

Docket No.: 50-483

OCT 05 1984

Mr. D. F. Schnell  
Vice President - Nuclear  
Union Electric Company  
Post Office Box 149  
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

Dear Mr. Schnell:

Subject: Federal Register Monthly Notice - Applications and Amendments  
to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards  
Considerations - Callaway Plant, Unit No. 1

A copy of the NRC's Monthly Notice for applications and amendments to operating licenses involving no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register on September 28, 1984, is enclosed for your use. One Notice for Callaway is contained in the monthly receipts. Your amendment request, dated August 1, 1984, to modify Technical Specification Table 3.3-1 by revising one action statement (Action 4) and adding an additional action statement (Action 12) for the source range neutron flux monitors during shutdown conditions was prenoticed in this monthly publication.

Sincerely,

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

Enclosure: As stated

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

~~Docket File~~  
NRC PDR  
L PDR  
PRC System  
LB#1 R/F  
MRushbrook  
JHolonich  
PO'Connor

NGrace  
EJordan  
OELD

LB#1:DL  
MRushbrook:kab  
10/5/84

LB#1:DL  
JHolonich  
10/5/84

LB#1:DL  
PO'Connor  
10/5/84

LB#1:DL  
BJYoungblood  
10/5/84

8410150563 841005  
PDR ADOCK 05000483  
P PDR

---



---

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

#### I. Background

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

This monthly notice includes all amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, since the date of publication of the last monthly notice which was published on August 22, 1984 (49 FR 33353) through September 17, 1984.

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

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following

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

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

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

By October 29, 1984, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's

property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

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

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

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

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

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

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the

expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at (800) 325-6000 (in Missouri (800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (*Branch Chief*): petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Executive Legal Director, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

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

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

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 13, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Steam Generator Surveillance to (1) provide clarity, (2) modify the designation of those areas identified as special areas in the steam generator where imperfections have been previously found and (3) allow the sleeving of ten steam generator tubes as part of a demonstration program. Only the portion of the proposed amendment dealing with (3) above is considered in this notice. Portions (1) and (2) above will be considered in a separate notice.

Specifically the portion of the proposed amendment considered in this notice would add a new footnote to Table 4.18-2 to allow for sleeving of ten defective tubes during the ANO-1 sixth refueling as part of a demonstration program. Currently the TSs allow repair of defective steam generators by plugging defective tubes. In the proposed change, the licensee intends to repair up to ten (10) selective steam generator tubes by installing sleeves (sensitized Inconel alloy 800) inside the original tubes to bridge the degraded areas, thus permitting the tubes to remain in service. The sleeves would be roll expanded into the tubes at both ends of the sleeves to provide a leak proof boundary and structural integrity of the sleeves. The method to be used is similar to that which has been employed at utilities in large scale projects since the 1930's. The licensee has indicated that the tube sleeves have been qualified for use in degraded Once Through Steam Generator (OTSG) tubes by a series of tests and analysis and that the sleeves are strong enough, sufficiently leak free and corrosion resistant to be used as a permanent remedy to keep the degraded tubes in service. Also, the licensee has indicated that up to 5000 sleeves could be installed in each steam generator with minimal effect upon plant operation. The effect of installing ten sleeves as proposed by the licensee would be insignificant. Further, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated or a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The NRC staff agrees with the preliminary results provided in the licensee's application.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*



The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). None of the examples, relating to whether significant hazards considerations are likely or unlikely, appear to be directly applicable to this amendment. The Commission, however, proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration because the proposed method of repairing the degraded tubes will restore their original capabilities and provide a level of safety in operation commensurate with that anticipated of the facility had it not experienced the need to repair steam generators. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that 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.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Nicholas S. Reynolds, Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 13, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Steam Generator Surveillance to (1) provide clarity, (2) modify the designation of those areas identified as special areas in the steam generator where imperfections have been previously found and (3) allow the sleeving of ten steam generator tubes as part of a demonstration program. Only the portions of the proposed amendment dealing with (1) and (2) above are considered in this notice. Portion (3) dealing with the sleeving of the steam generator tubes will be considered in a separate notice.

Specifically, the portions of the proposed amendment considered in this notice would:

1. Clarify Specification 4.18.3.a.2.

The first sample inspection during each inservice inspection \* \* \* shall include:

1. \* \* \*  
2. At least 50% of the tubes inspected shall be in those areas where experience has indicated potential problems.

The following phrase would be added: "except where specific groups are inspected per Specification 4.18.3.a.3."

The proposed change does not change the intent of the TS but rather makes it clear that if the licensee chooses the option of fully inspecting a special group (which indeed is a potential problem area), then that group does not need to be considered in the first random inspection and, more specifically, would not be considered in the 50% of the first random inspection (Specification 4.18.3.a.2).

2. Change Specification 4.18.3.a.2 which defines the groups that may, at the licensee's option, be excluded from the first random inspection if the group is fully inspected. The change would define the group as "potential problem areas to the portion of tubes (i.e., over the tubes' height) where imperfections have previously been found" in contrast to the current TS which implies that the group include the complete length of the tubes in the group.

3. Delete Specification 4.18.3.a.3.(2) which defines a special group that the licensee may, at the licensee's option, fully inspect and thus not be a part of the first random inspection. This group consists of those tubes which are supported in the 15 support plate by drilled holes rather than broached holes.

4. Add Specification 4.18.3.a.3.(3) which defines a special group that the licensee may, at the licensee's option, fully inspect and thus not be a part of the first random inspection. This group consists of those portions of tubes where previous imperfections have been found and is bounded by a large wedge (consisting of 1/3 of the tube bundle) originating at the center of the bundle and fanning out on either side of the lane region.

5. Correct a typographical error in Note 2 of Table 4.18-2. Reference to Specification 4.18.3.a.4 should be "4.18.3.a.3."

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations.

The proposed change discussed in (1) above is most like example (i) which constitutes a purely administrative

change to the technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the TSs. Since this portion of the proposed change more clearly describes what was intended, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that this portion of the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

For the proposed change discussed in (2) above, the three factors discussed in 10 CFR 50.92 are discussed as follows: The current TS implies that special groups include the full length of the tubes in the groups. The existence of special groups in the TS is the result of data from the operation of ANO-1 and, therefore, at the licensee's option, would be fully inspected. Since the implementation of the current TS, more operating data has been collected at ANO-1 and it indicates that imperfections in the current defined special groups are more likely in certain portions of the tubing (i.e., over the tube's length). Therefore, the licensee proposes to provide 100% inspection of the potential problem areas of the current defined special groups. Accordingly, the results of an inspection of the proposed defined special groups would yield results equivalent to the inspection results of the current defined special groups. In addition, the portion of tubes of the current defined special groups which would not be inspected under the proposed definition of the special groups would be included in the inspection of the first random inspection sample. Therefore, the proposed change would not (1) increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction a margin of safety. Therefore, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that this portion of the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

With regard to (3) above, due to the fact that this proposed amendment to the TSs merely eliminates an option that the licensee would exercise without limitation, the proposed change would not (1) increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction of a margin of safety. Therefore, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that this portion of the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.



The proposed change discussed in (4) above is most like example (ii) which constitutes an added limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the TS. The proposed special group is quite a large group to be fully inspected and would constitute a much larger surveillance of tubes if the licensee chooses the option of fully inspecting this group. Therefore, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that this portion of the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The proposed change discussed in (5) above is most like example (i) which constitutes a purely administrative change to the technical specifications; for example, a correction of an error. The proposed change would correct the reference to Specification 4.16.3.a.4 in Table 4.19-2. Therefore, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that this portion of the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Nicholas S. Reynolds, Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 15, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would add Technical Specification Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements to protect the reactor coolant system against an event of overpressurization during low temperatures where the reactor vessel material toughness, i.e., resistance to brittle fracture, is reduced from that which exists at normal operating temperature. Specifically, the proposed amendment would require (1) the core flood tank discharge valves be closed with power removed from the valves during plant cooldown, (2) the high pressure injection motor-operated valves be closed with their control circuits disabled when the reactor coolant temperature is less than 280 degrees F, (3) the plant not be operated in a water-solid condition with the reactor coolant system pressure boundary intact except as allowed by the emergency operating procedures, (4) surveillance of the low temperature overpressure protection alarm logic

every 18 months, and (5) the exercise of the Power Operated Relief Valve (PORV) at the end of each refueling period.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). An example of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is an amendment involving a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed Technical Specification modifications impose additional limitations, restrictions and controls and, therefore, fall within this example. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to the example for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Nicholas S. Reynolds, Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

**Arkansas Power and Light Company, Dockets Nos. 50-313 and 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Pope County, Arkansas**

*Date of amendment request:* July 11, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* This submittal is a revision to the request for amendments dated August 23, 1983, which was noticed in the Monthly Federal Register Notice on November 22, 1983 (48 FR 52805). The amendments would revise the Technical Specifications to incorporate hydrogen/oxygen concentration limitations and hydrogen/oxygen monitoring requirements in the radioactive waste gas systems. The proposed Technical Specifications would establish limits of hydrogen/oxygen concentrations in the Waste Gas Surge Tank and Waste Gas Decay Tank such that a flammable or explosive mixture would not be possible. This is an added limitation to the current Technical Specifications. The application was submitted in response to an NRC request to incorporate the applicable current staff positions, presented in NUREG-0472, "Radiological Effluent Technical

Specifications for PWRs," to ensure compliance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix I. The revision proposes the additional requirement of continuous monitoring of the waste gas to the waste gas decay tanks by redundant waste gas analyzers. These analyzers will detect the formation of a potentially flammable mixture of hydrogen and oxygen in the Waste Gas System before it becomes flammable. The implementation of the proposed changes is expected to reduce significantly the likelihood of hydrogen explosions in the radioactive waste gas systems.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards include changes that constitute additional limitations not presently included in the Technical Specifications and that make the license conform to changes in the regulations. Since the proposed changes add requirements and ensure compliance with the regulations in accordance with the staff positions, the staff proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Nicholas S. Reynolds, Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

*NRC Branch Chiefs:* James R. Miller, John F. Stolz.

**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 application for amendment:* April 9, 1984 and June 29, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would change the Unit 1 and Unit 2 Technical Specifications (TS) to reflect: (1) a change to the surveillance requirements for fire pumps to allow an alternate test method, (2) correction of a typographical error in a Unit 1 fire pump surveillance test, (3) clarification and correction of a typographical error concerning fire hose stations (4) clarification of operability requirements for the component cooling water system, (5) clarification of valve surveillance for component cooling, service water and salt water systems, and (6) provision for backup

instrumentation for the remote shutdown, wide range neutron flux instrumentation.

These changes to the TS are in partial response to the applications dated April 9, 1984 and June 29, 1984. The remaining issues addressed in these applications will be addressed in future correspondence.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2 TS 3/4.7.11, "First Suppression Systems," includes operability and surveillance requirements for the electric and diesel powered fire pumps. One such surveillance requirement, applicable to both diesel and electric powered pumps, requires a monthly test by operating these pumps "... on recirculation flow." The term "recirculation" means the establishment of a flow path by which a quantity of fluid discharged from the pump is routed back to the suction side of the pump. BG&E has proposed a change to TS 3/4.7.11 to delete the phrase "... on recirculation flow" to allow for use of an alternate test method for the diesel and electric powered fire pumps.*

The National Fire Codes, Volume 2, Chapter 20, Section 2-6, 1983 requires each fire pump to have a circulation relief valve. The code states that "Each pump shall be provided with an automatic relief valve set below the shutoff pressure at minimum expected suction pressure. It shall provide circulation of sufficient water to prevent the pump from overheating when operating with no discharge."

BG&E has proposed that these valves be utilized to provide a flow path in lieu of a recirculation flow path.

Our review of the alternate test method, involving the establishment of a fire pump flow path via the circulation relief valve, indicates that it provides an acceptable monthly demonstration of fire pump operability. Since the alternate test method is acceptable, use of this test will continue to demonstrate the reliability of the fire pumps.

On April 6, 1983 the NRC published guidance in the *Federal Register* (48 FR 14870) concerning examples of amendments that are not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. One such example (vi) involves changes "... where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan...". We conclude that the proposed change to TS 3/4.7.11 is consistent with this example and thus the Commission proposes to determine that this change involves no significant hazards considerations.

An additional change to Unit 1 TS 3/4.7.11 has been proposed to correct a typographical error. The word "fluch" in TS 4.7.11.1.1.d should actually be "flush." The correction of a typographical error was given as an example, (i) in 48 FR 14870, of an amendment which is not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the change to Unit 1 TS 4.7.11.1.1.d involves no significant hazards considerations.

BG&E has proposed to correct a typographical error in TS Table 3.7-6, "Fire Hose Stations." Entry number 3 in Table 3.7-6 contains the words "... Aux Feeder Water Pipe Rooms" which should actually be "Aux Feedwater Pump Rooms." As indicated previously, correction of a typographical error is unlikely to involve a significant hazards consideration. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change to TS Table 3.7-6, which involves the correction of a typographical error, involves no significant hazards considerations.

BG&E has proposed a second change to TS Table 3.7-6. This change involves entry number 2 which describes hose station on to -10' and -15' levels of the auxiliary buildings. Since these hose stations are common to Units 1 and 2 (the hose stations are situated such that equipment from both units can be reached by the water spray) BG&E has proposed a clarifying footnote to indicate this commonality. The TS entry, as presently worded, could be misinterpreted to mean that these hose stations are located at both Units 1 and 2 and thus would represent 6 hose stations rather than the 3 hose stations actually installed. One example given in 48 FR 14870 of an amendment which is not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is "(1) A purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature."

We conclude that the addition of the clarifying footnote to TS Table 3.7-6 represents an administrative change. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change to TS Table 3.7-6, to add a clarifying footnote, involves no significant hazards considerations.

BG&E has proposed a change to Unit 1 and 2 TS 3.7.3.1, "Component Cooling Water System." At the present time, TS 3.7.3.1 requires that "At least two component cooling water loops shall be OPERABLE." The licensee has proposed that the following be added to the

operability requirements for the component cooling water (CCW) system: "At least one component cooling water heat exchanger shall be operating and the remaining component cooling water heat exchanger may be in standby." The proposed change to TS 3.7.3.1 has been requested in order to reflect actual operating practices associated with the CCW system.

The CCW system for each Calvert Cliffs Unit consists of 3 motor driven pumps, 2 heat exchangers, a head tank, and associated valves, piping, instrumentation, and controls. Cooling water for the CCW heat exchangers is supplied by the salt water system which discharges its water directly to the ultimate heat sink (Chesapeake Bay). During normal operation, the CCW system supplies cooling water to a number of safety-related components. The Calvert Cliffs FSAR, Section 9.5.2, states that, "During normal plant operation, one of the pumps and one of the heat exchangers are required for cooling service." The remaining CCW heat exchanger is normally maintained in "standby" status with its discharge valve closed. In the event of a Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA), the CCW system services important safety-related components; however, the CCW system is designed so as not to supply cooling water immediately following a LOCA. During this period, the salt water system supply to the CCW heat exchangers is isolated. After a minimum of 36 minutes, salt water flow to the CCW heat exchangers is automatically reinitiated and CCW cooling begins. Existing emergency procedures instruct the reactor operators to open the outlet valve in the CCW heat exchanger. A time of 36 minutes is judged to be adequate for operators to take manual action in this regard.

The proposed change TS 3.7.3.1 serves to further document an operating mode, involving use of a single CCW heat exchanger during normal operation, that has been previously used and is described in the FSAR. In the event of LOCA, starting from operation with one CCW heat exchanger, a combination of manual actions and automatic features assure proper postaccident functioning of the CCW system. For the reason, accidents which require operation of the CCW system for mitigation will not be worse nor will any other new or different kind of accident be created. In addition, since no changes have been proposed to the design or operation of the CCW system, no safety margins will be reduced. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change to TS 3.7.3.1, which

clarifies operability requirements for the CCW system, involves no significant hazards considerations.

EG&E has proposed a change to Unit 1 and 2 TS 4.7.3.1, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.5.1 which provide Surveillance Requirements for the component cooling water, service water, and salt water systems, respectively. At the present time each of the TS contains a surveillance requiring that, "At least once per 31 days by verifying that each valve (manual, power operated or automatic) servicing safety related equipment that is not locked, sealed, or otherwise secured in position, is in its correct position."

BG&E has proposed replacing the phrase " \* \* \* Servicing safety related equipment \* \* \* " with the phrase " \* \* \* in the flow path \* \* \* " This proposed change would clearly identify the class of valves which require monthly verification.

Systems such as the component colling water, service water, and salt water systems contain a considerable number of valves. Not all of these valves have the same safety significance and thus need be subjected to the same type or frequency of surveillance. One class of valves performs functions which are very minor from a safety standpoint. These functions include: drains, vents, and instrument isolation (root) valves. Mispositioning of these valves would either be obvious during routine operation (i.e. a closed instrument root valve would cause the associated instrument to be inoperable) or perform functions which are minor with regard to the completion of the safety function of the system. These types of valves are typically quite numerous and monthly surveillance, with regard to position, is unnecessary.

At the present time Unit 1 and 2 TS 4.5.2 requires the following monthly test of valves in the emergency core cooling system (ECCS): "Verifying that each valve (manual, power operated or automatic) in the flow path that is not locked, sealed, or otherwise secured in position, is in its correct position."

The above wording appropriately excludes valves outside the flow path (valves with minor safety significance) from this routine surveillance. BG&E has proposed adopting this same surveillance requirement for the component cooling water, service water, and salt water cooling systems (TS 4.7.3.1, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.5.1); thus, the valve surveillance requirements of these systems would be consistent with similar requirements for the ECCS. Moreover unsecured valves in the main flow paths of these systems, whose misposition would prevent these

systems from completing their safety function, would still require periodic surveillance. For this reason, a high degree of assurance is maintained that these systems will be capable of performing their safety functions; therefore, no change in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered will result nor will accidents of a new or different kind be created. Since no design changes or changes in the level of operability of these systems will result herein, no decrease in margins of safety will occur. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to TS 4.7.3.1, 4.7.4.1 and 4.7.5.1 involve no significant hazards considerations.

BG&E has requested a change to Unit 1 and 2 TS 3/4.3.3.5, "Remote Shutdown Instrumentation," to allow the use of alternate wide range neutron flux instrumentation. BG&E has installed new remote shutdown panels in the Unit 1 and 2 switch gear rooms (1C43 and 2C43.) The remote shutdown panels had been located in the Unit 1 and 2 auxiliary feedwater pump (AFWP) rooms. The use of the new wide range neutron flux instrumentation, incorporated into the new remote shutdown panels, was approved by changes to TS 3/4.3.3.5 issued on June 6, 1984 (Unit 2, Amendment No. 75) and November 17, 1983 (Unit 1, Amendment No. 88).

On March 19, 1984, the new Unit 1 wide range neutron flux instrumentation began showing evidence of possible impending failure and was subsequently declared inoperable. On April 19, 1984 the NRC issued a change to TS 3/4.3.3.5 (Unit 1, Amendment No. 91) to allow the use of the wide range neutron flux instrumentation, still located in the Unit 1 AFWP room, until such time as the new instrumentation could be repaired. BG&E subsequently requested, by application dated June 29, 1984, a change to the Unit 1 and 2 TS 3/4.3.3.5 to allow use of the wide range neutron flux instrumentation, located in the Unit 1 and 2 AFWP rooms, at any time when the wide range neutron flux instrumentation at the new remote shutdown panels becomes inoperable.

The wide range neutron flux instrumentation located in the AFWP rooms has been shown by prior service to be reliable equipment. During the period when they would be required, when the primary wide range neutron flux instrumentation (located at 1C43 and 2C43) are inoperable, the instrumentation in the AFWP would be required to undergo routine surveillance. In addition, in the event that the wide range neutron flux instrumentation in the AFWP rooms are required to be

operable under emergency conditions, communications can be established between the AFWP rooms and the remainder of the remote shutdown instrumentation located at 1(2)C43.

The Wide Range Neutron Flux instrumentation is provided for monitoring purposes and does not provide inputs for automatically actuated equipment; therefore, the changes as reflected in the proposed Limiting Conditions for Operation do not change the course or severity of any analyzed accidents nor the probability of such accidents occurring. Moreover, the usefulness of this instrumentation to provide postaccident information has not been degraded. The proposed change thus would not decrease any margin of safety. Since this change involves only monitoring and provides no input for automatic actuation of safety equipment or functions, the change will not create the possibility of an accident not previously evaluated. On these bases, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed change to TS 3/4.3.3.5 for the remote shutdown instrumentation does not involve significant hazards considerations.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* James R. Miller.

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 9, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would replace the carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) system Technical Specifications with similar specifications for a Halon fire suppression system recently installed in the cable spreading room. References to the CO<sub>2</sub> system relative to switchgear rooms at the 23-foot and 37-foot elevations would be deleted since the CO<sub>2</sub> hose stations at those locations have been replaced by water hose stations.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The licensee states in its application that a Halon system has been installed to replace the "CO<sub>2</sub> system which was used as the main source of fire suppression in the cable spreading room (CSR) until it failed a dump test on October 24, 1981. Since that time, the CSR has been monitored by fire watch patrol." On January 18, 1982, the



licensee informed the NRC that the CO<sub>2</sub> discharge test referred to above, made the CSR so cold that electrical equipment in the room might not operate correctly. Halon would not have that effect since it would not make the room cold and it does not adversely affect electrical equipment in other ways.

NRC has previously evaluated Halon systems and has found that they provide fire suppression capability at least equivalent to that of CO<sub>2</sub> systems. Furthermore, the licensee states that the Halon system in the Pilgrim CSR was successfully tested on May 3, 1984, in accordance with standard test criteria prescribed by the National Fire Protection Association. On this basis, the NRC staff concluded that operation of the Pilgrim Station 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 an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Therefore, the staff has made a proposed determination that this application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 25, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments to Operating Licenses NPF-11 and NPF-18 would revise the La Salle, Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications to somewhat reduce limits on monitors in accordance with guidance in Generic Letter No. 83-36, "NUREG-0737 Technical Specifications." The action statements for the accident monitoring instrumentation for (1) Drywell Hydrogen Concentration Monitor, (2) Primary Containment Gross Gamma Radiation, and (3) Noble Gas Monitors are modified as provided Generic Letter 83-36.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for a no significant hazards consideration determination by

providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (vi) of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a change which may reduce in some way a safety margin but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system of component specified in the standard review plan. The La Salle Technical Specifications for operability of plant monitors would be changed to reflect operability restrictions according to Generic Letter 83-36.

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

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* A. Schwencer.

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

*Date of amendments request:* June 20, 1984.

*Description of amendments request:* By NRC Generic Letter 83-43 to all licensees model Technical Specifications were forwarded which showed the revisions to reporting requirements as necessitated by Section 50.72 and 50.73 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Section 50.72 revises the immediate notification requirements for operating nuclear power plants. Section 50.73 provides for a revised Licensee Event Report System.

By letter dated June 20, 1984 the Consolidated Edison Company submitted proposed license amendments for NRC review and approval which reflects changes to reporting requirements.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change to make the licenses conform to changes in the regulations where the change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The NRC initial review of

the licensee's submittal indicates that this is the case. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Steven A. Varga.

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

*Date of amendments request:* June 29, 1984.

*Description of amendments request:* An amendment to the Technical Specifications to modify the definition of the term "Operable" as it applies to the single-failure criterion for safety systems: certain editorial and format changes would also be necessary. The proposed change was initiated in response to an NRC request to revise the definition consistent with guidance issued by NRC. The proposed amendment conforms to the NRC request and provides for a revised definition that is more restrictive in that it extends the definition to include systems that are associated with the system in question. This amendment request supercedes the licensee's prior request dated February 14, 1984.

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

The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by these examples in that: (1) the guidance provided by NRC and proposed in the amendment for the revised definition of the term "Operable" is more restrictive in that the operability of systems associated with the system must also now be considered; and (2) the resulting format and editorial changes are purely administrative changes. Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to the

example for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Steven A. Varga.

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 30, 1984 and August 6, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would (1) make the reporting requirements in the Technical Specifications (TS) consistent with 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 and (2) allow Plant Review Committee (PRC) review and approval of documents by document routing. The changes to the reporting requirements were proposed in response to Generic Letter No. 83-43, "Reporting Requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Sections 50.72 and 50.73, and Standard Technical Specifications," dated December 19, 1983.

Currently, the TS require a PRC meeting to approve documents which are reviewed by the PRC. The proposed change would allow PRC review and approval of documents by document routing. A meeting would still be required for review and approval of issues related to reportable events and changes to limiting safety system settings and limiting conditions for operation. Also, for the approval by routing of procedures, tests, experiments, TS changes, and safety system modifications additional controls would be instituted to ensure proper consideration of these issues by the PRC.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (vii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The proposed changes to conform to 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 affect only reporting requirements and do not affect facility operations.

Another example (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to purely administrative changes to the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes (1) affect only the procedure by which the PRC approves documents (a change from approval by meeting to approval by document routing) and (2) still require PRC approval of the same types of documents. The proposed changes also limit the document routing approval method to issues not related to reportable events and issues not involving changes to limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation. Approval by routing of procedures, tests, experiments, TS changes, and safety system modifications would be subject to special controls to assure proper consideration of these issues.

Therefore, since the changes make the license conform to changes in the regulations and do not affect plant operations or are purely administrative, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes would not involve a significant hazards consideration determination in that they: (1) do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident; (2) do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; and (3) do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Walter A. Paulson, Acting Chief.

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 30, 1984 and August 6, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would (1) make the reporting requirements in the Technical Specifications (TS) consistent with 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 and (2) allow Plant Review Committee (PRC) review and approval of documents by document routing. The changes to the reporting requirements were proposed in response to Generic Letter No. 83-43, "Reporting Requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Sections 50.72 and 50.73, and Standard Technical Specifications," dated December 19, 1983.

Currently, the TS require a PRC meeting to approve documents which are reviewed by the PRC. The proposed change would allow PRC review and approval of documents by document routing. A meeting would still be required for review and approval of issues related to reportable events and changes to limiting safety system settings and limiting conditions for operation. Also, for the approval by routing of procedures, tests, experiments, TS changes, and safety system modifications additional controls would be instituted to ensure proper consideration of these issues by the PRC.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (vii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The proposed changes to conform to 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 affect only reporting requirements and do not affect facility operations.

Another example (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to purely administrative changes to the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes (1) affect only the procedure by which the PRC approves documents (a change from approval by meeting to approval by document routing) and (2) still require PRC approval of the same types of documents. The proposed changes also limit the document routing approval method to issues not related to reportable events and issues not involving changes to limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation. Approval by routing of procedures, tests, experiments, TS changes, and safety system modifications would be subject to special controls to assure proper consideration of these issues.

Therefore, since the changes make the license conform to changes in the regulations and do not affect plant operations or are purely administrative, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes would not involve a significant hazards consideration determination in that they: (1) do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident; (2) do not

create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; and (3) do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Kalamazoo Public Library, 315 South Rose Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Walter A. Paulson, Acting Chief.

**Duke Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50-269, 50-270 and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units Nos. 1, 2 and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina**

*Date of amendment request:* June 26, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendments would authorize changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) by delineating the need for administrative controls to limit the working hours for station staff performing safety-related functions. The proposed changes to the Oconee TSs are in response to a June 12, 1984, NRC letter regarding Duke's December 28, 1982, response to Generic Letter 82-16. The licensee states that the proposed revision to TS 6.4.3 is in accordance with Generic Letter 82-16.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* Duke Power Company's submittal of June 26, 1984, included a discussion of the proposed action with respect to the no significant hazards consideration standards.

The Commission has provided, at 48 FR 14870, guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples. The proposed amendment of the TSs delineating the need for administrative controls to limit the working hours for station staff has been determined to be a change that constitutes additional limitations and controls not presently included in the TSs. Example (ii) of the types of amendments considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is applicable to this amendment request. This specific example involves amendment requests that are considered to be a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the TSs. The Commission's staff has determined, based on the above consideration, that the revision does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered, nor create the possibility of a new or

different kind of accident, and will not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that there is no significant hazards consideration involved in this amendment request.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Oconee County Library, 501 West Southbroad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

*Attorney for licensee:* J. Michael McGarry, III, Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell and Reynolds, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

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

*Date of amendment request:* November 3, 1983, as revised July 31, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* This is an application for and amendment to Operating License DPR-66, eliminating Appendix B in its entirety. All Technical Specifications in Appendix B refer to non-radiological requirements such as soil sampling, aerial infra-red photography, etc. The purpose of such required surveillance is to determine if operation of the unit would adversely affect the environment. The licensee believes that sufficient surveillance has been performed to enable him to conclude that the environment has not been adversely affected, and therefore proposes to eliminate all such requirements from the license.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Technical Specifications in Appendix B are not involved with Unit 1 hardware or operation. Thus elimination of these specifications does not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequence of an accident. In addition, no accident or malfunction of a different type from any previously analyzed would be created by the proposed amendment. Since Appendix B specifications are not concerned with safety, and do not impose any operating restriction, their elimination would not reduce any margin of safety.

Therefore, on this basis, the staff proposes to characterize the licensee's requested change as involving no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch chief:* Steven A. Varga.

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

*Date of amendment request:* June 28, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* This is an application for an amendment to Operating License DPR-66, revising a number of Tables in the Technical Specifications as follows:

(1) Table 4.3-13 would be revised to indicate that the Noble Gas Activity Monitor and Radiation Monitor provide control room alarm communication only; they do not initiate any automatic actuation, as is currently and erroneously indicated in the Specifications.

(2) Table 3.4-4 would be revised to specify the applicable time constant for the functional unit High Negative Steam Pressure Rate to be 50+ 5 seconds. This time constant is currently not specified in the specifications.

(3) Table 3.3-3, 3.3-4, 3.3-5 and 4.3-2 would be revised to add the list of signals that initiate the start of the Auxiliary Feedwater Systems. These signals are currently not included in the Specifications.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of these, Example (ii), involving no significant hazards considerations is "A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." Items (2) and (3) above match the example and the staff, therefore, proposes to characterize them as involving no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission also provided Example (i) which is "A purely administrative change to technical specifications for example, \* \* \* correction of an error \* \* \*". Item (1) above matches the example and the staff, therefore, also proposes to characterize it as involving no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Steven A. Varga.



**Florida Power and Light Company, et al.  
Docket No. 50-389, St. Lucie Plant Unit  
No. 2, St. Lucie County, Florida**

*Date of amendment request:* August 31, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would make changes in the technical specifications of St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 2, to allow continuous operation of the 8-inch containment purge supply and exhaust isolation valves. At present, the technical specifications allow the 8-inch containment purge supply and exhaust isolation valves to be open for less than or equal to 1000 hours per calendar year. As identified in the bases for the Technical Specifications, use of the 8-inch purge valves during plant operations is allowed since, in the event of a LOCA or steam line break, these valves will close and, therefore, the site boundary dose guidelines of 10 CFR Part 100 would not be exceeded in the event of an accident during purging operations.

The licensee requests that the restriction that allows the 8-inch containment purge valves to be open only for less than or equal to 1000 hours per year be deleted, thus allowing continuous operation of the system.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* Under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.92 the Commission may make a final determination pursuant to the procedures in 50.91, that a proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility licensed under 50.21(b) or 50.22 or for a testing facility involves no significant hazards considerations, if operation of the facility in accordance with a 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.

A discussion of these standards as they relate to this amendment follows:

*Standard 1. Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated.*

The proposed Technical Specification will allow continuous operation of the 8-inch containment purge system. This represents an increase in operating time from 1000 hours to 8760 hours per year. Continuous operation of this system will not increase the probability of an accident since this system cannot in itself cause an accident. This system

does serve to mitigate the consequences of a potential release to the public following a Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA). In the evaluation of these isolation valves, they were assumed to be open when a LOCA occurred. These valves are designed to close within 5 seconds of the start of a Containment Isolation Actuation Signal. This meets NRC Branch Technical Position CSB 6-4. Further, this system has been designed to accommodate a single failure. In the event of an accident, offsite doses will not exceed the limits specified in 10 CFR Part 100.

*Standard 2. Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from Any Accident Previously Evaluated*

The proposed Technical Specification will allow the 8-inch purge valves to remain open continuously. Extending the number of allowable purge hours per year does not involve any evolution that is not currently performed, thus does not lead to the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

*Standard 3. Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety*

The Continuous Containment/Hydrogen Purge System has been designed for continuous operation. In the event of a LOCA, with a failure of a single 8-inch purge valve, the remaining valves will close within 5 seconds. Offsite doses due to a LOCA and one 8-inch purge valve failure will not exceed 10 CFR Part 100 limits. Extending the number of allowable purge hours per year does not place the plant in a different configuration than that which is currently utilized routinely. Therefore, continuous operation of the 8-inch purge system does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The Commission has also provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing examples of amendments considered likely, and not likely, to involve a significant hazards consideration. These were published in the **Federal Register** on April 6, 1983 (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration (iv) relates to a relief granted upon demonstration of acceptable operation from an operating restriction that was imposed because acceptable operation was not yet demonstrated. This assumes that the operating restriction and the criteria to be applied to a request for relief have been established in a prior review and that it is justified in a satisfactory way that the criteria have been met. This proposed amendment is considered to be similar to example (iv)

in that it involves relief from an operating restriction that was imposed prior to licensing because justification for the relief requested in this amendment, based on plant operating experience, did not exist at that time.

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

*Local Public Document Room location:* Indian River Junior College Library, 3209 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, Florida 33450.

*Attorney for licensee:* Harold F. Reis, Esq., Newman and Holtzinger P.C., 1615 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.  
*NRC Branch Chief:* James R. Miller.

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

*Date of amendment request:* December 21, 1983, as supplemented April 16, 1984, and May 2, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would modify the Technical Specification Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) to increase the number of movable detectors in the Traveling Incore Probe (TIP) system that are required to be operable from three to four.

The amendment would also modify the Technical Specification Action Statement for this LCO to allow operation of the TIP system with one or more inoperable detectors. It would allow the functioning portions of the TIP system to be used for monitoring and calibration purposes for 31 effective full power days following the last normalization of the detectors. The current Technical Specification does not allow the TIP system to be used if all required detectors (currently three) cannot be normalized. The purpose of this change is to increase the accuracy of monitoring of core parameters by the local power range monitors (LPRMs) when portions of the TIP system are inoperable.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the criteria in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One such example is (ii), a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The increase in the number of movable detectors

required to be operable is similar to this example.

The Commission has also 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 current Technical Specification allows plant operation to continue for up to 31 effective full power days with less than three TIP detectors operable. LPRM drift during plant operation tends to be in a nonconservative direction (due to burnup of fissionable material in the ionization chambers). Thus, the current Technical Specification, in effect, prevents conservative corrections to the LPRM readings from being made during the period (up to 31 effective full power days) in which the plant is allowed to operate with less than three operable TIP detectors.

The modified Technical Specification will allow corrections to the LPRM readings for those LPRM strings that can be reached by the remaining operable TIP detectors when less than four detectors are operable. This will allow updating and more conservative monitoring of the core parameters and adjustment of Average Power Range Monitor setpoints. It thereby provides for more conservative operation with respect to core thermal limits.

While under certain conditions the modification will make it possible, when using a manual calculation to determine parameters, to operate at a higher power level than is currently allowed with less than three TIP detectors operable, the operating guidelines that the plant follows for usage of the manual calculation are designed to prevent use of this calculation in a nonconservative manner.

On the basis of the above, the Commission has determined that the requested modification meets the three criteria and therefore has made a proposed determination that the amendment application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* G.F.  
Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and

Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W.,  
Washington, D.C. 20036.

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 28, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*  
The proposed amendment requests approval of a Technical Specification Change to section 5.3.1.E to remove the weight limitation of the spent fuel shipping cask.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*  
On October 14, 1983, a U.S. District Court, Western District of New York, issued a Partial Settlement Agreement and Order which requires GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPUN) to return 224 spent fuel assemblies from the Nuclear Service Center in West Valley, New York to Oyster Creek. Accordingly, in preparation for receiving these fuel assemblies GPUN is contracting for the use of two TN-9 spent fuel shipping casks each having a full load weight of 40.5 tons. The use of these casks would reduce the number of shipments from West Valley to 32 instead of the 114 required if the NLI ½ cask were utilized.

On March 30, 1977, the NRC issued Amendment No. 22 to the Oyster Creek Technical Specifications (TS). This amendment addressed the increased spent fuel pool storage capacity and the requirements that go with it. One of these requirements had to do with limiting the weight of a spent fuel shipping cask, which could be raised over the top plate of the cask drop protection system (CDPS), to a maximum weight of 30 tons. Although the analysis for the CDPS had been performed by GPUN using a 100-ton cask, and had been found acceptable by the NRC as discussed in the March 30, 1977 SER of Amendment 22, the NRC imposed the 30-ton limitation until the details of the means used to limit the height to which the cask can be raised over the operating deck have been submitted by GPUN and approved by the NRC staff.

The proposed amendment change request would remove the 30-ton limitation so that GPUN can utilize the TN-9 shipping casks. GPUN is developing and will use specific procedures for handling the TN-9 casks. To ensure that the cask will not be raised more than 6 inches above the top plate of the CDPS, limit switches on the crane will be set to limit the crane's upward travel to a level such that the bottom surface of the cask base plate

will be limited to a maximum height of 6 inches above the top plate. In addition, a "GO, NO-GO" gauge will be used to ensure the cask is at the correct height prior to movement.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (April 8, 1983, 48 FR 14870). One of the examples (iv) of action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a relief granted upon demonstration of acceptable operation from an operating restriction that was imposed because acceptable operation was not yet demonstrated. This assumes that the operating restriction and the criteria to be applied to a request for relief have been established in a prior review and that it is justified in a satisfactory way that the criteria have been met. The changes proposed in the application for amendment are encompassed by this example and the requested action fulfills the requirements set forth in the SER supporting Amendment 22 of the Oyster Creek license. On this basis, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Walter A.  
Paulson, Acting Chief.

**GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania**

*Date of amendment request:* February 17, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*  
This amendment request supersedes the request dated June 8, 1981, which was published in the *Federal Register* on July 21, 1983 (48 FR 33383). The proposed amendment includes the recommended Technical Specification (TS) changes of our Generic Letter 84-13.

The proposed amendment would provide operability requirements and surveillance requirements for snubbers. The operability requirements would require an inoperable snubber to be restored to operable within 72 hours or the associated system would be declared inoperable and the required action for the inoperable system would be initiated. The surveillance requirements would include: visual inspections, refueling outage

inspections, visual inspection acceptance criteria, functional tests, functional test criteria, functional test failure analysis, functional testing of repaired or replaced snubbers, and snubbers seal replacement program.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided examples (48 FR 14870) of the type of amendments not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration. One example of this type (ii) is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed change regarding operability requirements falls into this category in that a time limitation (72 hours) would be placed on the restoration of inoperable snubbers. If the inoperable snubbers are not restored to an operable condition within the proposed time limitation, then the licensee would be required to declare the associated system inoperable which would result in a plant shutdown. Similarly, the surveillance requirements impose additional restrictions related to mandatory periodic testing of the snubber assemblies to assure operability. Such restrictions do not currently exist in the TSs. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for Licensee:* Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

**Indiana and Michigan Electric Company, Docket No. 50-315, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Berrien County, Michigan**

*Date of amendment request:* August 23, 1984, supported by Exxon Nuclear letters dated August 22 and 23, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications to revise the burnup dependent core physics parameters for Exxon fuel left in Unit 1 and to increase the heat flux hot channel factor,  $F_q$ , for Westinghouse fuel in Unit 1.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6,

1983). One of the examples (vi) of action not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. The first proposed change to revise the burnup dependent core physics parameters for Exxon fuel left in Unit 1 is directly related to this example. Westinghouse fuel is replacing the Exxon fuel in Unit 1 and due to the approved power increase, highly enriched Westinghouse fuel with extended burnup, the Exxon fuel remaining in the core will also be exposed to higher burnups. The proposed changes and effects on the fuel and plant operation to account for this higher burnup is based on analyses and methods used previously and found acceptable. The results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the fuel design and operational capability.

The second proposed change to the heat flux hot channel factor,  $F_q$ , is also like this example in that the licensee proposes to incorporate the BART computer code analysis in the currently approved large break analysis. The Commission has previously reviewed the use of the BART code in this fashion and has found it acceptable and the results clearly within all acceptance criteria. On the basis of the above, the Commission proposes to conclude that the proposed changes described above involve a no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Steven A. Varga.

**Indiana and Michigan Electric Company, Docket No. 50-316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Berrien County, Michigan**

*Date of amendment request:* August 28, 1984, supported by Exxon Nuclear letters dated July 7, 1984 and August 7, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specification values of the total heat flux hot channel factor,  $F_q^T$ , and the nuclear enthalpy rise hot channel factor as a result of new loss-of-

coolant-accident/emergency core cooling system (LOCA/ECCS) calculations.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The new LOCA/ECCS calculations have been performed with adjustments to FLECHT based heat transfer correlations to account for the difference in axial power distribution between that used in the Unit 2-Cycle 5 analysis and that used in the FLECHT tests where the correlations were first developed. The adjustments in the heat transfer correlation will make the resulting LOCA/ECCS calculations more representative of the D.C. Cook, Unit 2, core configuration and do not otherwise change the previous analyses or findings in the safety evaluation report supporting the Cycle 5 operation. As such, operation with the revised  $F_q$  and  $F_{delta H}$  will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Therefore, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Steven A. Varga.

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 17, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would correct an error in the instrument setpoint dealing with the bypass of the direct scram signals, at low reactor power, on turbine stop valve or turbine control valve closure generated during turbine trip or generator load rejection event, respectively.

The licensee states that during a review of the engineering designs related to the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) power uprate program, a discrepancy in a pressure instrument setpoint was discovered. The instrument setpoint was set at a turbine first stage pressure corresponding to 30% of the turbine power, instead of 30% of the core power as shown in the Final Safety



Analysis Report. Since 30% of the turbine power corresponds to approximately 35% of the core power, the instrument was erroneously set in a non-conservative manner. The licensee, therefore, required a change in the Technical Specifications to correct the value of the turbine first stage setpoint pressure to correspond to 30% of the core power instead of 30% of turbine power.

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

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

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 29, 1984, as supplemented by submittal dated July 18, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The original amendment request of February 29, 1984 was initially noticed on May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21831). The original request, in part, changed the Technical Specifications to implement the following TMI Action Plan Items set forth in NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements" and as requested by the staff's Generic Letter 83-36:

II.B.3—Post Accident Sampling  
II.F.1.1—Noble Gas Monitor

II.F.1.2—Iodine Particulate Sampling

II.F.1.3—Containment High-Range Monitor

II.F.1.4—Containment Pressure Monitor

II.F.1.5—Containment Water Level Monitor

By letter dated July 18, 1984, the licensee submitted a revision to the February 29, 1984 application to change the following two areas of the Technical Specifications relative to the above TMI Action Plan Items:

(1) The action statements for inoperable channels of the Containment Pressure Monitor (Item II.F.1.4) and Containment Water Level Monitor (Item II.F.1.5) are revised to be more stringent than the action statements proposed in the February 29, 1984 application.

(2) Requirements and references to Drywell Level Instrumentation, erroneously proposed in the February 29, 1984 application in response to TMI Action Plan Item II.F.1.5, are deleted.

In addition, the July 18, 1984 letter proposed a change to the Technical Specifications that was not addressed in the February 29, 1984 application and was not noticed in 49 FR 21831. In preparing the Technical Specifications for items (1) and (2) above, the licensee noted that the identification number and range of a Suppression Chamber/Torus Water Temperature instrument were incorrectly identified. The third item for which a Technical Specification revision is proposed by the licensee's July 18, 1984 letter is a correction to the Suppression Chamber/Torus Water Temperature instrument designation.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples relates to: "(i) a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature." Another example (ii) of actions involving no significant hazards consideration is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

(1) The proposed revision to the Technical Specifications relative to TMI Action Plan Items II.F.1.4, Containment Pressure Monitor, and II.F.1.5, Containment Water Level Monitor, impose more stringent action statements for inoperable equipment than originally proposed by the February 29, 1984 application. These revisions constitute

additional limitations, restrictions, or controls not presently included in the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) Technical Specifications. Therefore, the proposed changes are similar to the Commission's example (ii) above. Also, as noted, the proposed revision represents a more stringent limitation than that originally noticed in 49 FR 21831. Therefore, the proposed revision does not change our originally proposed determination that the requested change will not involve significant hazards considerations.

(2) The licensee proposes to revise the original Technical Specifications amendment application to delete requirements and references to the Drywell Level instrumentation. Technical Specification changes to add the Drywell Level instrumentation were erroneously proposed by the February 29, 1984 submittal, along with proposed changes to include Suppression Chamber/Torus Water Level instrumentation, in response to TMI Action Plan Item II.F.1.5. Because this TMI Action Plan Item only addresses Suppression Chamber/Torus Water Level instrumentation, Drywell Level Instrumentation need not be included in the Technical Specifications. Therefore, this correction does not change our proposed determination in 49 FR 21831 that the requested change will not involve significant hazards considerations.

(3) The licensee proposes to change the Technical Specifications to correct the identification number and range of a Suppression Chamber/Torus Water Temperature instrument. The correction is an administrative change similar to the Commission's example (i). Therefore, we propose to determine that the requested change will not involve significant hazards considerations.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Mr. G.D. Watson, Nebraska Public Power District, Post Office Box 499, Columbus, Nebraska 68601.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Domenic B. Vassallo.

**Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-339, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York**

*Date of amendment request:* July 11, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would modify the definition section, the limiting conditions for operations, surveillance requirements and bases section of the Technical Specifications with regard to

the reactor coolant leakage limits. More specifically, initiation of inspection and corrective actions are required when identified leakage increases at a rate of two gallons per minute within a twenty-four hour period or less; the frequency of reactor coolant leakage checks is increased; and operability and surveillance requirements are imposed on the leakage detection systems.

**Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:** The Commission has provided guidance concerning determination of significant hazards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. One of the examples relates to a change which is (ii) an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The proposed change imposes additional more restrictive requirements on the reactor coolant leakage limits. Therefore, the change is similar to example (ii) described above.

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

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

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

**NRC Branch Chief:** Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

**Date of amendment request:** July 19, 1984.

**Description of amendment request:** The proposed amendment changes the Technical Specifications to reflect a management organization change in which the Senior Vice President, Nuclear Operations' function is assumed by the Executive Director of Nuclear Operations and the Vice President of Quality Assurance's function is assumed by the Director of Quality Assurance.

**Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:** The licensee has presented its determination of significant hazards considerations as follows:

The proposed Technical Specification amendment regarding management reorganization involves no significant

hazards considerations. Therefore, the operation of Nine Mile Point, Unit No. 1 in accordance with the proposed amendment will not (1) involve a significant increase in the possibility 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. This determination is based on the following analysis.

The proposed amendment incorporates management organizational changes to improve the overall performance of Nine Mile Point, Unit No. 1 and construction and operation of Nine Mile Point, Unit No. 2. The positions of Executive Director of Nuclear Operation and Director of Quality Assurance were created to utilize the skills of Messrs. B. G. Hooten and J.A. Perry to accomplish this goal. As a result of the delegation of authority and responsibility by the Board of Directors, these positions possess the authority of officers of the Corporation.

The proposed amendment, therefore, involves no significant hazards consideration. This proposed determination is supported by the fact that the requested action corresponds with example (i) of the Sholly Rule published in the *Federal Register* on April 6, 1983, which involves a purely administrative change in the Technical Specifications.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's significant hazards consideration determinations and based on this review concurs that the proposed change is administrative in nature since the function and independence of the previous organization appears to be maintained. The staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

**NRC Branch Chief:** Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

**Date of amendment request:** August 3, 1984, superseding in part the request of April 13, 1984.

**Description of amendment request:** This submittal supersedes in part the request for amendment dated April 13, 1984 which was noticed in the Monthly *Federal Register* Notice on June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25365). This request for Technical Specification (TS) changes is to incorporate limiting conditions for operation, action statement, and surveillance requirements for the

instrumentation that initiates the diesel generators. The proposed changes provided in the August 3, 1984 submittal are in response to telephone conferences of May 17, July 23, and July 30, 1984.

**Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:** The Commission has provided guidance concerning the determination of significant hazards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. One of the examples (ii), relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The proposed Technical Specification amendment imposes more stringent controls on the diesel generator initiation logic. This is accomplished by increased surveillance and operational requirements. This proposed determination is similar to example (ii) in that the changes constitute an additional control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

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

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

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

**NRC Branch Chief:** Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

**Date of amendment request:** August 7, 1984.

**Description of amendment request:** The proposed amendment would change section 6.0, Administrative Controls of the Technical Specifications relating to Safety Review and Audit Board (SRAB) audits of actions taken to correct deficiencies occurring in facility equipment, structures, systems or methods of operation that affect nuclear safety. In particular, the word "all" is being deleted as a modifier to "actions."

**Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:** The proposed Technical Specification change to section 6.5 *Review and Audit*

of the Nine Mile Point Unit 1 Administrative Controls involves a reduction in the required scope of review by SRAB of results of actions taken to correct deficiencies in facility equipment or methods of operation. The change proposed by the licensee is identical in scope to that found in the Administrative Controls section of BWR Standard Technical Specifications, NUREG-0123, Rev. 3, endorsed by Chapter 16 (NUREG-0800) of the Standard Review Plan. Further, significant events and their respective corrective actions are reported to the NRC by Licensee Event Reports. Therefore, the operation of the plant in accordance with the proposed amendment will 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. Therefore, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* April 3, 1984, as revised August 17, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The August 17, 1984 submittal replaces the request for amendment dated April 3, 1984 which was noticed in the Monthly **Federal Register** Notice on May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21833). The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications to add a number of specifications by the Commission in NUREG-0737 following the Three Mile Island accident and following certain system changes made at the Monticello site. The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications provide Limiting Conditions of Operation and Surveillance Requirements for post-accident sampling equipment and control room habitability equipment.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for making a no significant

hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870).

One of these examples (ii), is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The proposed amendment matches this example in that the only changes are additional restrictions, imposed by NUREG-0737, not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

Therefore, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* May 29, 1984 and August 16, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications as follows:

1. A new intertie line has been installed at the Monticello plant between the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) suction line and RHR return line for the purpose of reducing the potential for water hammer. There are three motor-operated valves in the new line. The proposed change adds limiting conditions for operation (LCOs) and surveillance requirements for the new valves.

2. A recirculation system cross-tie line has been removed from the Monticello plant during the current pipe replacement outage. The cross-tie line is valved closed during reactor operation, and its use during reactor operation is prohibited by Technical Specifications. Because the cross-tie line has now been physically removed, the proposed change deletes, from the Technical Specifications, limiting conditions for operation prohibiting the use of the cross-tie line during reactor operation.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the determination of significant hazards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments considered not likely to involve

significant hazards consideration. One of the examples, (iv), is a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan: for example, a change resulting from the application of a small refinement of a previously used calculational model or design model.

This example is applicable to the first item in the proposed amendment which adds Technical Specification requirements pertaining to the new intertie line in that the change may reduce in some way a safety margin with respect to LOCA analyses or suppression pool loading. The new intertie line has been analyzed by the licensee to determine any possible adverse effects resulting from its presence, including effects on LOCA analyses and containment suppression pool loadings. Adverse effects have been found negligible compared to the positive benefits from reducing the potential for water hammer. The results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria for the system or component as specified in the Standard Review Plan, Section 15.65, "LOCA Resulting from Spectrum of Postulated Piping Breaks Within the Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary" and Section 6.2.1.1.C, "Pressure-Suppression Type BWR Containments."

Another example provided by the Commission, (i), is a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature.

This example is applicable to the second item in the proposed amendment because the change deletes, from the Technical Specifications, restrictions pertaining to the operation of a line which has now been physically removed.

Therefore, since all of the changes are encompassed by examples of changes which the Commission has determined are not likely to pose a significant hazards consideration, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and



Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W.,  
Washington, D.C. 20036.  
*NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B.  
Vassallo.*

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

*Date of application for amendment:*  
July 27, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*  
The proposed amendment would provide a higher limiting setpoint for degraded grid voltage protection than now exists in the Technical Specifications, and would specify time delay and deviations from the setpoint for the degraded voltage trip and reset functions which are presently unspecified.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*  
The Commission has provided guidance concerning the determination of significant hazards by providing certain examples (48 FR 1470) of amendments considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. One of the examples (ii) is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

A higher degraded voltage setpoint is more restrictive, and specification of the permissible time delay and deviation from setpoint for the trip and reset functional provide limitations which do not presently exist in the Technical Specifications.

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

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B.  
Vassallo.*

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

*Date of application for amendment:*  
August 17, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*  
The proposed amendment would revise section 5.2 of the Technical Specifications (TSs) to reflect the use of

hybrid design hafnium control rod assemblies. These assemblies will be used to replace standard control rod assemblies during the current Monticello refueling outage.

The other change proposed in the August 17, 1984 application is being handled by separate action.

The changes made to section 5.2 of the Monticello TSs reflect the use of hybrid design hafnium control rod assemblies to replace existing control rod assemblies. The Hybrid I Control Rod (HICR) Assembly has been designed by General Electric (GE) to be used as direct replacement for the present control rod assemblies. The original control rods contained only boron carbide, B<sub>4</sub>C, as the absorbing material. The new assembly design use B<sub>4</sub>C absorber cubes and three solid hafnium rods in the outside edge of each wing. This new design will lengthen control rod lifetime.

The description of these control rods was submitted to the NRC by General Electric in topical report NEDE-22290. Based on the staff's evaluation of the information provided in (a) NEDE-22290, (b) a meeting with GE representatives, and (c) responses to NRC staff questions, the staff concluded that there is reasonable assurance that the substitution of Type I HICRs for other approved GE control blades will not result in unacceptable hazards to the public and should, in fact, result in improved control blade performance and a positive contribution to reactor safety. Therefore, NEDE-22290, as amended to incorporate this safety evaluation, is approved as a referenced document for the GE Type I HICR by NRC letter dated August 22, 1983.

*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 staff has reviewed the proposed amendment and the related topical report. The licensee concludes that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration and based on the following discussion the staff concurs with this conclusion.

The materials evaluation, which includes the chemical, physical, mechanical and irradiation properties, indicates that data and experience demonstrate acceptable corrosion resistance in high temperature water and steam exists for hafnium in BWR control rods. The physical properties expected to be germane to control applications indicate acceptable performance in the BWR environment.

The mechanical evaluation indicates that the thermal expansion and irradiation growth of hafnium will not interfere with handle and velocity limiter.

A nuclear evaluation indicates that the HICR will have no significant impact on core and fuel operation when used as a replacement for the current B<sub>4</sub>C control rod assemblies. Experiments provide critical benchmarks for calculations and illustrate a minimum impact on local power and flux distributions with all hafnium rods. An even smaller impact is expected for HICR which is a mixture of hafnium and B<sub>4</sub>C. Therefore, the HICR can be used without change in the current lattices physics treatment of control rod assemblies and current design procedures.

Thermal-hydraulic evaluation shows that the maximum temperature of the new rods is not significantly different from the currently used control rod assemblies.

An accident evaluation shows that the HICR weight and envelope are identical to the current assemblies. The mechanical and nuclear properties of the HICR do not differ from the current assemblies in any measures that might be significant during normal or accident conditions. The HICR is, except for minor differences, mechanically identical to the BWR assemblies for which many reactor years of safe operating experience are available. Accordingly the mechanical safety analysis for the HICR is enveloped by the mechanical safety analyses for the current assemblies.

The reactor core response for the HICR design has been evaluated against the current control rod design for comparison with linear heat generation, minimum critical power ratio and maximum average planer heat generation limits. The HICR weight and rod worth are the same as the current control rod design, therefore the scram speed and scram reactivity are the same and the above limits are not affected by the change.

Based on the above, the staff has determined that: (1) the probability or occurrence or the consequences of an

accident would not be increased above those analyzed in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) because the weight and envelope of the HICR are identical to those of the currently used assemblies, and the nuclear and mechanical properties of the HICR do not differ from currently used assemblies in a significant way; (2) the possibility of an accident different from those analyzed in the FSAR would not result from these changes because, in addition to the above, these systems would not be operated in a manner new or different from that described in the FSAR; and (3) the margin of safety as analyzed in Technical Specifications would not be reduced because the proposed amendment involves no significant relaxation of the criteria used to establish safety limits, no significant relaxation of the bases for limiting safety system settings, and no significant relaxation in limiting conditions for operation. Therefore, the staff finds that 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; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room*

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

*Date of application for amendment:*  
September 7, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*  
The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications to add Limiting Conditions of Operation and Surveillance Requirements for the low low setpoint logic modification. The low low setpoint logic modification is designed to ensure a minimum water leg clearing time between any safety relief valve (SRV) closure and subsequent actuation to minimize thrust loads as part of the generic Mark I containment modification program. The review and

approval of the low low setpoint logic modification was issued by the NRC to the licensee by letter dated March 19, 1984.

The proposed amendment also reduces the Limiting Condition of Operation for the maximum suppression pool water volume, so that the water volume is consistent with the analysis supporting the Mark I containment modification program.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*  
The Commission has provided guidance concerning the determination of significant hazards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration. One of the examples (ii), relates to change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

The present Monticello Technical Specifications do not contain Limiting Conditions of Operation and Surveillance Requirements for the low low setpoint logic modification. Also the present Monticello Technical Specifications contain a less restrictive value for the maximum suppression pool water volume.

Therefore, since this change is more restrictive than the current Technical Specification limit, the change is similar to example (ii). The staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it is similar to the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration cited by the Commission.

*Local Public Document Room*

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Domenic B. Vassallo.

**Northeast Nuclear Energy Company,  
Docket No. 50-245, Millstone Nuclear  
Generating Station, Unit No. 1, New  
London County, Connecticut**

*Date of amendment request:* July 17, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*  
The Technical Specification change proposed by the amendment request would modify the Appendix A Technical Specifications to lower the primary containment oxygen concentration from five (5) percent to four (4) percent. The change would further limit the amount of oxygen in the containment drywell and wetwell to assure sufficient inerting

(nitrogen inerted) to prevent combustible gas mixtures due to hydrogen generation following postulated loss-of-coolant accidents (LOCAs). The reduced oxygen limit is in accord with Northeast Nuclear Energy Company's (NNECO's) calculations that show an inerted containment with less than four (4) percent oxygen during normal plant operation will not support combustion of hydrogen formed in the post LOCA recovery period considering water radiolysis, metal/water reactions and other potential sources of oxygen.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*  
The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for a no significant hazards consideration determination by providing certain examples (April 6, 1983, 48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The change proposed by the licensee involves a new more restrictive requirement for containment oxygen concentration and satisfies the four (4) percent oxygen concentration operating limit requirement of NRC Generic Letter 84-09 dated May 8, 1984. Thus, the proposal is encompassed within example (ii) since the requested action would result in additional limitation. On this basis the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve a no significant hazards consideration determination.

*Local Public Document Room  
location:* Waterford Public Library, Rope Ferry Road, Route 156, Waterford, Connecticut 06385.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Walter A. Paulson, Acting Chief.

**Pennsylvania Power & Light Company,  
Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388,  
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,  
Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County,  
Pennsylvania**

*Date of amendment request:* May 3, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*  
The proposed amendment would: (1) allow for contractor personnel who have been awarded a temporary 180-day clearance and have requested a PP&L-C full clearance to be granted an extension of the temporary clearance when unforeseeable and lengthy delays in the

background investigation are encountered, or when the time necessary to complete the work project is beyond the projected completion date; and (2) provide the Director-Corporate Security a reasonable degree of flexibility during the clearance process to grant a contractor clearance when certain minor information has not been received, as otherwise required.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* PP&L's screening program for contractors is only to grant unescorted access for a limited duration—180 days. Due to the transient nature of work performed by contractors, frequently workers are initially processed for a temporary clearance and are subsequently laid off prior to the expiration of their 180-day limitation under temporary clearance provisions. In many cases only several weeks later, the same workers may be rehired to perform another function; however, their temporary clearance is nearing expiration or has recently expired. As a result, these workers must be escorted in order to gain entrance to the protected area.

The implementation of the interim PP&L-C clearance would allow these previously-cleared personnel to return to work in an expeditious manner without the need for escorting.

In addition, unforeseeable and uncontrolled delays in the conduct of the background investigation occur from time to time. The interim PP&L-C clearance would bridge the gap between the expiration of the temporary and the completion of the full contractor clearance in such instances.

The proposed interim PP&L-C clearance would not simply be an extension of the temporary clearance because (1) a prerequisite will be that a full PP&L-C clearance must be in progress (in many cases the full clearance is submitted); (2) all case information available at the time of the request for the interim clearance will be considered in the decision to grant an interim PP&L-C clearance; (3) psychological evaluations are required for all interim clearances (which may not be the case for temporary clearances); (4) the immediate supervisor for each individual requesting an interim clearance must submit a completed questionnaire which addresses alcohol/drug usage, credit, mental or nervous problems, reliability and trustworthiness; and (5) the supervisor must provide a statement of opinion as to whether or not he recommends the employee for unescorted access based upon his

association and observation of the employee's behavior.

The scope of PP&L's background investigation includes most aspects of a clearance candidate's life including checks into credit history, character references, employment and unemployment and local law enforcement agencies records. Occasionally, due to a backlog in similar requests for information, some agencies do not respond in a prompt fashion. In this situation, all other components of the background investigation are usually completed with favorable results; however, the clearance, in such instances, cannot be awarded until all information is available for review.

This unduly punishes an otherwise acceptable candidate for failings beyond his control. Also, it should be noted that the information requested from a non-responsive agency has usually been verified indirectly through other sources such as references. In most instances, a complete picture of the individual's character, reliability and trustworthiness has already been established. In such cases, PP&L would actively pursue attempts to acquire the information even when previous attempts are ignored.

This option would provide PP&L with optimum flexibility during the clearance process and would yield a more cost-effective worker-responsive program without diminishing program goals and intent.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves a proposed change which meets the standards for concluding that the operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not, involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

*Attorney for licensee:* Jay Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

*NRC Branch Chief:* A. Schwencer.

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

*Date of amendment request:* January 28, 1983, as supplemented and amended March 27, 1984. These requests supersede an earlier application for amendment dated March 15, 1979.

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

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

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



reasonable achievable" effluent objectives.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Multnomah County Library, 801 S.W. 10th Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* James R. Miller.

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 23, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*

The proposed change to the Technical Specifications adds a surveillance requirement for steam generator tube examinations and evaluations following a tube leak. The proposed change was requested by the NRC to formalize the commitment to perform these examinations and evaluations as stated in our June 22, 1984 letter. Prior to the issuance of this proposal, a typographical error will require correction and the Basis will require elaboration to be more meaningful.

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

Since the proposed change involves the addition of a new surveillance requirement, the above example applies and the staff proposes to determine that this action does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room*

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Bryant O'Donnell, Public Service Company of Colorado, P.O. Box 840, Denver, Colorado 80201.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Eric H. Johnson.

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 17, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*

The proposed amendment would delete information pertaining to the definition of hot channel factors which is no longer relevant.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

By letter dated December 20, 1983, the licensee requested changes to the Ginna Technical Specifications (TS) to permit the use of the Westinghouse Optimized Fuel Assembly (WOFA). Included in the proposed TS revision were new definitions of the nuclear hot channel factors which were applicable to the use of the WOFA at Ginna. The licensee did not request removal of the old hot channel factor definitions and they were not deleted with the approval for the use of WOFA which was granted by the staff on May 1, 1984. Since the new factors are included in the TS and are governing, the old factor definitions are inoperative and should be removed in the interest of clarity.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870, April 6, 1983). One of the examples (i) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is a purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature. The staff proposes that the proposed changes are administrative in nature and fall within example (i). Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the request involves no significant hazards consideration, in that: (1) it does not 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.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14604.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* Walter A. Paulson.

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 22, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*

The amendment would change the Technical Specification reporting requirements to be in accordance with new regulation 10 CFR 50.73. The new

§ 50.73 provides for a revised Licensee Event Report System and replaces all existing requirements for licensees to report "Reportable Occurrences" as defined in individual plant Technical Specifications.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples relates to a change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The amendment involved here is similar in that it changes the reporting requirements contained in Technical Specifications to be in accordance with new regulation 10 CFR 50.73. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room*

*Location:* Fairfield County Library, Garden and Washington Streets, Winnsboro, South Carolina 29810.

*Attorney for licensee:* Randolph R. Mahan, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Elinor G. Adensam.

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 19, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:*

The amendment would revise Technical Specification 6.3, "Unit Staff Qualifications," to clarify educational requirements of candidates for Senior Reactor Operator's (SRO) Licenses. The revision consists of a reference to NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirement," section I.A.2.1, and NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examiner Standards," ES-109D.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

The current Technical Specification 6.3 requirement for SROs is that they shall meet or exceed the minimum qualifications of ANSI N18.1-1971 for comparable positions and the supplemental requirements specified in Sections A and C of Enclosure 1 of the March 28, 1980, letter to all licensees. The amendment would add the following: "as clarified in NUREG-0737,

section I.A.2.1, and NUREG-1021, ES-109D.

The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) 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 amendment and has determined that should this request be implemented, it will not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the referenced documents are NRC approved recommendations for SRO qualifications, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the plant design is not changed, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the referenced documents are NRC approved recommendations for SRO qualifications. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Randolph R. Mahan, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29180.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Elinor G. Adensam.

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 24, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would revise Technical Specification Table 3.3-7, "Seismic Monitoring Instrumentation," and Technical Specification Table 4.3-4, "Seismic Monitoring Instrumentation Requirements" to allow an installed triaxial peak accelerograph to be moved to an accumulator safety injection line from the pressurizer surge line. A typographical error would also be corrected in Technical Specification Table 3.3-7.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided certain examples (48 FR 14870) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples relates to a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications such as correction of an error in Technical Specifications. The correction of the

typographical error in Technical Specification Table 3.3-7 is similar to this example. However, the request to move the triaxial peak accelerograph does not match any of the examples. The staff has reviewed the licensee's request for the above amendment and has determined that should this request be implemented, it will not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the accelerograph will still be available to determine if a seismic event exceeding the operating basis earthquake (QBE) occurs, which requires plant shutdown by 10 CFR 100, Appendix A. Also, it will not (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the accelerograph function of recording seismic events is not being changed and it will not (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the new location is an analyzed location away from restraints which produces relatively large accelerations under OBE conditions. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Randolph R. Mahan, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29180.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Elinor G. Adensam.

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

*Date of amendment request:* April 6, 1984, April 27, 1984 and September 11, 1984 (reference PCN-135).

*Description of amendment request:* Technical Specification 3/4.3.2 requires that the Engineered Safety Features Actuation System (ESFAS) instrumentation channels be operable, and defines a number of functional tests and response time tests that must be periodically conducted in order to assure operability. Table 3.3-4 of this Technical Specification defines the ESFAS instrumentation trip values for the Toxic Gas Isolation System (TGIS). The TGIS is actuated by greater than allowable concentration of toxic gas (i.e., chlorine, ammonia, butane/propane, or carbon dioxide) in the normal control room air supply duct. Upon receipt of a TGIS signal, the control room heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system is

automatically isolated. The FSAR analysis indicates that adequate protection for the control room operators will be provided if the toxic gas concentration in the control room during the first two (2) minutes after the detector responds is less than the protective action limit for toxic gas concentration. The proposed change would make the following revisions to Table 3.3-4:

(1) The allowable values for chlorine concentration would be increased from less than or equal to 6.2 ppm to less than or equal to 15.0 ppm. With an allowable value for chlorine limited to less than or equal to 15.0 ppm, the high chlorine trip value would be increased from less than or equal to 6.0 ppm to less than or equal to 14.3 ppm.

(2) The allowable values for ammonia concentration would be increased from less than or equal to 44.7 ppm to less than or equal to 100 ppm. With an allowable value for ammonia limited to less than or equal to 100 ppm, the high ammonia trip value would be increased from less than or equal to 42.4 ppm to less than or equal to 97 ppm.

(3) The allowable values for butane/propane concentration would be increased from less than or equal to 89.3 ppm to less than or equal to 200 ppm. With an allowable value for butane/propane limited to less than or equal to 200 ppm, the high butane/propane trip value would be increased from less than or equal to 84.8 ppm to less than or equal to 193 ppm.

(4) The allowable value for carbon dioxide concentration would be deleted (the present value is less than or equal to 4275.0 ppm). Therefore the high carbon dioxide trip value would also be deleted (the present value is less than or equal to 4061.3 ppm).

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazard consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. Example (vi) relates to a change which may result in some increase in the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptance criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan (SRP). The proposed change is similar to this example in that the proposed allowable toxic gas concentrations,

while larger than those presently used, nevertheless meet the requirements of Section 6.4 of the Standard Review Plan by ensuring that during the first two (2) minutes after the detector responds, the control room will not exceed the protective action limit for toxic gas concentration.

Specifically, the license has recently revised the flow model in the previously used method for calculating toxic gas concentration in the control room. Analysis using the revised TGIS allowable values and trip setpoints will still provide the plant operators with the required two (2) minutes of warning time before the protective action limit for toxic gas concentration in the control room is exceeded.

In the case of item (4), above, the licensees' analysis shows that even with no control room isolation, the maximum control room concentration of carbon dioxide at any time is 11,000 ppm. Since the two (2) minute protective action limit for carbon dioxide is 50,000 ppm, this monitor can be deleted from the Technical Specifications and the plant will still meet the toxic gas criteria of the SRP. Therefore, based on the above considerations, the Commission proposes to determine that these changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Charles R. Kocher, Esq., Southern California Edison Company, 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770 and Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, Attn.: David R. Pigott, Esq., 600 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94111.

*NRC Branch Chief:* George W. Knighton.

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Unit 3, Limestone County, Alabama**

*Date of amendment request:* May 10, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would delete operability and test requirements for valves 74-77 and 74-78 which previously served as primary containment isolation valves for the residual heat removal (RHR) head spray piping located at containment penetration X-17. The amendment would also change the name of containment penetration X-17 from "RHR head spray line" to "blank."

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has made a proposed

determination that the amendment request involves 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 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 an accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety for the following reasons:

1. Valves 74-77 and 74-78 will be replaced by permanent pipe cap. Valves are subject to leakage and failure-to-close; however, since a welded-in pipe cap is not, there will be no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The capped-off piping will not be physically or functionally connected to any other system, component, or equipment in a manner which could create a new different kind of accident. Because of the cap, the piping is dead-ended to flow.

3. The piping penetration will continue to be testable and subject to Appendix J, Type B leakage tests. Therefore, there will be no significant reduction in the margin of safety.

On the above basis, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* H. S. Sanger, Jr., Esquire, General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 Commerce Avenue, E 11B 33C, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Domenic B. Vassallo.

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

*Date of amendment request:* (1) January 25, 1984 (2) September 17, 1982 (3) December 10, 1981 (4) December 29, 1983 (5) June 13, 1984 (6) May 25, 1984 (7) April 20, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* (1) On January 25, 1984, the licensee requested changes to the Technical Specifications for Units 1 & 2 to incorporate operating conditions and surveillance requirements for newly installed instrumentation and the reactor coolant vent system. Plant modifications were made to comply with the operating license conditions and

conformance with NUREG-0737. The additional accident monitoring instrumentation provides continuous indication in the control room of containment conditions during the course of an accident. Instruments are also installed to provide an indication of inadequate core cooling. The reactor coolant system will permit the venting of noncondensable gases from the top of the reactor vessel, in the unlikely event an excessive amount of gases accumulate in this part of the reactor coolant system. During normal operations noncondensable gases are removed through the pressurizer vessel, thereby eliminating the accumulation of gases in the reactor coolant system. Also, the licensee requested changes in the requirements for diesel generator surveillance testing to conform with the NRC July 25, 1983, letter to "All Holders of Operating Licenses." This change deletes a specific diesel surveillance requirement since it was not consistent with NRC General Design Criteria No. 17. (2) On September 17, 1982, the licensee requested that the primary containment average air temperature for Unit 1 be lowered from 110°F to 105°F in the upper compartment and raised from 120°F to 125°F in the lower compartment. These values are consistent with the current loss-of-coolant analysis for the Sequoyah containments. This revision is identical to the change recently made for Unit 2 (Amendment No. 25). (3) On December 10, 1981, the licensee requested changes to the surveillance requirements for fire hose testing for Units 1 & 2. The revision was made on Unit 1 (Amendment No. 13) but inadvertently omitted for Unit 2. Fire hose hydrostatic testing is to be conducted at a pressure of 150 psig, instead of 300 psig, or at least 50 psig above maximum fire main operating pressure, whichever is greater. (4) On December 29, 1983, the licensee requested an extension for Unit 2 of the visual inspection requirements of certain protective fuses instead of destructive testing of fuses until NRC completes a review of this matter on a generic basis. This request was previously granted on Unit 1 (Amendment No. 34). (5) On June 13, 1984, the licensee proposed changing the isolation signal to the phase B signal rather than phase A for certain radiation monitors in containment in order to eliminate conflicting Technical Specification requirements when a containment isolation signal occurs. Phase A signal occurs at 1.54 psig containment pressure and certain valves and systems are isolated. Phase B signal occurs at 2.81 psig containment pressure and full containment isolation occurs.



(6) On May 25, 1984, the licensee proposed changes in the Technical Specification requirements on the time period for performing the pressure decay test for containment air lock door seals. The method for meeting the surveillance test requirements would be changed to a quicker but more accurate measurement of the integrity of the air door seals. (7) On April 20, 1984, the licensee proposed changes to the Technical Specifications to make the reporting requirements for licensee event reports in accordance with the NRC letter of December 19, 1984.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions likely to involve no significant hazards consideration relates to a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. The proposed changes (1-6) involved here are similar to this example in that there is some increase to the probability or consequences of previously analyzed accident, but the results of the change are within acceptable criteria. A second example provided in the **Federal Register** is a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications. The proposed change (No. 7) involved here is similar in that reporting requirements would be made to be consistent with NRC general guidance in this area. A third example is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the technical specifications. Parts for the proposed change (No. 1) which add requirements involved here is similar to the example. Accordingly, the Commission has made an initial determination that the above changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Herbert S. Sanger, Jr., Esquire, General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 Commerce Avenue, E11B33, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Elinor G. Adensam.

**The Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County Ohio**

*Date of application for amendment:* November 21, 1983 (Item 1 only supplemental information on May 2, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment considers only Item 1 of the application for amendment. The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications to permit the removal of power to the operators of valves DH-11 and DH-12 while the plant is operating in Modes 1, 2 or 3. These valves are in series in the decay heat removal system suction line from the reactor coolant system and serve as pressure isolation valves at the high pressure/low pressure interface. Interlocks are installed to close valves DH-11 and DH-12, if open, if reactor coolant pressure exceeds a predetermined trip level. The requirement for the valve interlock is to protect against the possibility of overpressurizing the Decay Heat Removal System while it is in use and the reactor vessel head is in place.

The proposed amendment is to remove the requirement to have the interlock on DH-11 and/or DH-12 operable if the valves are closed and 480 VAC power to the valve operator is disconnected.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Safety Evaluation Report issued by the Commission (September 23, 1983) supporting the decision to permit restart of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station identified the potential for a fire in the control room to disable the pressure interlock and open valves DH-11 and DH-12. If this were to occur a loss-of-coolant accident outside of containment could result. By removal of operator power when the valves are closed and the reactor coolant system pressure is above the interlock trip setting, the potential for inadvertent opening of the valves due to a control room fire is removed.

The function of the valve interlock is to close valves DH-11 and DH-12 if they are open. If power is removed, disabling automatic valve actuation, when the valve is closed the interlock is not required since the valves are already in a closed position. The valves could be opened locally by manual manipulation of the valve hand wheel. This is not likely, however, because the valves are inaccessible when the plant is operating. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant

increase in the probability or consequence 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 safety margin.

Therefore, the Commission proposed to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

**The Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio**

*Date of amendment request:* February 28, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would delete from the tabulation of post-accident monitoring instrumentation the requirement for at least one operable channel of instrumentation to provide Containment Air Recirculating Fan status. The associated Surveillance Requirement would also be deleted.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* Amendment No. 66, dated January 20, 1984, deleted Technical Specification Section 3.6.4.2 which required two independent containment recirculation systems to be operable. With the requirement for these systems to be operable deleted, all other operability and surveillance requirements associated with them should have been deleted also. Amendment No. 66 failed to delete the post-accident monitoring requirement in Tables 3.3-10 and 4.3-10.

The Commission has provided examples (48 FR 14870) of amendments considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration. One example is a purely administrative change to the technical specifications such as a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications or to correct an error. The proposed amendment fits this example. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

**The Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-356, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio**

*Date of amendment request:* July 20, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would permit operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station for Cycle 5. The design cycle length would be 390 effective full power days (EFPD). The amendment would revise the Appendix A Technical Specifications to account for changes in power peaking and control rod worths and would consist of revised Reactor Protection System trip setpoints, regulating rod group insertion limits, axial power shaping rod insertion limits, axial power imbalance limits, and control rod group assignments.

*Basis of proposed no significant hazards consideration:* The Cycle 5 core design would require the loading of 64 new fuel assemblies and the reinsertion of one fuel assembly previously discharged from an earlier refueling. The cycle design lifetime is 390 EFPD resulting in an extension of the nominal operating cycle to 18 months from the 12-month nominal cycle which characterized the previous core designs.

To control the increased core reactivity required for the longer cycle, burnable poison rod assemblies (BPRAs) will be located in each of the 64 new fuel assemblies. The new fuel assemblies (Mark B-5 design) will be identical in mechanical design to the other fuel assemblies (Mark B-4 design) except for a redesigned upper end fitting which avoids the need for a BPRA hold-down mechanism.

The only significant changes in the Cycle 5 design from Cycle 4 are the increase in cycle life to 390 EFPD and the accompanying BPRAs to provide additional reactivity control. The Cycle 5 design allows for withdrawal of the Axial Power Shaping Rods (APSRs) to permit power coastdown near the end of the cycle. APSR withdrawal and power coastdown has been utilized for previous cycles.

There have been no significant changes to the analytical methods used and previously accepted for Cycle 4 to demonstrate conformance with acceptance criteria and NRC regulations. Previous fuel cycle evaluations included a rod bow penalty for each fuel batch based on the highest

burnup fuel rod in the batch. No departure from nucleate boiling ratio (DNBR) reduction due to fuel rod bowing has been considered for Cycle 5. A topical report, which as been reviewed and approved by the NRC, has concluded that the rod bow penalty is insignificant and is offset by other effects.

The changes requested result from a core reloading. No fuel assemblies differ significantly from those found acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at this facility and there have been no significant changes to the acceptance criteria and analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance with regulations.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (Example (iii)) of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to reload amendments involving no fuel assemblies significantly different from those found previously acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at the facility in question. This assumes that no significant changes are made to the acceptance criteria for the Technical Specifications, that the analytical methods used to demonstrate conformance with the Technical Specifications and regulations are not significantly changed, and that NRC has previously found such methods acceptable.

As shown in the above discussion, the proposed amendment is similar to this example; therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

**The Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio**

*Date of amendment request:* August 4, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would add a condition to the license that would require the licensee to follow the approved plan for integrated scheduling of plant improvements and modifications. This includes improvements and

modifications identified by the licensee, the NRC, or other regulatory agencies. The license condition would require the licensee to periodically update the schedule to maintain it current and to provide reports as specified in the approved plan. The license condition, which would be effective for a two-year period only but subject to renewal upon application, also provides a framework for changing project schedules when necessary.

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

The incorporation of a license condition requiring the use of a plan to provide for scheduling plant modifications and to provide a framework for making necessary schedule alterations is a change that constitutes an additional control not presently included in the operating license for the facility. Therefore, the proposed license condition matches example (ii) of the Commission's examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration. On the basis, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that the application involves no significant hazards considerations.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

**The Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio**

*Date of amendment request:* August 27, 1984, Item 1 only.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specification Table 4.4-5 by deleting specific irradiation surveillance capsule locations and by revising the capsule removal schedule. The amendment also would change Surveillance requirement 4.4.9.1.2 to clarify that the surveillance specimens

are representative of the Davis-Besse reactor vessel materials and would change Basis Section 3/4.4.9 to delete redundant information relating to the general guidelines for the capsule removal schedule. The proposed amendment is in response to Item 1 of the Licensee's application. Item 2 will be the subject of a separate notice.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The withdrawal schedule in the proposed amendment was developed in accordance with the 1982 edition of ASTM E 185 and provides a better defined removal schedule for the surveillance capsules based on accumulated neutron fluence rather than on the basis of refueling cycle. Thus, any change in the nominal cycle time will not greatly influence the characterization of reactor vessel material condition as a function of accumulated neutron fluence. The original removal schedule was developed in accordance with the 1973 edition of ASTM E 185. Appendix H to 10 CFR 50 provides for the use of ASTM E 185-82 in the material surveillance program.

The deletion of specific locations in the reactor vessel for the surveillance capsules permits the use of a revised capsule management program which would decrease the time required for capsule handling and eliminate the need for all but one dummy capsule. Thus, personnel radiation exposure is reduced and less radioactive waste is generated. The revised capsule management program will not reduce the effectiveness of the reactor vessel material surveillance program.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). None of these examples are applicable to the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment relates only to a materials surveillance program and does not involve any change in the facility or its operation. Furthermore, neither the quantity nor the quality of the information obtained from the surveillance program is reduced. The change also is within all acceptable criteria with respect to the program specified in the Standard Review Plan. The proposed amendment, therefore, meets the requirements specified in 10 CFR 50.92(c) for an amendment which does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* John F. Stolz.

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

*Date of amendment request:* August 1, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The purpose of the proposed amendment request is to modify Technical Specification Table 3.3-1 by revising one action statement (Action 4), and adding an additional action statement (Action 12) for the source range neutron flux monitors during shutdown conditions. The source range neutron flux monitors provide in part, protection for a boron dilution accident during Modes 2, 3, 4 and 5. These monitors initiate, upon doubling of neutron flux within 10 minutes, a switchover of the suction for the charging pumps from the Volume Control Tank (VCT) to the Refueling Water Storage Tank (RWST). The addition of Action 12 specifies appropriate compensatory actions, when two channels are out of service, to maintain the plant in a safe condition. The revision to Action 4 provides for a limited time, a block of both flux doubling channels in order to perform a reactor startup. Initial criticality is not achievable without this change. This situation occurred through an oversight because the Callaway Plant is the first to receive an operating license with the Westinghouse Boron Dilution Mitigation System. During development of the Callaway Technical Specifications, greater consideration was given to assuring that the system fulfilled its intended safety function than was given to possible operational limitations. Recent surveillances of the system have identified that the technical specifications do not allow both channels to be blocked as designed to permit a planned reactor startup.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The licensee, in his letter of August 1, 1984, stated that the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident or other adverse condition over previous evaluations; nor create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident or condition over previous evaluations; nor involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Based on the foregoing, the requested amendment does not present a significant hazard. The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the Standards in 10 CFR

50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). For the addition of Action 12, the request is similar to the example of a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The change to Action 4 is similar to the example of an administrative change to technical specifications for correction of an error. In this case, the Technical Specifications are not consistent with the plant design and would not allow plant startup.

*Local Public Document Room locations:* Fulton City Library, 709 Market Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251 and the Olin Library of Washington University, Skinker and Lindell Boulevards, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* B.J. Youngblood.

**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 amendment request:* February 29 as modified June 7, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would revise an earlier submittal which provided limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for new systems installed in accordance with NUREG-0737, TMI Action Plan. Specifically, a correction was made to the sample calibration gas hydrogen concentrations for surveillance of the hydrogen gas monitor. The calibration frequency is also revised to show that electronic calibration is done each refueling interval and the gas calibration is done quarterly (the previous submittal listed the calibration frequency as once per refueling interval).

The revised submittal also corrects errors in the previous submittal concerning the Reactor Coolant Gas Vent System limiting conditions for operation and provides clarification regarding actual system operation. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments and Proposed No Significant Hazards Determination relating to the licensee's February 29, 1984 submittal was published in the **Federal Register** (49 FR 25350 at 25381).

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions likely to involve no



significant hazards considerations is example (i), purely administrative changes to the technical specifications, for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error or a change in nomenclature. The licensee's submittal corrects errors in the surveillance of the hydrogen monitor and clarifies the system operation and corresponding limiting conditions for operation for the reactor coolant gas vents systems from an earlier submittal. Therefore, the staff finds that these changes are administrative in nature and proposes to determine that the proposed amendments involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* James R. Miller.

**Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-361, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin**

*Date of amendment request:* June 8, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification 15.3.10 for Point Beach Units 1 and 2 to redefine the "fully withdrawn" term for control rods as equal to or greater than 225 steps. Previously "fully withdrawn" was equal to 228 steps.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidelines concerning the application of these standards (48 FR 14870). Several categories of license amendments are considered as likely not to involve a significant hazards consideration. One of these categories (vi) involves changes which may reduce in some way a safety margin, but the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria.

The licensee performed an evaluation of inserting the control rod to a parked elevation of 225 steps of the core and the effects were shown to be minimal. Redefinition of "fully withdrawn" as being 225 steps or greater does not alter the conclusions of the reload safety evaluations performed for the existing Unit 1 and 2 cycles. At 225 steps withdrawn, the control rods are only 0.3 inches into the active fuel. Because of the low rod worth in the top region of

the core, the power distribution perturbations resulting from the shallow rod insertion are very small. FQ(Z) is expected to increase in the bottom of the core by less than 1%; and the axial offset is expected to be more negative by less than 1%. Sufficient peaking factors and DNB margin are available to accommodate this small perturbation in power distribution. The minimal reduction in shutdown margin for an insertion of 3 steps can be easily accommodated by the substantial excess shutdown margin. The impact on other key safety parameters is negligible.

As discussed above, the proposed change has a minimal effect on the power distributions and related safety parameters for Point Beach Units 1 and 2; however, the evaluated results are well within the parameters outlined in the Technical Specifications and do not invalidate the conclusions of the current cycle reload safety evaluations for Units 1 and 2. Therefore, while the proposed change may reduce a safety margin, the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria. Accordingly, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*NRC Branch Chief:* James R. Miller.

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 27, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* This proposed amendment would revise the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant Technical Specifications to be consistent with the new reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.73, "Licensee Event Report System".

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of these, Example (vii) involving a no significant hazards consideration, is "a change to make a licensee conform to changes in the regulations, where the change results in very minor changes to facility

operations clearly in keeping with the regulations." The requested amendment matches the example and the staff, therefore, proposes to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Wisconsin Library Learning Center, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

*Attorney for licensee:* Steven E. Keane, Esquire, Foley and Lardner, 777 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202.

*NRC Branch Chief:* Steven A. Varga.

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

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

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

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 31, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment would change the surveillance requirement acceptance criteria for the Auxiliary Feedwater pumps. The new surveillance requirements specify lower flows at slightly higher pressures. These changes would make the Technical Specifications consistent with the values assumed in the accident analysis.

*Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register:* August 20, 1984 (49 FR 33068).

*Expiration date of individual notice:* September 19, 1984.

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

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Docket No. 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit No. 3, York County, Pennsylvania

*Date of amendment request:* May 30, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TSs) to permit continued operation of Peach Bottom Unit 3 after reaching End of Cycle 6 (EOC-6) exposure in the region of the operating map bounded by the constant recirculation pump speed line between 100% power, 105% core flow (100,105) and 70% power, 110% core flow (70,110) with or without the last stage feedwater heaters valved out-of-service. The change would specifically involve increasing the TS values on Table 3.5.K.3 for the Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) of P8X8R and PTA fuel by 0.01 during the period from 2000 MWD/t before EOC-6.

*Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register:* August 10, 1984, 49 FR 32136, as corrected August 30, 1984, 49 FR 34434.

*Expiration date of individual notice:* September 10, 1984.

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

#### NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

During the 30-day period since publication of the last monthly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in 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 51.22(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, N.W., Washington, D.C. and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* December 12, 1983.

*Brief description of amendments:* Technical Specifications are modified to add: (1) reactor vessel head vents, (2) noble gas effluent monitors, (3) containment water level monitors, and (4) instrumentation for detection of inadequate core cooling required by the Commission in NUREG-0737 dated November 1, 1983.

*Date of issuance:* September 12, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 12, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 47 and 38.

*Facilities Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8:* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* March 22, 1984 (49 FR 10731).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 12, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received.

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

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

*Date of amendment request:* March 28, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TS) pertaining to the Surveillance Requirements for diesel generator testing.

*Date of issuance:* September 7, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 7, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 56.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 20, 1984 (48 FR 25352).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a letter dated September 7, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* March 27, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The changes revise the fire protection Technical Specifications to reflect changes made to the station in accordance with the requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50. Only the changes relative to penetration fire barriers are included in this amendment. The other requested changes in the fire protection specifications are being reviewed and will be addressed in a future action.

*Date of issuance:* August 22, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 22, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 76.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* May 23, 1984, 49 FR 21826.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 22, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* March 20, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment changes the Technical Specifications by extending the Power/Flow Map; requiring the rod block

monitor maximum trip level to be set at 107% power for core flows of 100% rated or greater; and correcting a typographical error (from "REM" to "RBM"). These changes do not permit continuous operation at power levels greater than 100% of the present rating.

*Date of issuance:* August 28, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 28, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 77.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 20, 1984, 49 FR 25353.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 28, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Plymouth Public Library, North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* December 28, 1983, as supplemented February 21, 1984 and July 12, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment authorizes Cycle 7 operation of the reactor with 160 new fuel bundles identical to some of the partially used fuel from Cycle 6 and with 32 new fuel bundles with barrier type fuel. The latter is similar to the other new fuel except that a thin Zirconium liner has been added to the inner surface of the cladding to reduce cladding failures due to pellet-clad interaction.

*Date of issuance:* September 4, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 4, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 78.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* April 25, 1984, 49 FR 17855.

Subsequent to the initial notice in the **Federal Register**, the Boston Edison Company, by letter dated July 12, 1984, provided a revision to an identification number in the reload report. This revision is within the scope of the original notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Plymouth Public Library, North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* June 26, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* These changes to the Technical Specifications apply to the new scram discharge instrument volumes with redundant and diverse instrumentation which have been installed in response to an NRC Confirmatory Order dated June 24, 1983.

*Date of issuance:* September 6, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 6, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 79.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 6, 1984 (49 FR 31349).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 6, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Plymouth Public Library, North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* May 7, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The proposed amendments would revise section 3/4.7.5 of the Technical Specifications to eliminate Table 3.7.5-1 (Safety-Related Hydraulic Snubbers) and conform with guidance provided by the Commission in its letter dated May 3, 1984 (Generic Letter No. 84-13) and to incorporate miscellaneous administrative changes to sections 3/4.7.6 and 3/4.7.7.

*Date of issuance:* September 10, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 10, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 74 and 100.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62.* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29904).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 10, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* October 14, 1983.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment would revise the Technical Specification to incorporate new heatup and cooldown limitation curves.

*Date of issuance:* September 4, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 4, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 82.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-23.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 26, 1984 (49 FR 3346).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* October 24, 1983 as clarified by letters dated December 12, 1983 and March 28, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* Would revise the Technical Specifications to add the Standard Westinghouse Specification Section 4.05.

*Date of issuance:* September 10, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 10, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 83.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-23.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 21, 1983 (48 FR 52658).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1984.

Significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

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

**Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237/245, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois**

*Date of application for amendment:* June 11, 1984.



*Brief description of amendment:* The amendments approve Technical Specifications which revise the present Technical Specifications, without changing the technical content, into a format which has improved legibility and versatility.

*Date of issuance:* August 6, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 6, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 82, 75.

*Provisional Operating License No. DPR-19, and Facility Operating License No. DPR-25.* The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 3, 1984 (49 FR 27385). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a letter dated August 6, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60451.

**Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, Grundy County, Illinois**

*Date of application for amendment:* March 19, 1984 as supplemented by letters dated April 9, 1984 and August 2, 1984. The latter submittal transmitted a copy of the proposed Technical Specification (TS) page in the recently approved reformatted TS style with no change in the technical content from the earlier submittals.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment authorizes an extension of the MAPLHGR limits for two fuel types in the Dresden 3 core to 40 000 MWd/STU and also approves slightly higher MAPLHGR limits for one of the fuel types in the range 1250-25 000 MWd/STU.

*Date of issuance:* September 14, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 14, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 76.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-25.* The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21827).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 14, 1984. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60451.

**Duke Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287 Oconee Nuclear Station, Units Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina**

*Date of application for amendments:* February 10, 1983.

*Brief description of amendments:*

These amendments revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to make the surveillance frequencies of certain pumps and valves consistent with the requirements of Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda, as required by 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4).

*Date of issuance:* August 27, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 27, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 130, 130 and 127.

*Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47 and DPR-55.*

Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 21, 1983, 48 FR 56502.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Oconee County Library, 501 West Southbroad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

**Duke Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287 Oconee Nuclear Station, Units Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina**

*Date of application for amendments:* February 10, 1983.

*Brief description of amendments:*

These amendments revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) to reflect that Penetrations 24 and 42 are to be used as part of the Reactor Building Hydrogen Analyzer, in lieu of their being spare penetrations into the reactor building. Other changes requested in the February 10, 1983, submittal are still under staff review and will be addressed by separate safety evaluation and license amendment.

*Date of issuance:* September 13, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 13, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 131, 131 and 128.

*Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47 and DPR-55.*

Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 21, 1983, 48 FR 56502.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 13, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Oconee County Library, 501 West Southbroad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

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

*Date of application of amendment:* May 21, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment changes the Technical Specifications to add technical specifications dealing with the reactor coolant system vents.

*Date of issuance:* September 5, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 5, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 68.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29902 at 29908).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Indian River Junior College Library, 3209 Virginia Avenue, Ft. Pierce, Florida.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* August 6, 1982, as modified September 1, 1982, January 3, 1983, April 25, 1983, January 31, 1984 and April 23, 1984.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments provide requirements in the Technical Specifications for protection of safety-related equipment subjected to sustained degraded voltage conditions at the offsite power source and interactions between the onsite and offsite power systems.

*Date of issuance:* August 14, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 14, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 104 and 98.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 23, 1983 (48 FR 39403) and renoticed June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25359).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 14, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Environmental and Urban Affairs Library, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199.

**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:* September 12, 1983, as supplemented on October 26, 1983.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments delete non-radiological Environmental Technical Specifications in Appendix B which address the groundwater monitoring program and environmental protection limits.

*Date of issuance:* August 24, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 24, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 105 and 99.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 21, 1983 (48 FR 56503) and renoted March 28, 1983 (49 FR 18898).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 24, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received.

An Environmental Assessment has been prepared in accordance with 10 CFR 50.12(b) and a finding of No Significant Impact made dated August 20, 1984 (49 FR 33069).

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

**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 29, 1982.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments revise the Technical Specifications by adding additional Limiting Conditions of Operation for Purge Isolation; setpoints for high containment radioactivity; surveillance requirements for turbine trip including basis; and requirements for reporting power operated relief valve and safety valve challenges and failures

*Date of issuance:* August 27, 1984

*Effective date:* August 27, 1984.

*Amendments Nos.:* 106 and 100.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 23, 1983 (48 FR 38404).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received.

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

**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:* May 21, 1984.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments revise and expand the Table of Safety-Related Snubbers in section 3.13 in Appendix A of the Technical Specifications.

*Date of issuance:* August 27, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 27, 1984.

*Amendments Nos.:* 107 and 101.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29914).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received.

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

**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:* April 27, 1984.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments prohibit the travel of heavy loads over irradiated fuel assemblies in the spent fuel pools with the exception of a temporary crane for use during proposed reracking of the spent fuel pools.

*Date of issuance:* August 29, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 29, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 108 and 102.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29913).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 29, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* April 21, 1980 as supplemented March 9, 1981, August 31, 1982, July 22 and October 28, 1983, and May 1, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The proposed Technical Specification (TS) changes would revise cycle dependent parameters in support of Core 10 operations following refueling.

*Date of Issuance:* August 27, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 27, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 75.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 20, 1983 (48 FR 33081) and July 20, 1984 (49 FR 29495).

The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received: No.

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

**GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania**

*Date of amendment request:* March 28, 1984, revised May 11, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revises the definition of OPERABLE or OPERABILITY to assure that the single failure criterion for safety system is preserved. Existing requirements are extended to include multiple outages of redundant components and to include the effects of outages support systems. The amendment includes limiting conditions for operation and ACTION statements.

*Date of Issuance:* August 7, 1984.

*Effective date:* 45 days after the date of issuance.

*Amendment No.:* 98.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-50.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 20, 1984, 49 FR 25362.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 7, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Walnut Streets, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126.

**GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania**

*Date of application for amendment:* July 11, 1983, as supplemented November 8, 1983.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment adds general requirements on the applicability of surveillance TSs, section 4, so that surveillance requirements do not have to be performed on systems/components during operational conditions for which the systems/components are not required to be operable. Surveillance interval tolerances are removed from section 4 because they are provided in Table 1.2. In section 6.5.4, this amendment requires members of the Independent Onsite Safety Review Group (IOSRG) to have experience in nuclear power plant engineering, operations and/or technology. Also, changes have been made on the TS format in section 6.5.4.

*Date of Issuance:* August 8, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 8, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 99.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-50.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* April 25, 1984, 49 FR 17862. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 8, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* January 20, 1984, as supplemented March 15, 1984.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments modify the Technical Specifications to add a specification required by the Commission in NUREG-0737 following the Three Miles Island accident. The change adds Technical Specifications on the reactor vessel head vents and on the pressurizer steam space vents.

*Date of issuance:* August 24, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 24, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 81 and 85.

*Facilities Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74.* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* April 25, 1984 (49 FR 17863).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 24, 1984.

No Significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* January 27, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The January 27, 1984 application requested several changes related to NUREG-0737 requirements described in the NRC Generic Letter 83-36, and other miscellaneous items. This amendment relates only to Item I.E.3—Post Accident Sampling and also corrects two typographical errors on page 3.2-23b of your Technical Specifications. Other items in the January 27, 1984 application will be handled in separate actions.

*Date of issuance:* August 22, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 22, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 104.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* March 22, 1984 (49 FR 10736).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 22, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, 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:* April 12, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revises the Technical Specifications to meet a new rule on reporting requirements and to make some administrative changes.

*Date of issuance:* August 24, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 24, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 105.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25362).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 24, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, 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:* August 29, 1978, as supplemented November 5, 1981 and March 16, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revises the Technical Specifications to incorporate changes resulting from compliance with those 10 CFR 50, Appendix J requirements which do not require future plant modifications.

*Date of issuance:* August 24, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 24, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 106.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 26, 1983 (48 FR 49588) and May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21831).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 24, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Cedar Rapids Public Library, 426 Third Avenue, 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:* January 27, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises the Technical Specifications pertaining to NUREG-0737 TMI Action Plan Item I.F.1.3 related to containment high-range radiation monitors only. Other items in the January 27, 1984 application will be handled in separate actions.

*Date of issuance:* September 4, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 4, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 107.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* March 22, 1984 (49 FR 10736).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1984.



No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO), Docket No. 50-245, Millstone Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 1, New London County, Connecticut**

*Date of application for amendment:*  
February 1, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The Technical Specification changes proposed by the amendment request modify the Appendix A Technical Specifications to include provisions for the new steam tunnel ventilation radiation monitoring system.

*Date of issuance:* September 14, 1984.  
*Effective date:* September 14, 1984.  
*Amendment No.* 100.

*Provisional Operating License No. DPR-21.* The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* April 25, 1984 (49 FR 17867).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 14, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*  
location: Waterford Public Library, Rope Ferry Road, Route 156, Waterford, Connecticut 06358.

**Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50-336, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, Town of Waterford, Connecticut**

*Date of application for amendment:*  
October 12, 1983 as supplemented May 16, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment modified the Technical Specifications as follows: (1) Revised the pressurizer level band to a wider range during periods of normal operation; and (2) Imposed more restrictive operability requirements for the pressurizer heaters.

*Date of issuance:* September 5, 1984.  
*Effective date:* September 5, 1984.  
*Amendment No.:* 97.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 22, 1983 (49 FR 52804 at 52817). The May 16, 1984 letter provided clarifying information for each transient and accident analysis affected by the proposed amendment and did not revise the initial noticing action.

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

Safety Evaluation dated September 5, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:*  
March 30, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* Revises the Technical Specifications to extend the allowable interval between integrated containment leakage rate tests, add requirements pertaining to the recently-installed intake structure sprinkler system, and make various non-safety related changes to the Technical Specifications.

*Date of issuance:* August 15, 1984.  
*Effective date:* August 15, 1984.  
*Amendment No.* 25.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-22.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21832).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 15, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota**

*Date of application for amendment:*  
April 10, 1984 as supplemented July 9, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendments revised the TS to implement the requirements of NUREG-0737 Items II.B.3, II.F.1.2, and III.D.3.4 and correct typographical errors.

*Date of issuance:* September 12, 1984.  
*Effective date:* September 12, 1984.  
*Amendment Nos.:* 70 and 64.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-42 and DPR-60.* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25350 at 25367).

The licensee's letter of July 9, 1984 provided information on new methodology for estimation of incapacitation times following exposures to toxic gases which was utilized during performance of a control

room habitability study and resulted in a significant reduction in the number of toxic chemicals that would have to be monitored to assure an adequate habitability of the control room. Use of the new methodology concludes that only the chlorine detection is necessary to meet the requirements of NUREG-0737 Item III.D.3.4. The new methodology would affect our conclusion of the safety evaluation issued by letter dated April 9, 1982. Therefore our initial safety evaluation on NUREG-0737 Item III.D.3.4 related to the toxic gases originating from off-site sources will be revised to reflect the results of the new methodology before putting TSs in place. The license withdrew from consideration the proposed Toxic Gas Monitoring System TS requested in the April 10, 1984 application.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 12, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*  
location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska.

*Date of application for amendment:*  
October 3, 1983 as supplemented June 22, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment updated the surveillance capsule removal schedule (Table 3-7).

*Date of issuance:* September 7, 1984.  
*Effective date:* September 7, 1984.  
*Amendment No.:* 83.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 22, 1983 (48 FR 52819). Supplemental information was received from the licensee after the initial notice was published in the **Federal Register**. This supplemental information did not affect the discussion which was contained in the original notice. On this basis, we did not renotice the application.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 7, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* June 8, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment changed the administrative controls section of the technical specifications to reflect changes to the plant support and plant organizations.

*Date of issuance:* September 7, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 7, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 84.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29902 at 29915).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 7, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* April 27, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment makes miscellaneous changes involving fire protection and administrative controls.

*Date of issuance:* August 17, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 17, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 92.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-1.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25350 at 25370).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 17, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No comments received.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* April 24, 1984 as supplemented June 1, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment incorporated technical specifications for some equipment

added or modified as a result of post-TMI safety improvements approved by the Commission in NUREG-0737. The amendment request was submitted in response to NRC Generic Letter 83-37. Items included in this amendment are: reactor coolant system vents (II.E.1), auxiliary feedwater pumps (II.E.1.1), containment pressure monitor (II.F.1.4), containment hydrogen monitor (II.F.1.6), and control room habitability (III.D.3.4) (chlorine detectors).

*Date of issuance:* September 5, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 5, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 93

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-1.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 20, 1984 (49 FR 25356 at 25369) and July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29902 at 29918).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 5, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No comments received.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* February 20, 1981.

*Brief description of amendment:* The revision of the Technical Specifications adds the use of the term "operable" as it applies to safety systems in power reactors. The change includes a definition of "operable" as well as a section on operability requirements in the Limiting Conditions for Operation and surveillance section of the Technical Specifications.

*Date of issuance:* August 28, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 28, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 83.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-59.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 20, 1983, 48 FR 33085.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 28, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Penfield Library, State

University College of Oswego, Oswego, New York.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* June 30, 1983.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment adds License Conditions which ensure the implementation of fire protection modifications on Unit 2.

*Date of issuance:* August 30, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 30, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 25.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-75.* Amendment revised the Salem Unit 2 license.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 22, 1983 (48 FR 52822).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 30, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments have been received.

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

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

*Date of amendment requests:* August 1, 1983 and January 20, 1984.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment approves changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) which: (1) consolidate the positions of Superintendent of Nuclear Production and Superintendent of Ginna; and (2) recognize certain organizational title changes within the Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation.

*Date of issuance:* August 14, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 14, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 63.

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

*Date of initial notices in Federal Register:* May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21836 and 21837).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 14, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Rochester Public Library, 155 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14604.

**Southern California Edison Company et al., Docket Nos. 50-206/361/362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1/2/3, San Diego County, California**

*Date of application for amendment:* December 15, 1983 as modified April 2, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment approves changes to the Physical Security Plan which (1) consolidate several adjacent vital areas into a single vital area; (2) reduce the size of several large vital areas by compression of the boundaries; and (3) move certain equipment not required for safety outside of the vital boundary.

*Date of issuance:* August 7, 1984.

*Effective date:* Amendment is effective upon issuance and shall be fully implemented upon completion of modifications but no later than January 1, 1985.

*Amendments Nos.:* 78, 23, and 12.

*Operating License Nos. DPR-13, NPF-10 and NPF-15 respectively:*

Amendments revised the licenses.

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

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 7, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* December 12, 1983 as supplemented March 20, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment approves changes to the Technical Specifications to add the radiological effluent technical specifications necessary to implement the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I. The amendment provides new Technical Specification sections defining limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent monitoring, concentration, dose and treatment of liquid, gaseous and solid wastes and total dose.

*Date of issuance:* August 27, 1984.

*Effective date:* January 1, 1985.

*Amendment No. 79*

*Provisional Operating License No. DPR-13.* The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

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

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* May 17, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment incorporates a license condition requiring (1) plant shutdown for steam generator inspection within 6 equivalent months of operation after the start of operation from the backfitting outage that began on February 27, 1982, (2) the inspection program be submitted to the Commission at least 45 days prior to scheduled, and (3) Commission approval must be obtained before resuming power operation following this inspection. The license condition requiring a shutdown within 6 equivalent months of operation after the start of Cycle 8 operation is deleted.

*Date of issuance:* September 4, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 4, 1984.

*Amendment No. 80.*

*Provisional Operating License No. DPR-13.* The amendment modifies the license.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29920).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1984. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-266 and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3, Limestone County, Alabama**

*Date of application for amendment:* December 17, 1982.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendments change the Technical Specifications to permit the main steam line high temperature isolation function to be made inoperable for up to four hours for testing and maintenance purposes.

*Date of issuance:* August 15, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 15, 1984.

*Amendment Nos. 110, 103 and 76.*

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 22, 1983 (48 FR 52832).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 15, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* September 21, 1981, as supplemented June 3, 1982.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendments revise the Technical Specifications to change the neutron flux trip setting adjustment factor from a limiting safety system setting to a limiting condition for operation with a six hour action statement.

*Date of issuance:* August 17, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 17, 1984.

*Amendment Nos. 104 and 77.*

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-52 and DPR-68.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 22, 1983 (48 FR 52828).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 17, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 3, Limestone County, Alabama**

*Date of application for amendment:* January 23 and June 6, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to reflect changes in instrumentation requirements, testing and surveillance requirements as well as in administrative changes resulting from modifications made during the current refueling outage. Changes related to the reload were issued in Amendment No. 70.

*Date of issuance:* August 27, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 27, 1984.

*Amendment No. 78.*

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-68.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21841).



The June 6, 1984 letter did not add or modify any of the January 23, 1984 change requests; it only withdrew some of them, therefore no additional notice was issued subsequent to May 23, 1984.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* November 5, 1982.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendments change the Technical Specifications to increase the Main Steam Isolation Valve (MSIV) surveillance test interval.

*Date of issuance:* September 4, 1984.

*Effective date:* September 4, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 111, 105 and 79.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 26, 1984 (49 FR 3356).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**The Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio**

*Date of applications for amendment:* July 10, 1981 as revised May 2, February 22, and August 18, 1983.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment modifies Technical Specifications (TSs) 4.8.1.1.2 and 4.8.1.2 to correct errors concerning surveillance testing of the diesel generators to demonstrate operability. The amendment also corrects typographical errors in TS 6.9.1.5.b and TS Table 3.6-2.

*Date of issuance:* August 27, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 27, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 75.

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

*Date of initial notices in Federal Register:* December 21, 1983 (48 FR 56514) and January 26, 1984 (49 FR 3357).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1984.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

During the 30-day period since publication of the last monthly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in license amendment.

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual 30-day Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing. For exigent circumstances, a press release seeking public comment as to the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination was used, and the State was consulted by telephone. In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant, a shorter public comment period (less than 30 days) has been offered and the State consulted by telephone whenever possible.

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

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant

hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.22(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, N.W., Washington, D.C., 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, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendments. By October 29, 1984, 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, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is

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

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

**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:* June 14, 1984.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments expand the Power Distribution Limits section of the Unit 1 Technical Specifications to include Base Load Operation in addition to the currently approved Relaxed Axial Offset Control operation.

*Date of issuance:* September 13, 1984.

*Effective date:* June 21, 1984.

*Amendment Nos.:* 34 and 15.

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

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

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 13, 1984.

*Attorney for licensee:* Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, P.O. Box 33189, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28242.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* August 6, 1984, as supplemented August 10, 14 and 16, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises Technical Specification Table 3.6.3-1 to require certain containment isolation valves to automatically close upon receipt of a low-low-low reactor water level signal rather than upon receipt of a low reactor water level signal as currently required.

*Date of issuance:* August 22, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 22, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 40.

*Facility Operating License No. DPF-5.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

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

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 22, 1984.

*Attorney for licensee:* G.F.

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

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-259, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Limestone County, Alabama**

*Date of application for amendment:* July 31, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment changes the Technical Specifications to temporarily permit Train A of the Containment Air Dilution System to be considered operable with valve FCV-84-8B inoperable.

*Date of issuance:* August 15, 1984.

*Effective date:* August 15, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 109.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-33.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

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

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 15, 1984.

*Attorney for licensee:* H.S. Sanger, Jr., Esquire, General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 Commerce

Avenue, E. 11B 33C, Knoxville,  
Tennessee 37902.

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

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No.  
50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit 2,  
Hamilton County, Tennessee**

*Date of application for amendment:*  
July 11, 1984.

*Brief description of amendment:* The  
amendment authorizes a one-time 36-  
hour extension of the time allowed for  
ECCS operability with one centrifugal  
charging pump inoperable.

*Date of issuance:* August 23, 1984.

*Effective date:* July 11, 1984.

*Amendment No.:* 27.

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

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

The Commission's related evaluation  
is contained in a Safety Evaluation  
dated August 23, 1984.

*Attorney for licensee:* Herbert S.  
Sanger, Jr., Esq., General Counsel,  
Tennessee Valley Authority, 400  
Commerce Avenue (E11B 33), Knoxville,  
Tennessee 37902.

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

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 20th day  
of September 1984.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Donald E. Sells,**

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

[FR Doc. 84-3528 Filed 9-27-84; 8:48 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M