPR-72.

Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Press release issued requesting comments as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes.

Comments received: No.

State Contacted: No comments.

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 19, 1983.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. S. A. Brandimore, Florida Power Corporation, Vice President and General Counsel, P.O. Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: July 26, 1983, as supplemented July 28 and 29, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes Technical Specification Table 3.7-1 related to surveillance testing of the degraded voltage relays in that the relay performance is verified at voltages below the trip setpoint; and changes Technical Specification 3.7.2.H related to manual action when the grid voltage drops below 218KV in that positive actions will be taken to return the grid voltage to 218KV. If the grid is not returned to 218KV within 8 hours, one electrical division will be operated on its diesel generator independent of offsite power.

Date of issuance: August 3, 1983.

Effective date: August 3, 1983.

Amendment No.: 50.

Facility Operating License No.: DPR-54.

Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

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

State contacted: No comments.

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 3, 1983.

Attorney for licensee: David S. Kaplan, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, P.O. Box 15830, Sacramento, California 95818.

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

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No
50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit 2,
Hamilton County, Tennessee**

Date of application for amendment: June 21, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment authorizes a temporary change in the surveillance requirements for rod drop tests and calibration of full length control rod position (rod bottom) limit switches. The licensee is required to demonstrate periodically (every 18-22

months) that the control rods will drop from the withdrawn position to the fully inserted position within a certain specified time. Also, the full length control rod position limit switches are calibrated in the remote shutdown control room during the same period of time. Control rods are verified to be operable every 31 days in accordance with other provisions of the Technical Specifications. Technical requirements associated with the restart of Unit 2 at this stage of the core life cycle, such as xenon buildup, would make it impractical to return to power operations after July 16, 1983. The amendment increases the surveillance period by 20 days. The maximum surveillance interval permitted by the

Technical Specifications is 688 days. This change was made to permit the licensee to carry out the control rod tests and calibration of the limit switches to coincide with the scheduled refueling for Unit 2 which will occur no later than August 5, 1983.

Date of issuance: July 15, 1983.

Effective date: July 15, 1983.

Amendment No. 20.

Facility Operating License No.: DPR-79.

Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

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

Comments received: No.

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 15, 1983.

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

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

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 18th day of August 1983.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert A. Clark,

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

[FR Doc. 83-22971 Filed 8-22-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M