NEW YORK PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP, INC.
NYPIRG
9 Murray St. ● New York, N.Y. 10007 ● 349-6460
Offices in: Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, Fredonia, Long Island, New Paltz, New York City, Niagara Falls, Syracuse, Utica

REGUL PUBLICATIONS BR.
JUL 11 A8:38

DS09 1/0
L. Luther

JOAN HOLT
BOX 817
TRURO, MA 02666

#699

July 6, 1989

(Biweekly)

54FR23306
5/31/89
(1)

Regulatory Publications Branch
Division of Freedom of Information
and Publications Services
Office of Administration
and Resources Management
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to formally request an extension of time in which to respond to Federal Register notice of Wednesday, May 31, 1989, Vol. 54, No. 103, page 23306. Specifically, I am requesting on behalf of myself and other affected individuals and groups additional time for the submission of comments, request for hearing, or/and petition to intervene regarding the Commission's "proposed no significant hazards consideration determination" for a license amendment requested by Consolidated Edison for its Indian Point Unit II plant (Docket No. 50-247), to increase allowable power level.

I first learned of this notice on June 21, 1989. I phoned NRC and spoke with Mr. Donald Brinkman who read sections of the notice to me, doing his best to explain procedures to me on the phone. He promptly sent me a copy of the notice which arrived several days later at my current address in Massachusetts, where I am without ready access to the Federal Register or any local PDR. After studying the notice, I called the Office of the Secretary with some procedural questions and to clarify how I might request an extension of time. The person I spoke to (Ms. Chris Cater) promised to get back to me but was apparently unable to reach me. Shortly before 5:00 pm on Friday, June 30, I called the Office of the Secretary again and explained my situation to Mr. John Hoyle. He told me he'd get back to me or have someone else do so July 3rd or 5th. Mr. Emile Julian reached me yesterday, the 5th, informing me that I should write my request for a time extension to you and to Mr. Donald Brinkman, Project Manager for Indian Point II. I have provided you with all this detail so that you will be aware that I have gone to some lengths to find out what to do.

I have begun to inform some other people who have been interested in matters relating to Indian Point; several were interested in seeing the Federal Register notice and considering making a response. So, I hope that you will provide us all the extra time in which to consider whether or how to respond. Since the Staff review is not expected to be completed until some time in the Fall (according to Mr. Brinkman), it surely would be possible to provide potentially interested parties a reasonable period in which to inform themselves about this matter and submit responses.

Please notify me of your decision at my summer address: Box 817, Truro, MA 02666. My phone, should you need it, is (508) 349-2120.

Yours truly,

Joan Holt

cc: Mr. Donald Brinkman
Project Manager, Indian Point II

8907180053 890706
PDR ADOCK 05000247
H PDR

DISTRIBUTION
Docket file
DLaBarge
DBrinkman
MSlosson
JNeighbors
CVogan
PDI-1 Rdg
RCapra

June 12, 1989

DOCKET NO(S). 50-333
50-247
50-286
50-220
50-410

SUBJECT: **MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT, RADIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING REPORT, AND ANNUAL ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING REPORT**

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

- [ ] Notice of Receipt of Application, dated _____.
- [ ] Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No._____ dated _____.
- [ ] Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License, dated _____.
- [ ] Bi-Weekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations, dated _____ [*see page(s)*] _____.
- [ ] Exemption, dated _____.
- [ ] Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Order Extending Construction Completion Date, dated _____.
- [X] Monthly Operating Report for ~~see attachment~~ transmitted by letter dated ~~see attachment~~.
- [X] Annual/Semi-Annual Report- **Radiological Environmental Montirdig Report, and Annual Environmental Monitoring report** transmitted by letter dated _____.

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

ACRS-1
ent

cc: **See next page**

OFFICE	PDI-1						
SURNAME	CVogan						
DATE	6/12/89						

NRC FORM 318 (10/80) NRCM 0240

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

50-247

DISTRIBUTION
PDI-1 Rdg
CVogan
JNeighbors
MSlosson
MHaughey
DLaBarge
Docket file

February 2, 1989

DOCKET NO(S). 50-333
and 50-247
50-286
50-220
50-410

SUBJECT: **MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT**

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

- [ ] Notice of Receipt of Application, dated _____.
- [ ] Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No._____ dated _____.
- [ ] Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License, dated _____.
- [ ] Bi-Weekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations, dated _____ [*see page(s)*] _____.
- [ ] Exemption, dated _____.
- [ ] Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Order Extending Construction Completion Date, dated _____.
- [x] Monthly Operating Report for **seeaattachment** transmitted by letter dated **see attachment.**
- [ ] Annual/Semi-Annual Report- _____ _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

cc: **See next page**

ACRS-1

OFFICE	PDI-1						
SURNAME	CVogan:vr						
DATE	2/2/89						

NRC FORM 318 (10/80) NRCM 0240 **OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

ATTACHMENT

FITZPATRICK

November 1988 Monthly Operating Report
December 1988 Monthly Operating Report

INDIAN POINT UNIT 2

November 1988 Monthly Operating Report
December 1988 Monthly Operating Report

INDIAN POINT UNIT 3

November 1988 Monthly Operating Report
December 1988 Monthly Operating Report

NINE MILE POINT UNIT 1

November 1988 Monthly Operating Report
December 1988 Monthly Operating Report

NINE MILE POINT UNIT 2

November 1988 Monthly Operating Report
December 1988 Monthly Operating Report

Indian Point 2
Indian Point 3
Nine Mile 1
Nine Mile 2
FitzPatrick

cc: Chief
Division of Ecological Services
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife
U.S. Department of the Interior
Washington, DC 20240

Chief (NOAA/BF/ECD/H6814)
Ecology and Conservation Division
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce (Rm. 6814)
14th and Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20230

Dr. William Cunningham
FDA Research Chemist
National Bureau of Standards
Reactor Building 235, Room B108
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region II Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
26 Federal Plaza
New York, NY 10007

Distribution
Docket NOs. 50-237
50-249
PD III-2 r/f
LLuther - w/encl.

August 25, 1988

DOCKET NO(S). 50-237 and 50-249

SUBJECT: Commonwealth Edison Company, Dresden Nuclear Powee Station, Units 2 and 3

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

- [ ] Notice of Receipt of Application, dated _____.
- [ ] Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No._____ dated _____.
- [ ] Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License, dated _____.
- [X] Bi-Weekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations, dated 8/10/88 [*see page(s)*] 30127, 30128, 30147.
- [ ] Exemption, dated _____.
- [ ] Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Order Extending Construction Completion Date, dated _____.
- [ ] Monthly Operating Report for _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.
- [ ] Annual/Semi-Annual Report- _____ _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.

Daniel R. Muller, Director, PD III-2
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

cc: see next page
w/enclosures

PD-III-2
LLuther
8/25/88

Mr. Henry E. Bliss
Commonwealth Edison Company

Dresden Nuclear Power Station
Units 2 and 3

cc:

Michael I. Miller, Esq.
Sidley and Austin
One First National Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Mr. J. Eenigenburg
Plant Superintendent
Dresden Nuclear Power Station
Rural Route #1
Morris, Illinois 60450

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Resident Inspectors Office
Dresden Station
Rural Route #1
Morris, Illinois 60450

Chairman
Board of Supervisors of
Grundy County
Grundy County Courthouse
Morris, Illinois 60450

Regional Administrator
Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region III
799 Roosevelt Road, Bldg. #4
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Mr. Michael E. Parker, Chief
Division of Engineering
Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety
1035 Outer Park Drive, 5th Floor
Springfield, Illinois 62704

August 11, 1988

DOCKET NO(S). 50-247

See Attached List of Addressees

DISTRIBUTION w/o encl.
Docket File w/encl
PDI-1 Rdg.
CVogan
MSlosson
DLangford

SUBJECT: CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK
IndianPoint Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2

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

- [ ] Notice of Receipt of Application, dated _____.
- [ ] Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No._____ dated _____.
- [ ] Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License, dated _____.
- [X] Bi-Weekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations, dated 7/27/88 [~~xxxxxxxxxx~~] comments by 8/~~00~~/88.
- [ ] Exemption, dated _____.
- [ ] Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Order Extending Construction Completion Date, dated _____.
- [ ] Monthly Operating Report for _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.
- [ ] Annual/Semi-Annual Report- _____ _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

cc: See next page

OFFICE	pdi-1						
SURNAME	cvogan						
DATE	8/10/88						

NRC FORM 318 (10/80) NRCM 0240

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law (P.L.) 97-415, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. P.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 biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from June 30, 1988 through July 15, 1988. The last biweekly notice was published on July 13, 1988 (53 FR 26517).

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.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules and Procedures Branch, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration and Resource Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 4000, Maryland National Bank Building, 7735 Old Georgetown Road, Bethesda, Maryland from 8:15 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC. The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By August 26, 1988 the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 325-6000 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (*Project Director*): 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 Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

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

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

Date of amendment request: June 13, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would change the Technical Specifications (TS) as follows:

1. Modify the Units 1 and 2 TS requirement 6.2, "Organization," by incorporating the changes recommended in the NRC Generic Letter (GL) 88-06, "Removal of Organization Charts from Technical Specification Administrative Control Requirements," by:

a. deleting the organization charts of TS Figures 6.2-1, "Management Organization Chart - Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant - Baltimore Gas & Electric Company," and 6.2-2, "Organization Chart (Two Unit Operation) - Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant - Baltimore Gas & Electric Company," and replacing them with a TS 6.2.1.a requirement to establish onsite and offsite organizations with lines of authority, responsibility and communication defined and documented in Chapter 12 of the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) as organization charts for all management levels, intermediate levels and operating organization positions;

b. defining the responsibilities of the Manager - Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant and the Vice President - Nuclear shall be defined in TS 6.2.1.b and c;

c. add TS 6.2.1.d to provide all training, health physics and quality assurance staff members with independence from but reportability to onsite management;

d. specifying in TS 6.2.2, "Unit Staff," the staffing positions required to hold operator licenses as was previously reflected in TS Figure 6.2-2;

e. adding a new TS 6.2.1.a requirement to establish and document the lines of authority, responsibility and communication in Chapter 12 of the UFSAR through functional descriptions of departmental responsibilities and relationships, and job descriptions for key personnel positions. Change 1.e would become effective 90 days following the effective date for changes 1.a through d.

2. Make changes to the Units 1 and 2 TS 6.1, "Responsibility," 6.5.1, "Plant Operations and Safety Review Committee (POSRC)," 6.8, "Procedures," 6.16, "Process Control Program," and 6.17, "Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (ODCM)," to reflect the changes in nomenclature of a) the title Manager - Nuclear Operations to the new title of Manager - Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant and, b) the title of General Supervisor - Operations to the new title of General Supervisor - Nuclear Operations.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: In accordance with the guidance provided in GL 88-06, changes 1.a through e propose the replacement of the Units 1 and 2 TS 6.2, "Organization," Figures 6.2-1 and 6.2-2 with the standardized GL 88-06 technical specifications which were found to be generically acceptable by the NRC staff for all power reactors. These changes would (1) result in more restrictive TS, which would require improved definition of functional positions and job descriptions, (2) maintain all current TS organizational requirements important to safety in the TS, such as the requirement for an organization with defined lines of authority, responsibility and communications and the specific operating organizations positions required to hold operating licenses, and (3) would provide greater flexibility for licensees to implement organizational changes, consistent with Commission policy, in a controlled process under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59, "Changes, tests and experiments" rather than as a TS amendment.

In implementing these proposed changes, the licensee has requested that the additional restrictive requirement of proposed TS 6.2.1.a (change 1.e) for "functional descriptions of departmental responsibilities and relationships, and job descriptions for key personnel positions" be made effective 90 days after the effective date of changes 1.a through e. This request was made to permit the licensee's new management sufficient time to evaluate plant problems, goals and programs and to appropriately determine and delegate these functional responsibilities and duties related to key positions.

Change 2 was also a strictly administrative change in that it only modifies the titles of Manager - Nuclear Operations and General Supervisor - Operations to the new titles of Manager - Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant and General Supervisor - Nuclear Operations, respectively.

The licensee evaluated these proposed changes against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has determined that these amendments would not:

(i) Involve a significant increase in an accident probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated...

These changes are administrative in nature. No plant equipment or operations are affected. Future organizational changes will still be required to be fully defined with an adequately reviewed and approved safety evaluation performed in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59. Furthermore, all future organizational changes will be required to be evaluated against the current level of commitment described in the licensee's Quality Assurance program and thus, must comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54. As such, these proposed changes do not involve any increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(ii) Create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated...

As this proposal does not alter any plant operability requirements, surveillance testing, maintenance, or system design or functions, no possibility of creating a new or different type of accident would result from the proposed changes.

(iii) Involve a significant reduction in margin of safety...

All plant operational requirements are unaffected by these proposed administrative changes. All organizational requirements potentially affecting plant safety (i.e., personnel required to hold operators licenses) remain unchanged. Therefore, these proposed changes will not involve any reduction in a margin of safety.

Finally, on March 6, 1986, the NRC published guidance in the Federal Register (51 FR 7751) concerning examples of amendments that are not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration.

These changes are consistent with two of the examples provided: "(i) a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications: for example.... a change in nomenclature and (ii) a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications." Consequently, the NRC staff proposes to determine that these proposed changes to TS 6.1, 6.2, 6.5.1, 6.8, 6.16 and 6.17 involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Jay E. Silbert, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra, Director

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

Date of amendment request: June 30, 1988

Description of amendment request: The amendment would change the degraded voltage trip and alarm setpoints (Tables 3.2.B, 3.2.B.1 and Limiting Condition for Operation 3.9.B

based on a recent analysis of the electrical power distribution system for the Pilgrim Plant. The analysis indicated the trip setpoint should be set at 3868V ±0.5% in order that the safety related devices on the worst case motor control center have sufficient voltage for proper and safe operation. The alarm setpoint should be set at 3959 ±0.5% to allow for required operator action and permit load shedding when required during a LOCA. The installation of newer, more reliable, and higher quality solid state relays allows the revised setpoints and tolerances to be used. The remarks section of Table 3.2.B and 3.2.B.1 have also been reworded to provide the operators with a more detailed description of the load shedding logic associated with the degraded voltage protective relays.

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

The licensee has evaluated the proposed amendment against the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 and has determined the following:

(1) Operation of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station (PNPS) in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Raising the degraded voltage setpoints does not affect the operation of equipment relied on in the accident analysis because the voltage at the safety-related devices continues to be maintained above the voltage where proper operation can be assured.

The proposed changes are being made to maintain the existing protection provided by the degraded voltage protection relays. Previously evaluated performances of safety systems will not be changed by raising the degraded voltage trip and alarm setpoints. Therefore, the proposed changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

(2) Operation of PNPS in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

It is concluded from the system evaluations, discussed in Item 1, that the proposed degraded voltage setpoints do not change any accident analyses previously evaluated for the affected systems.

Safety-related equipment continues to be provided adequate voltage to perform their intended safety functions. Therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

(3) Operation of PNPS in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

For the reasons stated in Items 1 and 2 above, it is concluded that the proposed changes do not alter or remove other existing technical specifications, do not change any accident analysis previously evaluated and, do not reduce the margin of safety for equipment relied on in the accident analysis. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Therefore, based on this review, the staff proposes to determine that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

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

NRC Project Director: R. H. Wessman, PDI-3

Duke Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: December 15, 1987, as supplemented April 15, 1988

Description of amendment request: The request proposes five changes to Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.7.8 for Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. They are: Change 1 would delete an optional sampling plan for snubber inspection (Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8e.3)—the "55" snubber plan) which has never been used at Catawba; Change 2 would allow deletion of the "reject" line from Figure 4.7-1 and in the "37" functional test plan (Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8e.2)); Change 3 proposes an alternate sampling plan, not yet approved by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), involving grouping of snubber failure modes; Change 4 would allow deletion of the phrase "of a type" from Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8e.; and Change 5 would delete the requirement to inspect snubber attachment hardware (Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8c.—Visual Inspection Acceptance Criteria) because this inspection is already under the requirements of ASME Code, Section XI.

Only changes 2 and 5 are discussed below. However, changes 1, 3 and 4 remain under NRC staff's review and consideration although they are not covered by this notice.

Change 2 would revise the acceptability criteria for snubber testing by the "37" functional test plan in Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8e.2) by deleting the "reject" line from Figure 4.7-1, which could unnecessarily require the functional testing of all 1600 snubbers. A similar revision was approved in TS amendments 46 and 27, issued September 30, 1985, for McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, respectively.

Change 5 would revise Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8c. to delete the portion related to the inspection of the hardware by which a snubber is attached to its supporting structure. This hardware would instead be inspected in accordance with the less stringent requirements of ASME Code, Section XI.

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

The licensee, in its April 15, 1988 submittal, provided the following evaluation of Change 2:

This change would allow deletion of the reject line from Figure 4.7-1 and in the 37 functional test sample plan (Surveillance 4.7.8e.2)).

The justification for this has already been evaluated for the McGuire Technical Specification change issued September 30, 1985. This change has also been agreed upon by the OM-4 working group for Revision 2 of the OM-4 standard.

Deletion of the "REJECT" line will remove the possibility of rejecting a good population of snubbers which would require unnecessary testing of the total population of approximately 1600 snubbers.

The discussion of the statistical significance of deleting the reject line was presented as justification for the McGuire amendment. This discussion is applicable to Catawba.

With regard to the three 10 CFR 50.92 standards, the licensee's evaluation is as follows:

(1) Deletion of the "REJECT" line will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident. Deletion of the "REJECT" line will omit the possibility of rejecting a good population of snubbers without increasing the possibility of passing a bad population. The requirement to continue testing additional samples of snubbers if inoperable snubbers are found will remain in the specifications.

(2) The proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the amendment will not result in a change to the design or operation of the station.

All snubbers will still be required to be operable and appropriate snubber inspections will continue to be performed As such, this change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) The proposed change will not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Deletion of the "REJECT" line will remove the possibility of unnecessarily having to test all of the snubbers at the station. The requirement to test additional samples of snubbers when inoperable snubbers are found will be retained. Therefore this change will not significantly reduce a margin of safety.

For Change 5 the licensee's April 15, 1988 submittal provides the following evaluation:

Surveillance 4.7.8c. Visual Inspection Acceptance Criteria goes beyond inspection of the snubber and its attachment to supporting structures. It also requires inspection of the attachment hardware. This inspection is already under the requirements of ASME Sect XI IWF, which the OM-4 working group has acknowledged. The inspection plan (ISI) required by the ASME Code, Section XI, IWF for hanger supports, including snubbers, is performed under procedure using a certified VT-3 inspector. For the snubber Technical Specification to require more stringent visual inspections for snubbers (which are needed to function during an earthquake) than on other piping supports (which are always needed to function) is an undue burden on the plant staff.

Approximately 1000 snubbers require removal and replacement of mirror insulation in order to perform this inspection. Because of the potential for the creation of airborne radioactivity as a result of removing the insulation, respirator protection is required for any jobs being performed in the area. It is estimated that the cost associated with work is in excess of $100,000 each year. This change is recommended so that unnecessary man-rem and man-hours can be saved.

The licensee provided the following evaluation with regard to the three 10 CFR 50.92 standards:

(1) Deletion of the requirement to inspect attachment hardware will remove an unnecessary burden from the snubber specification. This inspection is already required under Section XI of the ASME Code. The Section XI inspection will be performed as required, thus this change will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of any previously evaluated accident.

(2) The proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the amendment will not result in a change to the design or operation of the station.

All snubbers will still be required to be operable and appropriate snubber inspections will continue to be performed. As such, this change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) Deletion of the requirement to inspect the snubber attachment hardware will eliminate an unnecessary amount of inspection. Since this inspection is required to be performed per Section XI of the ASME Code, deletion from the specifications will not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The staff has considered proposed changes 2 and 5, and agrees with the licensee's evaluation of each of these changes with respect to the three standards.

On this basis, the Commission has concluded that the requested changes meet the three standards and, therefore, has made a proposed determination that the amendment application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Duke Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: July 11, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise the Total Number of Channels in Table 3.3-10 titled "Accident Monitoring Instrumentation" for the: (1) Auxiliary Feedwater Flow Rate, (b) PORV Position Indicator, and (c) PORV Block Valve Position Indicator. The first two changes would reduce the total number of channels from 2 to 1 for Catawba Units 1 and 2, and the third change would reduce it from 2 to 1 for Unit 1 only. For Unit 2, the third change was approved in license amendments 46 and 39, issued on June 1, 1988, for Catawba Units 1 and 2, respectively.

The Auxiliary Feedwater Flow Rate and PORV Position Indicator channels are classified as Type D variables and fall under the Category 2 definition as presented in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.97. Thus, a single channel would be adequate. However, the PORV Block Valve Position Indicator is not addressed in RG 1.97.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided certain examples (51 FR 7744) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. The request involved in this case does not match any of those examples. However, the staff has reviewed the licensee's request for the above amendments and determined that should this request be implemented, it would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes reflect the intent of the system design and are in accordance with RG 1.97, Revision 2.

Also, the proposed amendments would not (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the instrumentation affected is used for post-accident monitoring and the proposed changes would not introduce unanalyzed conditions or new modes of operation for any safety-related systems. For the reasons stated in items (1) and (2) above, the proposed changes would not (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendments involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Duquesne Light Company, et. al., Docket No. 50-334 and 412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: June 11, 1988

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the administrative control requirements to reflect changes to the Nuclear Group organization, and incorporate general requirements to replace the organization charts in accordance with the guidance provided in the staff's Generic Letter 88-06.

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

(1) The proposed amendment does not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the reorganization of the nuclear group and deletion of the organization charts from the Technical Specifications do not affect plant operation. As in the past, the NRC will continue to be informed of organizational changes through other required controls. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.34(b)(6)(i) the licensee's organizational structure was included in the Final Safety Analysis Report, and as required by 10 CFR 50.71(e), the licensee submits annual updates to the FSAR. In addition, Appendix B to 10 CFR 50 and 10 CFR 50.54(a)(3) govern changes to organization described in the quality assurance program; some of these organizational changes require prior NRC approval. Also, it is the licensee's practice to inform the NRC of organizational changes affecting the nuclear facilities prior to implementation.

(2) The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated because the proposed changes are administrative in nature, and do not involve any physical alterations of plant configuration, set points or operation procedures.

(3) The proposed amendment does not involve a reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed amendment only changes the administrative parts of the Technical Specifications from specific to generic, and does not relax any requirements. Operation of the units will continue to be governed by current regulations, current operating specifications and the licensee's commitments.

Accordingly, the staff proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensees: Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

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

Date of amendment request: June 21, 1988

Description of amendment request: The June 21, 1988 request identified as TSCR172 by the licensee would delete the requirement for a daily exercise of the Main Steam Isolation Valves (MSIVs). The basis has also been changed to reflect deletion of this requirements. Specifically, these changes are as follows:

(a) Section 4.5.I.3.a of the Technical Specifications has been deleted and Section 4.5.I.3.b has been incorporated in Section 4.5.I.3.

(b) The basis for MSIV Testing has been revised to reflect the requirements of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI, 1974 edition with 1973 addendum.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee has evaluated its proposed changes against the standards in 10 CFR 50.92. The results are as follows:

Section 4.5.I.3.a

(1) The proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated. This change results in deletion of the daily exercise of the MSIVs. Quarterly valve operability testing will be maintained as presently required. Such testing is in accordance with the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI, 1974 edition with winter 1973 addendum which is approved under 10 CFR 50.55a and provides sufficient indication of valve reliability. Daily cycling of the MSIVs results in accelerated wear of the upper rib and poppet pad which may result in degradation of the valve seat tightness which is counter productive in assuring valve reliability.

The daily test is accomplished by slow closure which is not representative of the valve response when performing its design function; therefore, the daily test is not indicative of valve response during an actual event. Elimination of this testing will not result in an increase of the probability of valve failure during accidents previously evaluated since the quarterly test verifies the capability of the valve to accomplish its design function.

(2) The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change only eliminates the daily exercise and does not result in any change to the system configuration or function. Therefore, there is no change to the design function or actuating logic. Valve reliability will be demonstrated during the required quarterly testing which remains unchanged.

(3) The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. MSIV operability is assured by performance of the quarterly functional testing and is not enhanced by the daily exercise to the 95% open position. Such daily testing is accomplished by slow closure which does not represent the fast closure capability of the valves. Daily cycling in this manner is excessive and results in unnecessary wear on the MSIV internals. Since the quarterly functional testing assures valve operability, as in the past, the margin of safety is not reduced and unnecessary wear on valve internals is eliminated.

Sections 4.5.I.3.b and 4.5.I.3

Section 4.5.I.3.b has been incorporated into section 4.5.I.3. The technical requirement remains unchanged. Therefore, this change is purely administrative and does not involve any increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident, nor does it result in a decrease in the margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's submittal and concurs with its no significant hazards determination.

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

Attorney for licensee: Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Gulf States Utilities Company, Docket No. 50-498, River Bend Station, Unit 1 West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: May 25, 1988 as supplemented July 6, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise License Condition 2.C(14), Emergency Response Capabilities, Attachment 5, Item 3. Item 3 of Attachment 5 to the license, requires that prior to startup from the second refueling outage, the licensee shall implement modifications (installation or upgrade) for neutron flux monitoring consistent with the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2 unless prior approval of an alternate design is granted by the NRC staff. The proposed change to Attachment 5, Item 3., would delay implementation until a refueling outage following the issuance of the NRC safety evaluation relating to the Boiling Water Reactor Owner's Group (BWROG) topical report, Position or NRC Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 3, Requirements for Post-Accident Neutron Monitoring System, NEDO-31558, March 1988. Specifically, the proposed change would state that Gulf States Utilities (GSU) shall implement modifications (installation or upgrade) for neutron flux monitoring consistent with the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.97, Revision 2 or the NRC staff's Safety Evaluation Report (SER) of the BWROG topical report NEDO-31558. Modifications, if required, shall be completed before restart from the next refueling outage starting after 10 months from the date of receipt of the NRC staff SER on NEDO-31558.

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

1. No significant increase in the probability or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated results from this change because:

There is no change in system design or operation. The license condition currently requires upgrade of the neutron flux monitoring system (NMS) during the second refueling outage. This license condition proposed change will allow operation with the currently installed system which has been found to comply with all criteria proposed in the BWROG letter. This system is required to provide neutron flux indication and is not postulated to initiate any accidents. The neutron monitoring system is used to verify reactor shutdown as part of the Emergency Operating Procedures (EOPs). The use of neutron monitoring in the EOPs is conservative in that, if it is not available, actions are specified which will lead to safe shutdown without the system. The requirements of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.97 concerning neutron monitoring are additions to the existing system abilities. Therefore, delay in upgrade to RG 1.97 requirements will not significantly increase the probability of an accident and would not lead to an increase in the consequences of an accident as defined in the safety analysis because of the conservative EOP actions.

2. This change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because:

The current system has been evaluated using alternate criteria proposed in NEDO-31558 and found acceptable for continued operation. This change does not involve any changes to design or operation. In addition, the neutron monitoring system is not postulated as the initiator of any accidents. Therefore, no new or different accidents are created.

3. This change would not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because:

Design, function, and operation of the existing neutron monitoring system remain the same. There is no specified "margin of safety" associated with this system as used in RG 1.97 other than to assure reactor shutdown following a transient or accident. EOP actions are conservative with respect to the use of neutron monitoring for verification that the reactor is shutdown. When not available during an accident or transient scenario, actions are specified which will lead to reactor shutdown. Because these actions lead to a safe plant condition (reactor shutdown), the margin of safety is not reduced. In addition, this request does not result in a reduction to the margin of safety as defined in the bases of the River Bend Station (RBS) Technical Specifications.

Because the present RBS design meets all criteria provided in the BWROG License Topical Report, NEDO-31558, which was submitted to the NRC April 1, 1988, as supported by the plant-specific evaluation in this amendment request, extension of the implementation date for a neutron monitoring system meeting RG 1.97 guidance is justified. This extension allows the NRC to complete their evaluation of the Licensing Topical Report, which provides an alternative design as allowed by the license condition to comply with the RG 1.97 requirements. In addition, GSU will be able to better plan its resource utilization to address the NMS pursuant RG 1.97 after the staff's SER is received.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination. Based on the review and the above discussions, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

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

NRC Project Director: Jose A. Calvo

Gulf States Utilities Company, Docket No. 50-498, River Bend Station, Unit 1 West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: May 31, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to add action requirements in the event that the scram discharge volume (SDV) vent and drain valves become inoperable. These additions are being requested because currently there are surveillance requirements to demonstrate operability of these valves; however, there are no action statements if the valves are determined to be inoperable. The proposed amendment would modify the TSs as follows:

(1) TS 3.1.3.1d would be added and would require that with one SDV vent valve and/or one SDV drain valve inoperable and open, the inoperable valve(s) must be restored to operable status within 24 hours or be in at least hot shutdown within the next 12 hours;

(2) TS 3.1.3.1e would be added and would require that with two SDV vent valves and/or two SDV drain valves inoperable and open, one valve in the vent line and one valve drain line must be restored to operable status within 8 hours and all valves must be restored to operable status within the next 16 hours or at least one vent valve and one drain valve must be closed and be in at least hot shutdown within the next 12 hours; and

(3) TS 3.1.3.1f would be added and would require that with any SDV vent valve(s) and/or any SDV drain valve(s) inoperable and closed, except when required by TS 3.1.3.1e above, all valves must be restored to operable status

within 8 hours or be in at least hot shutdown within the next 12 hours.

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

1. The change proposed by this submittal does not involve a significant increase in the probability or the consequences of a previously evaluated accident because:

The proposed Action (d) provides "additional" action requirements to be met in the event of one SDV vent and/or one SDV drain valve is found inoperable and open. In this configuration, at least one vent and one drain valve are capable of automatically closing on a scram signal to provide the required isolation function. The 24 hours allowed by this proposed action requirement allows sufficient time to find and correct the problem without requiring the unit to shutdown unnecessarily when the isolation function is still capable of being performed.

The proposed Action (e) provides "additional" action requirements to be met in the event that two SDV vent and/or two SDV drain valves are found inoperable and open. In this configuration, the isolation function of the SDV cannot be performed. Therefore, a more restrictive 8 hours are proposed to allow time to find and correct the problem. In the event of a reactor scram while operating in this configuration, reactor coolant would be released to the containment equipment drain sumps. However, this effluent would still be contained within the primary containment. Adequate reactor vessel makeup would be available from either the condensate and feedwater systems or the high pressure core spray system. Therefore, the safe shutdown of the unit is not adversely affected. The proposed action requirements would further require the remaining SDV vent and drain valves be restored to operable status within the next 16 hours. This is consistent with proposed Action (d) since all vent and drain valves would be required to be made operable within 24 hours.

The proposed Action (f) provides "additional" action requirements to be met in the event that any SDV vent or SDV drain valves are found inoperable and closed. In this configuration, the isolation function of the SDV is being maintained by the closed inoperable valve(s). When there is no scram and the inoperable valves are closed, water will accumulate in the SDV. Although this condition may initiate a reactor scram, the valves are in their preferred closed position. The redundant and diverse SDV water level instrumentation and automatic reactor scram will ensure adequate SDV volume will remain to accept the water displaced during a scram while operating in this configuration. The proposed Action (f) is conservative by allowing only 8 hours for restoration of the SDV vent and drain valves to accumulate in the SDV. Therefore, the safe shutdown of the unit would not be adversely affected. The 8 hours allowed by this proposed action allows sufficient time to find and correct the problem without requiring the unit to be shutdown unnecessarily when the isolation function of the SDV is being performed.

If any of the actions are not met within the proposed time requirements, the unit will be required to be placed in at least hot shutdown within 12 hours. This requirement is consistent with the action requirements previously approved on other Mark III BWR/6 nuclear plant dockets for Perry, Clinton, and Grand Gulf.

Additionally, this change will not result in any design or hardware changes and is within the capabilities of the current equipment. Adequate makeup capability to the reactor vessel would be available from the condensate and feedwater systems or the high pressure core spray systems in the event of a failure to isolate the SDV during a scram. Additionally, any reactor coolant released through inoperable and open SDV vent and/or drain valves would be collected in the containment equipment drain sumps and would be contained within the primary containment. Therefore, the safe shutdown capability of the unit is not adversely affected.

The small break LOCA inside containment analyses provided in Chapters 6 and 15 of the River Bend Station updated safety analysis report (USAR) are still bounding. As stated in Chapter 6 of the USAR, the resulting drywell temperatures are significantly lower for this type of small break LOCA than one in which blowdown flow consists of reactor steam only.

2. The change proposed by this submittal does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because:

The proposed "additional" action requirements do not result in any design or hardware changes and are within the capabilities of the current equipment. In addition, the proposed change imposes more detailed action requirements on River Bend Station (RBS) than currently required by the Technical Specifications. Adequate makeup capability to the reactor vessel would be available from the condensate and feedwater systems or the high pressure core spray system in the event of a failure to isolate the SDV during a scram. Additionally, any reactor coolant released through inoperable and open SDV vent and/or drain valves would be collected in the containment equipment drain sumps and would be contained within the primary containment. Therefore, the safe shutdown of the unit is not adversely affected.

3. This proposal as submitted does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because:

These proposed changes provide more definite action requirements for the conditions when either one or two vent and/or drain valves are inoperable.

The proposed "additional" action requirements are consistent with the provisions in other recently licensed BWR/6 plants with similar design features as River Bend. More specifically, the proposed action requirements would conform to those previously approved on the Grand Gulf docket. These additional requirements do not significantly reduce any margin of safety because the changes provide assurance that provisions are made to address the situation where one or two SDV vent and/or drain valves are inoperable without causing an immediate shutdown per the provisions of Technical Specification 3.0.3. Because these actions lead to a safe plant condition (reactor shutdown), the margin of safety is not reduced. In addition, this request does not result in a significant reduction to the margin of safety as defined in the bases of the RBS Technical Specifications.

The proposed amendment, as discussed above, has not changed the system design or function as discussed in the USAR. The proposed action requirements are consistent with other recently licensed BWR/6 plants with similar design features as River Bend. In the event of a reactor scram with the SDV incapable of performing its isolation function, adequate reactor coolant makeup would be available and the current small break LOCA analyses presented in the River Bend USAR would still bound this condition. Additionally, any reactor coolant released through inoperable and open SDV vent and/or drain valves would be collected in the containment equipment drain sumps and would be contained within the primary containment. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not increase the probability or the consequences of a previously evaluated accident and will not create a new or different accident. Since the proposed changes provide adequate action requirements to assure that provisions are made to address the situation where SDV vent and/or drain valves are inoperable without imposing an unnecessary operational transient associated with immediate shutdown in accordance with Technical Specification 3.0.3, the proposed change does not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety. Therefore, GSU proposes that no significant hazards considerations are involved.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination. Based on the review and the above discussions, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

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

NRC Project Director: Jose A. Calvo

Gulf States Utilities Company, Docket No. 50-498, River Bend Station, Unit 1 West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: June 21, 1988

Description of amendment request: The amendment would delete Figure 6.2.1-1, River Bend Station Organization, and Figure 6.2.2-1, River Bend Station Organization, and replace them with a functional description of the offsite and onsite organizations in Section 6.2.1 of the Technical Specifications (TSs). Where qualifications for certain positions are currently designated by organization charts as requiring a Senior Reactor Operator or Reactor Operator license, they are included in Section 6.2.2 of the proposed TS. Guidance for the deletion of organization charts from the TSs was provided in the NRC's Generic Letter 88-06, Removal of Organization Charts from Technical Specification Administrative Control Requirements, March 22, 1988.

The amendment would also delete the address for correspondence concerning monthly operating reports in Section 6.9.1.6 of the TSs because it duplicates the address instructions for all routine reports in Section 6.9.1.

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

1. The proposed deletion of organization charts from River Bend Station (RBS) Technical Specifications does not affect plant operations. Gulf States Utilities (GSU) believes that the current organization charts in the RBS TSs have been of little assistance in ensuring that the objectives of administrative control requirements are met. Organizational characteristics important to safety are defined and maintained in the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 10, Part 50.34(b)(6)(i). Detailed information on organizational structure, reporting responsibilities, qualifications, and purpose are maintained in the USAR and updated annually in accordance with 10 CFR 50.71(e). In addition, this proposed change does not impact previously evaluated safety analysis as identified in USAR sections 6 or 15. Therefore, GSU proposes that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. These proposed changes affect administrative controls in the RBS TSs and do not affect plant equipment, physical features, or the required technical qualifications of plant personnel. Specific operational requirements are required elsewhere in the TS that bear more directly on operational safety than organization charts.

Therefore, GSU proposes that the requested amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated.

3. No technical limits are changed or reduced by this proposed amendment. There is no reduction of authority, responsibility, or administrative reporting requirements of individuals in the RBS organization due to the deletion of organization charts. Many of the details shown on the organization charts are not essential to the safe operation of the facility. In addition, these proposed changes do not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis of the RBS TS. Therefore, GSU proposes that the requested amendment does not involve significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Since the proposed amendment does not change any safety analysis as described in the USAR nor does it create the possibility of a new or different type of accident or significantly reduce a margin of safety, GSU proposes that no significant hazards are involved.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination. Based on the review and the above discussions, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

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

NRC Project Director: Jose A. Calvo

Gulf States Utilities Company, Docket No. 50-498, River Bend Station, Unit 1 West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: June 21, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to bring the TSs in agreement with proposed changes to the Asiatic Clam Control Program (ACCP) that were submitted to the NRC for review and approval. The proposed changes to the ACCP were submitted by letter dated August 31, 1987 and revised by letter dated March 30, 1988. The proposed amendment would modify TS 6.8.4.d., Biofouling Prevention and Detection, as follows:

1. Delete the requirement for NRC staff approval of the ACCP prior to introduction of river water to plant systems. The NRC staff approved the current ACCP by letter dated September 27, 1985 and Mississippi River water was introduced into the plant cooling system in November 1985. Thus, this requirement was met.

2. Delete the requirement for monitoring to detect the presence of Corbicula in the Mississippi River and add the requirement for monitoring to detect Corbicula in the clarifier influent.

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

(1) No significant increase in the probability or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated results from this change because:

The proposed deletion from River Bend Station (RBS) TS does not affect plant operations. Gulf States Utilities (GSU) believes that the current river channel sampling has been of little assistance in ensuring that the objectives of the administrative control requirements are met.

Biofouling of safety-related components by *Corbicula* does not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated. Therefore, accident initiating events involving equipment susceptible to biofouling are not addressed in the current safety analysis. Safety-related components served by service water only mitigate the consequences of an accident and are not initiators of analyzed accidents.

The prevention and detection elements of the ACCP, such as performance trending of safety-related components, visual inspection of components, and chlorination of the normal service water system, continue to provide redundant assurance that safety-related components will be available to perform their intended function following an incident. No changes to the prevention and

detection elements are being requested. This proposed change involves only the suspension of river channel monitoring.

(2) This change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because:

This proposed change does not affect plant equipment, physical features, or the required staffing or qualifications of plant personnel as currently required in TS Section 6.0. Specific operational requirements are required elsewhere in the TS that bear more directly on operational safety than river channel sampling.

The implications of biofouling by bivalve organisms such as *Corbicula* have been identified in IE Bulletin 81-03 and as a generic safety issue (GSI). The implications of *Corbicula* biofouling at RBS were evaluated and the ACCP was found acceptable in SER Supplement No. 5 Section 9.2.1. The proposed change does not create the possibility of an accident new or different from those evaluations mentioned above since the ACCP assumes that *Corbicula* will be introduced into plant systems. The element of the ACCP regarding the monitoring for *Corbicula* in the source water is not diminished by the deletion of monitoring in the Mississippi River channel since monitoring will continue for adult/large juvenile clams in the embayment makeup pump area and for larval/smaller juvenile clams in the clarifier influent. Therefore, the effectiveness of the ACCP will not be decreased by these proposed changes. Prevention and early detection of biofouling within these systems continues to assure that safety-related systems will not be prevented from performing their intended functions.

(3) This change would not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because:

The proposed change affects only Section 6.0, Administrative Controls, of the TS. No technical limits are changed or reduced by this proposed amendment. The monitoring for presence or relative abundance of *Corbicula* in the Mississippi River channel is not essential to the safe operation of the facility. Relevant monitoring for *Corbicula* detection and prevention in the source water will continue to be performed as part of the approved ACCP. Suspension of river channel sampling from TS Section 6.0 represents no reduction in safety requirements. In addition, this proposed change does not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis of the RBS TS. Therefore, GSU proposes that the requested amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination. Based on the review and the above discussions, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

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

NRC Project Director: Jose A. Calvo

Illinois Power Company, Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc., Western Illinois Power Cooperative, Inc., Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1, DeWitt County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: February 5, 1988

Description of amendment request: This proposed amendment would revise the trip setpoint, allowable value and instrument-zero point specified for the suppression pool water level instrument associated with Technical Specification Tables 3.3.3-2 and 3.3.5-2. The proposed change only electronically affects the instrument loop indication and does not change the design basis for the trip function. Therefore, the actual suppression pool level (in terms of elevation) at which the trip function should occur will remain unchanged.

Initial performance of the plant calibration procedure revealed that, due to an error in the installation design, the desired calibration range for the noted instrument loop did not properly correspond to the calibration range of the installed transmitters. The effect of this was that the values indicated in inches (water column) by the analog trip module (ATM) for the Trip Setpoint and Allowable Value did not match the values specified in inches (water column) in the Technical Specifications. The licensees decided that the problem could be remedied without relocating the sensor by redesignating the instrument-zero point and correspondingly respecifying the associated Trip Setpoint and Allowable Value. The instrument would still continue to operate satisfactorily for the minimum range of water level (elevation) required. The effect of redesignating the instrument-zero point is to shift the ATM-indicated water level values by 15 inches. The Technical Specification thus needs to be changed to reflect the ATM-indicated values. That is, under the revised Technical Specification, the ATM-indicated values for the Trip Setpoint and Allowable Value would match the values indicated by the Technical Specification Table.

Basis for Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination: The staff has evaluated this proposed amendment and determined that it involves no significant hazards considerations. According to 10 CFR 50.92(c), a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations if operation of the facility in accordance with the amendment 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 safety.

The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes do not change the actual level (in terms of elevation) at which the affected instrument is designed to trip. Thus, the analytical basis from which the Trip Setpoint and Allowable Value were determined remains unchanged.

The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because no changes to plant operation or changes to the design function of the instrument are proposed.

The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because they do not alter the relationship between the Trip Setpoint, Allowable Value, instrument-zero point and analytical limit. The design basis of the Trip Setpoint is unchanged. The proposed change to the Technical Specification reflects a change to the instrument loop that will more closely match the sensor range to the range indicated by the trip unit thus enhancing satisfactory operation of the instrument loop and satisfactory performance of the instrument loop calibration.

For the reasons stated above, the staff believes this proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Vespasian Warner Public Library, 120 West Johnson Street, Clinton, Illinois 61727

Attorney for licensee: Sheldon Zabel, Esq., Schiff, Hardin and Waite, 7200 Sears Tower, 233 Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller

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

Date of application for amendment: July 30, 1987.

Description of amendment request: The proposed technical specification change provides restrictions on the reliance on one of the two available 115 KV incoming transmission lines to meet Technical Specification 3.12 until a new capacitor bank is made operational.

A study has shown that the 115 KV Mason line was capable of maintaining adequate voltage while supplying these worst case loads. Since Maine Yankee normally relies on the 115 KV Mason line, the reliance on the Surowiec line would only be of concern if the Mason line were to be out of service under these worst case loading conditions.

Following completion of this study, Maine Yankee established administrative controls to prevent the Surowiec line from being relied on to meet Technical Specification 3.12.A.1 or 3.12.B.1 without additional justification being provided. The proposed technical specification change serves to strengthen those administrative controls.

Maine Yankee plans to install a capacitor bank to improve the voltage of the Surowiec line. With capacitor bank operational, it is expected that the Surowiec line will be capable of maintaining adequate voltage while supplying peak auxiliary and safeguards loads under all expected conditions. Therefore, the proposed technical specification restriction on the use of the Surowiec line becomes void once the capacitor bank is operational.

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

The Proposed Change is administrative in nature and does not involve a significant hazards consideration for the reasons set forth below.

1. Does the change increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR?

The Proposed Change provides additional restrictions on one of the available 115 KV lines. It does not affect the probability or consequences of any accident evaluated in the FSAR.

2. Does the change create the possibility of a new type of accident not previously analyzed in the FSAR?

The Proposed Change is administrative in nature and does not create the possibility of a new type of accident.

3. Does the change decrease the margin of safety established in the basis of the Technical Specifications?

The Proposed Change places restrictions on one of the two available 115-KV transmission lines until a new capacitor bank is made operational. The Proposed Change provides additional assurance that the margin of safety of Technical Specification 3.12 is maintained until the adequacy of the Surowiec line is restored through the installation of the capacitor bank.

We have reviewed the licensee's analysis and have agreed with it. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazard.

Local Public Document Room location: Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, P.O. Box 367, Wiscasset, Maine 04578.

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

NRC Project Director: R. Wessman

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50-423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: February 24, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.3.9, "Radioactive Liquid Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation" and TS 3.3.3.10, "Radioactive Gaseous Monitoring Instrumentation." The proposed changes provide for the following: (1) allowance for planned inoperability of monitoring instrumentation for up to 12 hours for the purpose of maintenance and performance of required tests, checks, calibration or sampling, (2) a requirement to initiate auxiliary sampling within 12 hours after inoperability of certain gaseous effluent monitors, and (3) allowance for inoperability of certain liquid effluent monitoring instrumentation, during Mode 6 (refueling), when the effluent pathway is not being used.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements for liquid and gaseous monitoring instruments are contained in TS 3.3.3.9 and 3.3.3.10, respectively. These instruments monitor effluents during actual or potential releases of effluents and are not credited for operability in any analyzed accident. In the event that these instruments become inoperable, the TS requires the licensee to exercise "best efforts" to repair the instruments. A reporting requirement is also associated with effluent monitor instrument unavailability. At the present time, gaseous and liquid effluent monitors must be operable at all times with the exception of the Warehouse 5 Vent which must be operable when the gross activity of the regenerated waste is greater than 1×10^{-4} micro Curies/ml.

The licensee has proposed that TS 3.3.3.9 and 3.3.3.10 be modified to allow the gaseous and liquid effluent monitors to be made inoperable for up to "..... A maximum of 12 hours for the purpose of maintenance and performance of required tests, checks, calibrations and sampling." These activities are required to assure continued accurate performance of the subject instrumentation. The licensee has estimated that, based upon operating experience, instrument out-of-service time does not exceed 12 hours per calendar quarter which is less than 1% unavailability. The licensee has also proposed that certain secondary-coolant-side liquid effluent monitors, that do not represent a likely discharge path during refueling, not be required to be operable during refueling (Mode 6). The following instruments would not be required to be operable in Mode 6: (1) Waste Neutralization Sump-Condensate Polishing Facility, (2) Regenerate Evaporator Monitor-Condensate Polishing Facility and (3) Steam Generator Blowdown Monitor.

The licensee has proposed an additional change to TS 3.3.3.10 which presently requires that sampling of radioactive gaseous effluent pathways be undertaken if the minimum specified number of the associated monitoring channels become inoperable. No time limit, to begin monitoring, is presently incorporated in the TS. The licensee has proposed that such monitoring begin within 12 hours of time that the monitoring channels are determined to be inoperable.

With regard to the proposed changes to TS 3.3.3.9 and 3.3.3.10, these proposed changes to the TS would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Since the subject monitors were not credited in the present safety analysis, the slight increase in unavailability can not affect the probability or outcome of any analyzed accident. Since the subject monitors do not perform any function to ameliorate the consequences of accidents the misoperation or the failure of these monitors to be available during an accident will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. Finally, since the subject monitors are not credited in any accident analysis, the proposed changes to the TS do not involve any reduction in safety margins. Based upon the above, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to TS 3.3.3.9 and 3.3.3.10 involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Garfield, Esquire, Day, Berry & Howard, One

Constitution Plaza, Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3499.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50-423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: June 15, 1988

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Technical Specification Tables 2.2-1 and 3.3-4 to decrease the reactor trip setpoint and the engineered safety features actuation setpoints for auxiliary feedwater initiation identified as steam generator water level Low-Low from 23.5% to 18.10% of the narrow range instrument span. This change would increase the margin between the steam generator water level low-low trip setpoint and the normal operating band. This change reflects the results of a revised calculation of the errors associated with related instrumentation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: NNECO has reviewed the proposed change in accordance with 10 CFR 50.92 and has concluded that it does not involve a significant hazards consideration in that the change would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The revised trip setpoint is consistent with the accident analyses assumption. As recommended in WCAP-10991, the revised calculated value accounts for the instrument uncertainty including the harsh environmental effects and drifts. The lower calculated value is mainly due to a more accurate calculation of the effect of the reference leg heat-up on the trip setpoint. It accounts for the effect of a harsh environment both on instruments and cables. The lower setpoint does not delay reactor trip or auxiliary feedwater initiation beyond what is assumed in the analysis. Therefore, the proposed changes have no impact on the consequences of the accidents previously evaluated. The proposed changes have no impact on the probability of failure of the reactor protection system and auxiliary feedwater system. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve an 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. There are no changes in the way the plant is operated, therefore, the potential for an unanalyzed accident is not created, and there are no new failure modes associated with the proposed changes.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed changes do not affect the consequences of any accident previously analyzed. Therefore, there is no reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the NNECO's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the analyses. Based on this review, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

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

Date of amendment request: May 27, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise those portions of Table 3.7-1 ("Process Pipeline Penetrating Primary Containment") of the Technical Specifications (TS) which pertain to the Reactor Water Cleanup (RWCU) system isolation valves. The proposed revisions, in part, reflect two modifications which will be completed during the 1988 refueling outage.

One modification involves the addition of an isolation signal (high drywell pressure) to three existing RWCU containment isolation valves. When this modification is complete, these valves will be actuated using diverse isolation signals as recommended in Section 6.2.4 of the Standard Review Plan (the criteria referenced in NUREG-0737).

The second modification adds a motor-operated containment isolation valve outside containment in the RWCU return line (12MOV-069). This modification will bring the RWCU system into compliance with General Design Criterion 55 of Appendix A to 10 CFR 50. This new valve will actuate on diverse isolation signals, including high drywell pressure.

Additionally, the proposed amendment would revise Table 3.7-1 to administratively add an isolation signal to one RWCU valve entry (12MOV-18) to make the TS consistent with the original plant design. Another revision would reduce the maximum allowable closure time for two RWCU supply line valves from thirty seconds to twenty seconds to reflect the assumptions made in the environmental qualification analysis.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: In accordance with the Commission's Regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, the Commission has made a determination that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations. To make this determination the staff must establish that operation in accordance with the proposed amendment 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.

No accident previously analyzed in the FSAR is adversely affected by any of the proposed changes. RWCU system isolation is not an accident or transient initiating event. In the event of an accident, RWCU serves no mitigating functions, and, as a nonessential system, it is isolated from the Reactor Coolant System. The modifications described above will improve the system's capability to reliably isolate in the event of an accident. Therefore, operation in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The intentional or unintentional isolation of the RWCU system cannot initiate an accident or transient. The new RWCU isolation valve duplicates the function of an existing valve. Addition of this new isolation valve and the addition of a new isolation signal to three existing valves will increase the reliability of a post-accident isolation. The remaining changes will assure consistency of the TS and do not entail any physical modifications or changes in operating procedures. Therefore, operation in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The modifications described above are intended to improve containment isolation dependability and cannot adversely impact any margin of safety. The new isolation signal increases the redundancy and diversity of physical parameters sensed to isolate containment in the event of an accident. The new valve increases the likelihood that the line will be isolated in the event

of an accident. Spurious isolation of the RWCU System is inconsequential since the system has been classified as nonessential and is not required to mitigate the effects of an accident. The changes which are intended to assure consistency of the TS are administrative and also do not impact any margin of safety. Therefore, operation in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are encompassed by the criteria 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 of New York, Penfield Library, Reference and Documents Department, Oswego, New York 13126.

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra, Director

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

Date of amendment request: May 3, 1988

Description of amendment request: The amendment request would revise Surveillance Requirement 4.8.2.5.2.e for both Salem Unit 1 and Salem Unit 2 to remove the requirement for performing two separate tests of the 28-volt batteries during certain plant shutdowns. The amendment would allow the satisfactory performance of the more stringent of the two tests to satisfy the surveillance requirements for both the 18 month and the 60 month tests on those occasions when the 60 month test is performed.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a no significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92(c). A proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; 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 Public Service Electric and Gas Company reviewed the proposed change and determined and the NRC staff agrees that the proposed amendment does not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change in testing will not significantly impact the operability of the batteries. The performance of the battery discharge test will adequately determine whether the battery operates within acceptable limits relative to its original design capacity as well as the original requirements for the battery design. As such, a separate service test is not necessary at the interval when the discharge test is performed.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The change in testing in no way affects the operability of the batteries or their ability to function in an accident situation. There is no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types of effluents that may be released offsite as a result of the proposed change. Also, the proposed change involves no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The purpose of battery service test is to demonstrate the ability of the battery to satisfy the design requirement (battery duty cycle) of the DC system, that is, the ability to support the equipment important to safety for a specific time period. The battery is sized during the plant design stages to have the capacity to perform this function. The purpose of the capacity discharge test is to show that the battery remains within an acceptable percentage of its original design capacity, which was initially demonstrated in the battery acceptance test. Since the battery capacity discharge test demonstrates that the battery is still within acceptable limits relative to its original design, this test also demonstrates, unless a significant change to the DC system has been made during subsequent plant operation (such a change would have been evaluated pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59), that the battery can also satisfy the original design duty cycle. Thus, the capacity discharge test satisfies the intent of the service test and renders performance of the service test unnecessary when performance of the discharge test is required.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Conner and Wetterhahn, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20006

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

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

Date of amendment request: February 26, 1988. Amendment Application No. 147 (Proposed Change No. 174)

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Technical Specification 3.5.5, Containment Isolation Instrumentation; 3.5.8, Radioactive Liquid Effluent Instrumentation; 3.5.9, Radioactive Gaseous Process and Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation and 4.1.3, Radioactive Gaseous Process and Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation. The changes are specific to each of the technical specifications affected. They provide clarification and relief for plant operation.

Specification 3.5.5 would be revised to exempt the Containment Radioactivity-High from Specification 3.0.4 and to clarify that there is not a single manual actuation switch for all five purge and exhaust valves. Specification 3.5.8 would be revised in the action statement to allow for a 12 hour sample collection and a 24 hour analysis for inoperable Turbine Building and Yard Sump monitors. Specifications 3.5.9, 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 would be revised to provide clarification on the operational requirements of specific radiation monitors.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91, the licensee has provided its analysis as to whether or not the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations which is presented below:

Proposed Change No. 174 is determined not to constitute a significant hazards consideration based on the following review questions and responses.

1. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: This proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the

probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Overall the proposed change provides clarification and relief within the technical specifications for plant operations. This proposed change does the following:

a. The provisions of 3.0.4 are not applicable to the Action Statement for the Containment Radioactivity-High instrumentation being inoperable. The Action Statement requires the purge and exhaust valves to be isolated during operations which is the normal configuration for these valves during operations. The condition of the plant remains the same and the probability or consequences of accidents are not changed. Therefore, removing the 3.0.4 applicability does not change the accident probability or consequences but allows the plant to continue into an operational mode.

b. The grab sample collection and analysis period for the Turbine Building Sump and Yard Sump effluents is changed from 12 hours for both collection and analysis to 12 hours for collection and 24 hours for the subsequent analysis. This change provides relief from performing the analysis within an unreasonably stringent time frame and has no affect on the probability or consequences of an accident. There are no potential sources of highly radioactive effluents which enter these sumps. The collection and analysis of grab samples from this pathway are primarily for documentation purposes. In the event of an accident which may result in radioactive liquid entering these sumps other means of detection would have occurred prior to the liquid entering the sumps.

c. The radiation monitors which can be utilized for the Sampler Flow Rate Measuring Device within the plant vent stack monitoring system are specifically identified consistent with the other items on Table 3.5.9.1. This change provides a clarification and has no effect on the accident probability or consequences.

d. The particular flow element in use in the liquid radwaste effluent line will be channel checked daily. This prevents checking both the element in use and the element not in use which would provide inaccurate information. This change is an operational clarification and has no affect on accident probability or consequences.

e. The notation indicating a specific radiation monitor does not perform an isolation function and does not have a control room alarm is deleted. The monitor does maintain these functions. This demonstrates an improvement in the monitor operation and has no affect on the accident probability or consequences.

f. Removing monitor R-1214 from the technical specifications has no effect on the probability or consequences of an accident. The function performed by R-1214 will still be provided by other monitors which are in the technical specifications.

Based on the above items discussed, it is clear that this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident?

Response: The intent of this proposed change is to provide ease in the daily operations of the plant. The change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. The change provides:

a. Clarification by:

1. Listing those monitors which can be used for the Sampler Flow Rate Measuring Device,

2. Providing for a channel check of a single flow element which is in use,

3. Deleting a note which identifies the limitations of a radiation monitor, and

4. Removing a monitor which is difficult to maintain and calibrate.

These changes have no impact on the plant such that new or different accidents are created. The changes provide clarification to the technical specifications for a more accurate description and use of the plant equipment.

b. Relief by removing the 3.0.4 applicability on an Action Statement for a containment radiation monitor and increasing the time allowed to perform analyses of certain grab samples. Increasing the time to perform analysis of grab samples from the Turbine Building Sump or the Yard Sump has no affect on the plant configuration. Therefore, in both cases the plant has not been affected such that a new or different kind of accident has been created.

Based on the above, it is clear that operation of the facility in the accordance with the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: The changes, as discussed, provide clarification within the technical specifications to improve the plant operation. The changes also provide relief in operations and radwaste sampling areas. These changes facilitate and clarify plant operations. The allowance of a longer grab sample analysis period is reasonable in that the subject pathway exhibits insignificant activity levels which do not necessitate analysis results within a short time frame. Removing monitor R-1214 from the T.S. is reasonable since there are other T.S. monitors which perform the designated function. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC Staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: General Library, University of California, P.O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713.

Attorney for licensee: Charles R. Kocher, Assistant General Counsel, and James Beoletto, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of amendment request: May 26, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to assure reactor operation is consistent with core design analysis. Control Group I would be precluded from insertion during power operation. This would lengthen the fuel cycle and diminish neutron leakage. The inclusion of this proposed amendment in the TS represents a formal restriction of plant operations in a manner that was previously administratively controlled.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91, the licensee has provided its analysis as to whether or not the proposed amendment involves a significant hazards consideration and has concluded that the proposed changes do not constitute a significant hazards consideration, based on the following.

(1) Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No, operation of the facility in accordance wth this proposed change is allowed by the current technical specifications. The change will only modify the rod position assumptions for future core reloads of the current spectrum of analyzed accidents. The proposed change serves to create a restriction that assures operation with Control Group 1 fully withdrawn. Accordingly, there are no changes to the probability or consequences of any previously analyzed accidents involving rod movement. The revision to the format and bases to allow action time to restore the control group to its insertion limit is consistent with STS requirements and does not involve a significant increase in any accident probability. Therefore, it is concluded that operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(2) Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No, operation of the facility in accordance with the control group insertion limit described in this proposed change is allowed by the current specifications. The operation of the facility in accordance with this change is bounded by the existing accident analyses and future core reloads will be bounded by the same analyses. These analyses assume dropped rod worth consistent with the control group and shutdown group rod design and, since this design does not change, only the assumed position changes, there is not the creation of any new or different accidents. The remaining changes are administrative in nature and do not affect previously analyzed accidents or create any new accidents. Therefore, it is concluded that operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No, operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involves an additional operating restriction that will increase the current design margin of safety in the main steamline break and ejected rod analyses. The increase in safety margin will be seen in the calculated peaking factors for these two accident scenarios. It is planned that future core reloads may take advantage of the additional margin to extend cycle life, but at no time would the design safety margin, as described in the basis of 3.5.2, be exceeded. The remaining changes are administrative in nature and do not impact any margin of safety. Therefore, it is concluded that operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the request and the licensee's analysis and agrees that the criteria appear to be satisfied. The NRC staff, therefore, proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: General Library, University of California, Post Office Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713.

Attorney for licensee: Charles R. Kocher, Assistant General Counsel, and James Beoletto, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of amendments request: May 24, 1988

Description of amendments request: Technical Specification Table 15.4.1-1, "Minimum Frequencies for Checks, Calibrations, and Test of Instrumentation Channels," specifies the test frequency for instrument channels. The proposed amendments would change the test frequency from bi-weekly to monthly for: Item 1, "Nuclear Power Range" instrument channels; Item 4, "Reactor Coolant Temperature" instrument channels; and Item 18, "Reactor Containment Pressure" instrument channels.

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

The proposed changes would reduce the frequency of testing the channel logics from biweekly to monthly. These changes will make the nuclear power range, reactor coolant temperature, and containment pressure channel logic test frequencies consistent with the other channels which use similar components. Additionally, these changes will allow Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, to conform to industry standards as well as the Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Pressurized Water Reactors. These channels have been very reliable. Based on the most severe drift rate experienced during biweekly testing, the channels should remain within Technical Specification setpoint limits between monthly testing. We, therefore, believe that these changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, and the first criterion is not violated. Because these changes only modify the frequency of testing for these three instrument channels and introduce no new testing, a new or different accident from any previously evaluated accident cannot be created and, therefore, the second criterion is not violated.

Lastly, these changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety for the same reasons discussed for criterion one. The amended test frequencies will be consistent with (1) other plant instrumentation using the same relays and bistables, (2) industry testing frequencies, and (3) the Standard Technical Specifications.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's evaluation of the proposed amendment, and agrees with the licensee's conclusion. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the requested amendments do not involve significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Joseph P. Mann Library, 1516 Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

Attorney for licensees: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Kenneth E. Perkins.

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

The following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances.

They are repeated here because the biweekly notice lists all amendments issued or 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.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-454 and 50-455, Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: June 22, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments would revise an action statement concerning the ultimate heat sink to state that the provisions to specification 3.0.4 do not apply in accordance with the licensee's application dated June 22, 1988.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: July 8, 1988 (53 FR 25710)

Expiration date of individual notice: August 7, 1988

Local Public Document Room location: Rockford Public Library, 215 N. Wyman Street, Rockford, Illinois 61101.

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

Date of amendment request: May 2, 1988, as revised June 3, 1988

Brief description of amendment request: The amendment would change the Technical Specifications by replacing Figure 6.2.1-1, "Offsite Organization," and Figure 6.2.2-1, "Unit Organization," with requirements that capture the essential aspects of the organization structure that are defined by these figures.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: June 29, 1988 at 53 FR 24513

Expiration date of individual notice: July 29, 1988

Local Public Document Room location: Hinds Junior College, McLendon Library, Raymond, Mississippi 39154

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated. No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following this notice.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendments, (2) the amendments, and (3) the Commission's related letters, Safety Evaluations and/or Environmental Assessments as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Projects.

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

Date of application for amendments: April 28, 1988

Description of amendments: The amendments delete Figure 6.2.1 (Offsite Organization for Facility Management and Technical Support), Figure 6.2.2 (Facility Organization), and references thereto from the Technical Specifications. To replace the charts, general requirements were added that capture essential aspects of the organizational structure that were defined by the organization charts. Equivalent information to that contained in the organization charts will be documented in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. This action conforms to the guidance of Generic Letter 88-06.

Date of issuance: July 8, 1988

Effective date: July 8, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 77, 69

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8. Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 6, 1988 (53 FR 20700) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 8, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket No. STN 50-530, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 3, Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of application for amendment: April 7, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Figure 3.1-1 of the Technical Specifications to increase the negative Moderator Temperature Coefficient limit from -30 pcm/° F to -35 pcm/° F.

Date of issuance: July 11, 1988

Effective date: July 11, 1988

Amendment No.: 9

Facility Operating License No. NPF-74: Amendment changed the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 4, 1988 (53 FR 15906). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 1, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: December 23, 1985 as supplemented on February 22, 1988

Brief Description of amendment: This amendment adds equipment allowable out of service times for calibration and testing of the Reactor Protection System (RPS) and Primary Containment Isolation System (PCIS). Note 1 to Table 3.1.1 and Note 1 to Table 3.2.A have been revised to add time limits for keeping RPS and PCIS equipment out of service during testing and calibration.

Date of issuance: July 8, 1988

Effective date: July 8, 1988 and implemented within 30 days

Amendment No.: 119

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 12, 1986 (51 FR 5272) The supplemental information supplied by the licensee on February 22, 1988 did not affect the sustance of the proposed amendment as noticed. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 8, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: March 10, 1988, supplemented April 21, 1988

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise the Technical Specifications to reduce the composition of the Onsite Nuclear Safety Group from four members to three members.

Date of issuance: July 1, 1988

Effective date: July 1, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 19, 19

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-37 and NPF-66. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 1, 1988 (53 FR 20041) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 1, 1988

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: The Rockford Public Library, 215 N. Wyman Street, Rockford, Illinois 61101.

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

Date of application for amendments: December 22, 1987

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revised Technical Specifications 3.2.D.3—for the refueling floor radiation monitors trip setpoint, and 6.2.C.1—for authority to review and approve plant procedures.

Date of issuance: June 30, 1988

Effective date: June 30, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 110 and 106

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 13, 1988 (53 FR 822). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 30, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021.

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

Date of application for amendment: February 19, 1988

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises Technical Specification Table 3.11-1, "Containment Isolation Valves," by adding five new containment isolation valves (CIVs) and deleting two CIVs. These changes were a result of plant modifications made during the 1987 refueling outage. Also, the page number was revised for Table 3.11-2.

Date of Issuance: July 1, 1988

Effective date: July 1, 1988

Amendment No.: 105

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** May 18, 1988 (53 FR 17783) The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 1, 1988

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: December 8, 1986 and March 3, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendments modified paragraph 3.D of Facility Operating License No. DPR-5 and paragraph 2.H of Facility Operating License No. DPR-26 to require compliance with the amended Physical Security Plan. This Plan was amended to conform to the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55. Consistent with the provisions of 10 CFR 73.55, search requirements must be implemented within 60 days and miscellaneous amendments within 180 days from the effective date of these amendments.

Date of issuance: July 6, 1988

Effective date: July 6, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 39 and 133

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-5 and DPR-26: Amendment revised the licenses.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** May 18, 1988 (53 FR 17784).[1]

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a letter to Consolidated Edison dated July 6, 1988 and a Safeguards Evaluation Report dated July 6, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Duke Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendments: January 11, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments changed Technical Specifications Sections 3.0 and 4.0 to conform to Generic Letter 87-09.

Date of issuance: July 12, 1988

Effective date: July 12, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 48 and 41

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 20, 1988 (53 FR 13013) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 12, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: February 17, 1987, as revised June 3, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments changed the Technical

[1] The Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing that appeared in 53 FR 17784 contained an error in the License paragraphs to be revised for Facility Operating Licenses DPR-5 and DPR-26. The notice neglected to state that paragraphs 3.E and 3.F of DPR-5, as well as paragraphs 2.H and 2.I of License DPR-26, would be superseded by the revised license condition. The NRC has not found it necessary to revoke its Consideration of Issuance as the error correctly states the proposed change.

Specifications by updating the index and making other purely administrative changes.

Date of issuance: July 5, 1988

Effective date: July 5, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 88 and 69

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 25, 1987 (52 FR 9566) The supplemental letter did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 5, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Florida Power and Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389, St. Lucie Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, St. Lucie County, Florida

Date of application for amendments: December 2, 1986, as supplemented November 5, 1987 and April 11, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified paragraph 2.D of the licenses to require compliance with the amended Physical Security Plan. This Plan was amended to conform to the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55. Consistent with the provisions of 10 CFR 73.55, search requirements must be implemented within 60 days and miscellaneous amendments within 180 days from the effective date of these amendments.

Date of Issuance: July 5, 1988

Effective Date: July 5, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 97 and 32

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16: Amendments revised the Licenses.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 1, 1988 (53 FR 20042) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a letter to Florida Power and Light Company dated July 5, 1988 and a Safeguards Evaluation Report dated July 5, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Indian River Junior College Library, 3209 Virgina Avenue, Ft. Pierce, Florida 33450.

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

Date of application for amendments: December 2, 1986, as supplemented November 12, 1987 and April 13, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments deleted paragraphs 3.F, 3.H and 3.J from the Turkey Point Unit 3 license, as well as paragraphs 3.E, 3.G and 3.I from the Turkey Point Unit 4 license, and added paragraph 3.L to both licenses to require compliance with the amended Physical Security Plan. This Plan was amended to conform to the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55. Consistent with the provisions of 10 CFR 73.55, search requirements must be implemented within 60 days and miscellaneous amendments within 180 days from the effective date of these amendments.

Date of issuance: July 5, 1988

Effective date: July 5, 1988

Amendment Nos. 131 and 125

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-31 and DPR-41: Amendments revised the Licenses.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 1, 1988 (53 FR 20042) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a letter to Florida Power and Light Company dated July 5, 1988 and a Safeguards Evaluation Report dated July 5, 1988. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendments: May 6, 1988, as supplemented June 7, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified the Technical Specifications by replacing the organization charts with more general organization requirements.

Date of issuance: July 12, 1988

Effective date: July 12, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 155 and 94

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 3, 1988 (53 FR 20397). The supplemental information submitted by the licensee on June 7, 1988 was editorial is nature and did not affect the substance of the initial notice or the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 12, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-424, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Unit 1, Burke County, Georgia

Date of application for amendment: May 6, 1988, supplemented June 1, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modified the Technical Specifications by replacing the organization charts with more general organization requirements.

Date of issuance: July 11, 1988

Effective date: July 11, 1988

Amendment No.: 6

Facility Operating License No. NPF-68: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 3, 1988 (53 FR 20398) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 11, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Burke County Library, 412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia 30830

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

Date of application for amendment: February 26, 1987, as supplemented June 1, July 10, and November 13, 1987

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications to reflect modifications made to comply with 10 CFR 50.62, the ATWS rule. These modifications consisted of the addition of an Alternate Rod Injection System, improvements to the Recirculation Pump Trip logic circuitry, and changes to the Standby Liquid Control System pump control circuitry.

Date of issuance: July 7, 1988

Effective date: July 7, 1988

Amendment No.: 151

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** October 21, 1987 (52 FR 39300) The licensee's November 13, 1987 submittal provided additional information which did not affect the description of the amendment requested on the staff's no significant hazards consideration analysis contained in the initial notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: December 2, 1986 and December 17, 1987

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modified paragraph 2.C(5) of the license to require compliance with the amended Physical Security Plan. This Plan was amended to conform to the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55. Consistent with the provisions of 10 CFR 73.55, search requirements must be implemented within 60 days and miscellaneous amendments within 180 days from the effective date of this amendment.

Date of issuance: July 15, 1988

Effective date: July 15, 1988

Amendment No.: 152

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** May 4, 1988 (53 FR 15913) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a letter to the Iowa Electric Light and Power Company dated July 15, 1988 and a Safeguards Evaluation Report dated July 15, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of amendment request: April 29, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the Technical Specifications for the Standby Liquid Control System to reflect 10 CFR 50.62 Anticipated Transient Without Scram (ATWS) modifications.

Date of issuance: July 5, 1988

Effective date: July 5, 1988

Amendment No.: 123

Facility Operating License No. DPR-46. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 1, 1988 (53 FR 20043) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 5, 1988

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket Nos. 50-220 and 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Scriba, New York

Date of application for amendment: December 2, 1986, November 25, 1987 and December 29, 1987.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified paragraphs 2.D(4) and 2.D(5) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 and paragraph 2.D(5) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-69 to require compliance with the amended Physical Security Plan. This Plan was amended to conform to the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55. Consistent with the provisions of 10 CFR 73.55, search requirements must be implemented within 60 days and miscellaneous amendments within 180 days from the effective date of these amendments.

Date of issuance: July 5, 1988

Effective date: July 5, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 100 and 6

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-63 and NPF-69: Amendments revised the licenses.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 20, 1988 (53 FR 13017)[1]

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a letter to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation dated July 5, 1988 and a Safeguards Evaluation Report dated July 5, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

[1] The Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing that appeared in 53 FR 13017 contained an error in the License paragraphs to be revised for Facility Operating License DPR-63. The notice neglected to state that paragraph 2.D(5), as well as 2.D(4) would be superceded by the revised license condition. The NRC has not found it necessary to revoke its Consideration of Issuance as the error correctly states the proposed change.

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

Date of application for amendment: April 25, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specifications (TS) 3.4.4, "Pressurizer," for Millstone 2 requiring that the 130KW of operable pressurizer heaters be, "...capable of being supplied by emergency power."

Date of issuance: July 7, 1988

Effective date: July 7, 1988

Amendment No.: 130

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** May 18, 1988 (53 FR 17790) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: March 18, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification Section 6.3.1., "Facility Staff Qualifications" by retitling the position of Radiation Protection Supervisor to Radiation Protection Branch Manager.

Date of issuance: July 7, 1988

Effective date: July 7, 1988

Amendment No.: 146

Facilities Operating License No. NPF-1: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 1, 1988 (53 FR 20044) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Portland State University Library, 731 S. W. Harrison St., Portland Oregon 97207

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of application for amendment: July 29, 1985

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the surveillance requirements for Trojan Technical Specification Section 3/4.6.1.1, "Containment Integrity."

Date of issuance: July 11, 1988

Effective date: July 11, 1988

Amendment No.: 147

Facilities Operating License No. NPF-1: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 9, 1986 (51 FR 12236). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 11, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Portland State University Library, 731 S. W. Harrison St., Portland Oregon 97207

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of application for amendments: February 24, 1988 (TS 238)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modify Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements 4.7.E.1, 4.7.E.3, 4.7.F.1, 4.9.A.2.c, and 4.11.A.5 by replacing the words "not to exceed" with the words "at least once every."

Date of issuance: July 5, 1988

Effective date: July 5, 1988, and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendments Nos.: 150, 146, 121

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 20, 1988 (53 FR 13018) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 5, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendments: April 17, 1987 and March 1, 1988 (TS 87-12 and 87-44).

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise paragraphs of Section 6, Administrative Controls, of the Sequoyah Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications (TS). The revisions are primarily 1) to reflect site organizational and title changes and (2) to revise the list of primary coolant sources outside containment in the section. The request to amend Section 6.2.2 and TS Figures 6.2-1 and 6.2.2 in TS 87-44 application dated March 1, 1988 were withdrawn in the licensee's letter dated June 13, 1988. The revision to the list of primary coolant sources outside containment applies only to the Unit 1 TS.

Date of issuance: June 30, 1988

Effective date: June 30, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 74, 66

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 9, 1987 (52 FR 34019) and April 20, 1988 (53 FR 13024), respectively. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 30, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-327 Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Hamilton County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendments: May 15, 1987

Brief description of amendments: The amendment to the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN) Unit 1 Operating License deletes the requirements of Section 2.C.(10), "Water Chemistry Control Program," of the SQN Unit 1 Facility Operating License.

Date of issuance: July 6, 1988

Effective date: July 6, 1988

Amendment No.: 75

Facility Operating Licenses No. DPR-77: Amendment revised the Operating License.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 23, 1987 (52 FR 35808) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 6, 1988.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

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

Date of application for amendments: February 3, 1987 (TS 79)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modify Technical Specification Table 3.3-9, Remote Shutdown Monitoring Instrumentation, to reflect changes in the measurement range of the pressurizer level, the measurement range of the auxiliary feedwater flow rate, and the required number of minimum channels operable for the reactor coolant temperature-hot leg and the auxiliary feedwater flow rate.

Date of issuance: July 12, 1988

Effective date: July 12, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 76, 67

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 12, 1987 (52 FR 7697) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 12, 1988

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND FINAL DETERMINATION OF NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING (EXIGENT OR EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES)

During the period since publication of the last biweekly 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 a Hearing. For exigent circumstances, the Commission has either issued a **Federal Register** notice providing opportunity for public comment or has used local media to provide notice to the public in the

area surrounding a licensee's facility of the licensee's application and of the Commission's proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration. The Commission has provided a reasonable opportunity for the public to comment, using its best efforts to make available to the public means of communication for the public to respond quickly, and in the case of telephone comments, the comments have been recorded or transcribed as appropriate and the licensee has been informed of the public comments.

In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant or in prevention of either resumption of operation or of increase in power output up to the plant's licensed power level, the Commission may not have had an opportunity to provide for public comment on its no significant hazards determination. In such case, the license amendment has been issued without opportunity for comment. If there has been some time for public comment but less than 30 days, the Commission may provide an opportunity for public comment. If comments have been requested, it is so stated. In either event, the State has been consulted by telephone whenever possible.

Under its regulations, the Commission may issue and make an amendment immediately effective, notwithstanding the pendency before it of a request for a hearing from any person, in advance of the holding and completion of any required hearing, where it has determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved.

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Projects.

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendments. By August 26, 1988, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

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

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

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

Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 325-6000 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (*Project Director*): 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 Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the

Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Duquesne Light Company, Ohio Edison Company, Pennsylvania Power Company, Toledo Edison Company, Docket No. 50-440, Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, Lake County, Ohio

Date of application for amendment: July 12, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment increased the limit for drywell average air temperature in Technical Specification 3.6.2.6 from 135° F to 145° F and revised the related Bases.

Date of issuance: July 14, 1988

Effective date: July 14, 1988

Amendment No. 14

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

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

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, consultation with the State of Ohio, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 14, 1988.

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

Local Public Document Room location: Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, Ohio 44081.

NRC Project Director: Kenneth E. Perkins.

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

Date of application for amendments: June 17, 1988 as supplemented June 23, and June 24, 1988 (TS 246)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments delete the organization charts from the administrative controls section of the technical specifications in accordance with Generic Letter 88-06. In addition, the title of the Manager of Nuclear Power is being changed to Senior Vice President, Nuclear Power.

Date of issuance: June 30, 1988

Effective date: June 30, 1988

Amendments Nos.: 149, 145, 120

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

Public comments requested regarding proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes. A Legal Notice requesting public comments by June 30, 1988 was published in the Decatur Daily and the Huntsville Times on June 24, 1988.

Comments received: No The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 30, 1988. The licensee's supplementary letters dated June 23 and June 24, 1988 clarified the licensee's application dated June 17, 1988 and did not affect the substance of the proposed amendments as noticed in the newspapers listed above or the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

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

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, E11 B33, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Assistant Director: Suzanne Black

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

Date of application for amendments: June 13, 1988 as supplemented by letters dated June 22 and 24, 1988 (TS 88-12)

Brief description of amendments: This amendment revises paragraphs and figures in Section 6, Administrative Controls, of the Sequoyah Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications (TS). The revisions are (1) to delete Figures 6.2-1 and 6.2-2, the organization charts in the TS, and references to these figures in accordance with Generic Letter 88-06, (2) to change the title of Manager of Nuclear Power to Senior Vice President, Nuclear Power and (3) to add references to the "unit" organization in Section 6.2.2.

Date of issuance: June 30, 1988

Effective date: June 30, 1988

Amendment Nos.: 74, 66

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

Public Comments Requested Regarding Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration: Yes. On June 29, 1988, Mr. G. Richard Howard of Chattanooga, Tennessee requested a clarification on the proposed amendments as to where the licensee's organization charts would appear if they are deleted from Section 6 of the TS. Specification 6.2.1.a requires that the organization charts will be in the Sequoyah Units 1 and 2 Final Safety Analysis Report. This is discussed further in the staff's Safety Evaluation on these amendments. A legal notice requesting public comments by June 30, 1988 was published in the Chattanooga News-Free Press and the Chattanooga Times on June 24, 1988. The State of Tennessee was consulted on June 30, 1988 and had no comments. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment and final no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated: June 30, 1988. The licensee's supplementary letters dated June 22 and June 24, 1988 clarified the licensee's application dated June 13, 1988 and did not affect the substance of the proposed amendments as noticed in the Chattanooga newspapers listed above or the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

Attorney for Licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 Summit Hill Drive, E11 B33, Knoxville, Tennesee 37902

Local Public Document Room location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of July, 1988.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Lester S. Rubenstein,

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects - III, IV, V and Special Projects Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

[Doc. 88-16766 Filed 7-26-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-D

July 19, 1988

DOCKET NO(S). 50-247

See Attached list of Addressees

DISTRIBUTION w/o encl
Docket File w/encl
PDI-1 Rdg.
CVogan
[redacted] MSlosson

SUBJECT: CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.
Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2

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

- [ ] Notice of Receipt of Application, dated _____.
- [ ] Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No._____ dated _____.
- [ ] Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License, dated _____.
- [x] Bi-Weekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations, dated ~~July 13, 1988~~ [see page(s)] ~~XXXXXXX~~ ~~Expiration date for hearing request and comments; August 12, 1988.~~
- [ ] Exemption, dated _____.
- [ ] Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Order Extending Construction Completion Date, dated _____.
- [ ] Monthly Operating Report for _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.
- [ ] Annual/Semi-Annual Report- _____ _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

cc: See next page

OFFICE	PDI-1						
SURNAME	CVogan						
DATE	7/25/88						

NRC FORM 318 (10/80) NRCM 0240

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Mr. Stephen B. Bram
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.

Indian Point Nuclear Generating
Station 1/2

cc:

Mayor, Village of Buchanan
236 Tate Avenue
Buchanan, New York 10511

Ms. Donna Ross
New York State Energy Office
2 Empire State Plaza
16th Floor
Albany, New York 12223

Mr. Jude Del Percio
Manager of Regulatory Affairs
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
Broadway and Bleakley Avenue
Buchanan, New York 10511

Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 38
Buchanan, New York 10511

Mr. Brent L. Brandenburg
Assistant General Counsel
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
4 Irving Place - 1822
New York, New York 10003

Director, Technical Development
Programs
State of New York Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Mr. Peter Kokolakis, Director
Nuclear Licensing
Power Authority of the State
of New York
123 Main Street
White Plains, New York 10601

Mr. Walter Stein
Secretary - NFSC
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
4 Irving Place - 1822
New York, New York 10003

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

May 26, 1988

DOCKET NO(S). 50-247
and 50-286

See Attabhed List of Addressees

DISTRIBUTION w/o encl.
Docket File
PDI-1 Rdg.
CVogan
MSlosson
DNeighbors

SUBJECT: INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 2 AND 3

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

- [ ] Notice of Receipt of Application, dated _____.
- [ ] Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement, dated _____.
- [ ] Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No._____ dated _____.
- [ ] Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, dated _____.
- [ ] Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License, dated _____.
- [ ] Bi-Weekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations, dated _____ [*see page(s)*] _____.
- [ ] Exemption, dated _____.
- [ ] Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____ dated _____.
- [ ] Order Extending Construction Completion Date, dated _____.
- [ ] Monthly Operating Report for _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.
- [ ] Annual/Semi-Annual Report- _____ _____ transmitted by letter dated _____.
- X OTHER: See Attached List of Transmittals

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

cc: See Next Page

OFFICE	PDI-1						
SURNAME	CVogan						
DATE	5/26/88						

NRC FORM 318 (10/80) NRCM 0240

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY