



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-58

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-440

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 10, 1996, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (licensees), proposed a change to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant (PNPP), Unit No. 1 on an emergency basis. This amendment grants a one-time extension of the performance intervals for certain Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements. Without this amendment, the plant would have to shut down six days prior to the scheduled end of the current fuel cycle.

2.0 EVALUATION

Surveillance extensions are requested for the logic system functional testing of the reactor mode switch-shutdown position and the manual scram. The PNPP reactor protection system (RPS) has redundancy, diversity, and independent trip systems such that a single failure will neither cause nor prevent a required reactor scram. Also, instrumentation failure is a small fraction of the scram failure probability. Therefore, a one-time extension of these RPS response time surveillance intervals is acceptable.

Also requested for extension are surveillances to check the logic for opening and closing the scram discharge volume vent and drain valves. Industry reliability studies for boiling water reactors (BWRs), prepared by the BWR Owners Group, show that the overall safety systems' reliabilities are not dominated by the reliabilities of the logic system, but by that of the mechanical components, which are consequently tested on a more frequent basis. Since the probability of a relay or contact failure is small relative to the probability of mechanical component failure, increasing the logic system test interval represents no significant change in the overall safety system unavailability. Since operation of these valves is verified at least once per 92 days, a one-time extension of the logic surveillance is acceptable.

Surveillances for the main steam isolation valve (MSIV) leakage control system (LCS) are requested for extension. One surveillance is the simulated actuation test. This test is supplemented during the operating cycle by tests performed on the system components including channel checks, channel functional tests, and inservice testing. Based on the periodic testing performed, a one-time extension to the surveillance interval is acceptable.

Finally, the surveillance for the MSIV LCS Rosemount transmitters (Model 1153) is proposed for extension. The NRC has accepted the report, "30 Month Stability Specification For Rosemount Model 1152, 1153, 1154 Pressure Transmitters." That report supported the extension of the calibration interval for the transmitters from 18 to 30 months based on a reduction in the drift allowance. These transmitters have sufficient margin to account for the drift allowance over a 30 month period, and therefore, a one-time extension of the surveillance interval is acceptable.

3.0 EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES

By letters dated March 24, June 9, and June 30, 1995, the licensee requested extensions to a large number (over 100) of TS surveillances in order to reach its planned refueling outage date. The NRC staff granted those surveillance extensions by license amendment (LA) 75 dated November 29, 1995. A period of 90 days was allowed for implementing LA 75. During a review of LA 75 for implementation on January 3, 1996, the licensee discovered that four additional surveillance extensions needed to be requested. These surveillances were not included in the original extension requests as shown by marked-up TS pages, although justification for the surveillance extensions was included.

LA 75 was issued to allow the licensee to operate until its planned refueling outage date. Failure to grant the additional four surveillance extensions would cause the plant to shut down six days before its planned refueling outage date. The licensee discovered the need for the additional surveillance extensions on January 3, 1996, and made a timely application for amendment on January 10, 1996. Therefore, the staff concludes that an emergency situation exists in that failure to act in a timely way will cause premature shutdown and that the licensee could not avoid this emergency situation.

4.0 BASIS FOR FINAL NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION

As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). The staff's review is presented below.

The amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because there is sufficient margin to account for transmitter drift, there is periodic testing of components during the operating cycle, and the logic system test extension represents no significant change in the overall system unavailability.

This change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because no physical alterations to the plant are being made, and no changes to plant operating procedures are being made.

This change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because plant requirements are not being changed, there is sufficient margin to account for transmitter drift, there is periodic testing of components

during the operating cycle, and the logic system test extension represents no significant change in the overall system unavailability.

Based on this review, the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff has determined that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

5.0 STATE CONSULTATION

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

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 or a change to a surveillance requirement. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluent that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission made a final no significant hazards consideration finding with respect to this amendment. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

7.0 CONCLUSION

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

Principal Contributor: J. Hopkins

Date: January 19, 1996

January 19, 1996

Distribution w/encls:

Docket File	GH11(2)
PUBLIC	JWermiel
PD3-3 Reading	CGrimes
ACRS	JRoe
WAxelson, RIII	

Mr. Donald C. Shelton
 Acting Vice President Nuclear - Perry
 Centerior Service Company
 P. O. Box 97, A200
 Perry, OH 44081

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-58 - PERRY
 NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NO. 1 (TAC NO. M94430)

Dear Mr. Shelton:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 78 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58 for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1. This amendment revises the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated January 10, 1996.

This amendment grants a one-time extension of the performance intervals for certain Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. A notice of issuance and final determination of no significant hazards consideration and opportunity for hearing will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:

Jon B. Hopkins, Sr. Project Manager
 Project Directorate III-3
 Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-440

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 78 to License No. NPF-58
 2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: EMERG.AMD

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

OFFICE	PD33-LA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PD33-PM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OGC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HICB:BC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	E	PD33:PD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NAME	DFoster-Curseen		JHopkins		SHOLLER		JWermiel			GMarcus	GHP
DATE	01/17/96		01/17/96		01/18/96		01/17/96			01/18/96	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20585-0001

January 19, 1996

Mr. Donald C. Shelton
Acting Vice President Nuclear - Perry
Centerior Service Company
P. O. Box 97, A200
Perry, OH 44081

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-58 - PERRY
NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NO. 1 (TAC NO. M94430)

Dear Mr. Shelton:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 78 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-58 for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1. This amendment revises the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated January 10, 1996.

This amendment grants a one-time extension of the performance intervals for certain Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. A notice of issuance and final determination of no significant hazards consideration and opportunity for hearing will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jon B. Hopkins, Sr.".

Jon B. Hopkins, Sr. Project Manager
Project Directorate III-3
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-440

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 78 to
License No. NPF-58
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

Mr. Donald C. Shelton
Centerior Service Company

cc:

Jay E. Silberg, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20037

Ms. Mary E. O'Reilly
Centerior Energy Corporation
300 Madison Avenue
Toledo, Ohio 43652

Resident Inspector's Office
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Parmlly at Center Road
Perry, Ohio 44081

Regional Administrator, Region III
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, Illinois 60532-4531

Lake County Prosecutor
Lake County Administration Bldg.
105 Main Street
Painesville, Ohio 44077

Ms. Sue Hiatt
OCRE Interim Representative
8275 Munson
Mentor, Ohio 44060

Terry J. Lodge, Esq.
618 N. Michigan Street, Suite 105
Toledo, Ohio 43624

Ashtabula County Prosecutor
25 West Jefferson Street
Jefferson, Ohio 44047

Mr. James D. Kloosterman
Regulatory Affairs Manager
Cleveland Electric Illuminating
Company
Perry Nuclear Power Plant
P. O. Box 97, E-210
Perry, Ohio 44081

Mr. James R. Williams, Chief of
Staff
Ohio Emergency Management Agency
2825 West Granville Road
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Perry Nuclear Power Plant
Unit Nos. 1 and 2

Mr. James W. Harris, Director
Division of Power Generation
Ohio Dept. of Industrial Relations
P.O. Box 825
Columbus, Ohio 43216

The Honorable Lawrence Logan
Mayor, Village of Perry
4203 Harper Street
Perry, Ohio 44081

The Honorable Robert V. Orosz
Mayor, Village of North Perry
North Perry Village Hall
4778 Lockwood Road
North Perry Village, Ohio 44081

Attorney General
Department of Attorney General
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Radiological Health Program
Ohio Department of Health
P.O. Box 118
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0118

Ohio Environmental Protection
Agency
DERR--Compliance Unit
ATTN: Mr. Zack A. Clayton
P.O. Box 1049
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0149

Mr. Thomas Haas, Chairman
Perry Township Board of Trustees
3750 Center Rd., Box 65
Perry, Ohio 44081

State of Ohio
Public Utilities Commission
East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0573

Mr. Richard D. Brandt, Plant Manager
Cleveland Electric Illuminating
Company
Perry Nuclear Power Plant
P.O. Box 97, SB306
Perry, Ohio 44081



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20565-0001

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.

DOCKET NO. 50-440

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 78
License No. NPF-58


1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Centerior Service Company, Duquesne Light Company, Ohio Edison Company, Pennsylvania Power Company, and Toledo Edison Company (the licensees) dated January 10, 1996, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-58 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, as revised through Amendment No. 78 are hereby incorporated into this license. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. This license amendment is effective immediately.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Gail D. Marcus, Director
Project Directorate III-3
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of issuance: January 19, 1996

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 78

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-58

DOCKET NO. 50-440

Replace the following pages of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications with the attached pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the area of change.

Remove

3/4 1-5
3/4 3-8
3/4 6-8

Insert

3/4 1-5
3/4 3-8
3/4 6-8
3/4 6-8a

REACTIVITY CONTROL SYSTEMS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

4.1.3.1.3 All control rods shall be demonstrated OPERABLE by performance of Surveillance Requirements 4.1.3.2, 4.1.3.3, 4.1.3.4 and 4.1.3.5.

4.1.3.1.4 The scram discharge volume shall be determined OPERABLE by demonstrating:

- a. The scram discharge volume drain and vent valves OPERABLE at least once per 18 months* by verifying that the drain and vent valves:
 1. Close within 30 seconds after receipt of a signal for control rods to scram, and
 2. Open when the scram signal is reset.
- b. Proper level sensor response by performance of a CHANNEL FUNCTIONAL TEST of the scram discharge volume scram and control rod block level instrumentation at least once per 31 days.

* Operability testing may be extended to be performed during the fifth refueling outage.

TABLE 4.3.1.1-1 (Continued)

REACTOR PROTECTION SYSTEM INSTRUMENTATION SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

<u>FUNCTIONAL UNIT</u>	<u>CHANNEL CHECK</u>	<u>CHANNEL FUNCTIONAL TEST</u>	<u>CHANNEL CALIBRATION</u>	<u>OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS IN WHICH SURVEILLANCE REQUIRED</u>
8. Drywell Pressure - High	S	Q	R ^(a)	1, 2 ⁽¹⁾
9. Scram Discharge Volume Water Level - High				
a. Level Transmitter	S	Q	R ^(a)	1, 2, 5 ^(b)
b. Float Switches	NA	Q	R	1, 2, 5 ^(b)
10. Turbine Stop Valve - Closure	NA	Q	R	1
11. Turbine Control Valve Fast Closure, Valve Trip System Oil Pressure - Low	NA	Q	R	1
12. Reactor Mode Switch Shutdown Position	NA	R ^(a)	NA	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
13. Manual Scram	NA	W ^(a)	NA	1, 2, 3, 4, 5

(a) Neutron detectors may be excluded from CHANNEL CALIBRATION.

(b) The IRM and SRM channels shall be determined to overlap for at least 1/2 decades during each startup after entering OPERATIONAL CONDITION 2 and the IRM and APRM channels shall be determined to overlap for at least 1/2 decades during each controlled shutdown, if not performed within the previous 7 days.

(c) Deleted

CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS

MSIV LEAKAGE CONTROL SYSTEM

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

3.6.1.4 Two independent MSIV leakage control system (LCS) subsystems shall be OPERABLE.

APPLICABILITY: OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS 1*, 2*, AND 3*.

ACTION:

With one MSIV leakage control system subsystem inoperable, restore the inoperable subsystem to OPERABLE status within 30 days or be in at least HOT SHUTDOWN within the next 12 hours and in COLD SHUTDOWN within the following 24 hours.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.6.1.4 Each MSIV leakage control system subsystem shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- a. At least once per 31 days by verifying:
 1. Blower OPERABILITY by starting the blower(s) from the control room and operating the blower(s) for at least 15 minutes.
 2. Inboard heater OPERABILITY by demonstrating electrical continuity of the heating element circuitry by verifying the inboard heater draws $8.28 \pm 10\%$ amperes per phase.
- b. During each COLD SHUTDOWN, if not performed within the previous 92 days, by cycling each motor operated valve, including the main steam stop valves, through at least one complete cycle of full travel.
- c. At least once per 18 months by:
 1. Performance of a functional test** which includes simulated actuation of the subsystem throughout its operating sequence, and verifying that each automatic valve actuates to its correct position, and the blower(s) start(s).
 2. Verifying that the blower(s) develop(s) at least the below required vacuum at the rated capacity:
 - a) Inboard system, 15" H₂O at ≥ 100 scfm.
 - b) Outboard system, 15" H₂O at ≥ 200 scfm.

* The provisions of Specification 3.0.4 are not applicable from the effective date of this amendment until the completion of Operating Cycle 6.

** Required testing may be extended to be performed during the fifth refueling outage.

CONTAINMENT SYSTEMS

MSIV LEAKAGE CONTROL SYSTEM

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

- d. By verifying the inboard flow and inboard and outboard pressure instrumentation to be OPERABLE by performance of a:
 - 1. CHANNEL FUNCTIONAL TEST at least once per 31 days, and
 - 2. CHANNEL CALIBRATION at least once per 18 months**.

** Required testing may be extended to be performed during the fifth refueling outage.



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20565-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-58

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, ET AL.

PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-440

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 10, 1996, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, et al. (licensees), proposed a change to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Perry Nuclear Power Plant (PNPP), Unit No. 1 on an emergency basis. This amendment grants a one-time extension of the performance intervals for certain Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements. Without this amendment, the plant would have to shut down six days prior to the scheduled end of the current fuel cycle.

2.0 EVALUATION

Surveillance extensions are requested for the logic system functional testing of the reactor mode switch-shutdown position and the manual scram. The PNPP reactor protection system (RPS) has redundancy, diversity, and independent trip systems such that a single failure will neither cause nor prevent a required reactor scram. Also, instrumentation failure is a small fraction of the scram failure probability. Therefore, a one-time extension of these RPS response time surveillance intervals is acceptable.

Also requested for extension are surveillances to check the logic for opening and closing the scram discharge volume vent and drain valves. Industry reliability studies for boiling water reactors (BWRs), prepared by the BWR Owners Group, show that the overall safety systems' reliabilities are not dominated by the reliabilities of the logic system, but by that of the mechanical components, which are consequently tested on a more frequent basis. Since the probability of a relay or contact failure is small relative to the probability of mechanical component failure, increasing the logic system test interval represents no significant change in the overall safety system unavailability. Since operation of these valves is verified at least once per 92 days, a one-time extension of the logic surveillance is acceptable.

Surveillances for the main steam isolation valve (MSIV) leakage control system (LCS) are requested for extension. One surveillance is the simulated actuation test. This test is supplemented during the operating cycle by tests performed on the system components including channel checks, channel functional tests, and inservice testing. Based on the periodic testing performed, a one-time extension to the surveillance interval is acceptable.

Finally, the surveillance for the MSIV LCS Rosemount transmitters (Model 1153) is proposed for extension. The NRC has accepted the report, "30 Month Stability Specification For Rosemount Model 1152, 1153, 1154 Pressure Transmitters." That report supported the extension of the calibration interval for the transmitters from 18 to 30 months based on a reduction in the drift allowance. These transmitters have sufficient margin to account for the drift allowance over a 30 month period, and therefore, a one-time extension of the surveillance interval is acceptable.

3.0 EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES

By letters dated March 24, June 9, and June 30, 1995, the licensee requested extensions to a large number (over 100) of TS surveillances in order to reach its planned refueling outage date. The NRC staff granted those surveillance extensions by license amendment (LA) 75 dated November 29, 1995. A period of 90 days was allowed for implementing LA 75. During a review of LA 75 for implementation on January 3, 1996, the licensee discovered that four additional surveillance extensions needed to be requested. These surveillances were not included in the original extension requests as shown by marked-up TS pages, although justification for the surveillance extensions was included.

LA 75 was issued to allow the licensee to operate until its planned refueling outage date. Failure to grant the additional four surveillance extensions would cause the plant to shut down six days before its planned refueling outage date. The licensee discovered the need for the additional surveillance extensions on January 3, 1996, and made a timely application for amendment on January 10, 1996. Therefore, the staff concludes that an emergency situation exists in that failure to act in a timely way will cause premature shutdown and that the licensee could not avoid this emergency situation.

4.0 BASIS FOR FINAL NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION

As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). The staff's review is presented below.

The amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because there is sufficient margin to account for transmitter drift, there is periodic testing of components during the operating cycle, and the logic system test extension represents no significant change in the overall system unavailability.

This change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because no physical alterations to the plant are being made, and no changes to plant operating procedures are being made.

This change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because plant requirements are not being changed, there is sufficient margin to account for transmitter drift, there is periodic testing of components

during the operating cycle, and the logic system test extension represents no significant change in the overall system unavailability.

Based on this review, the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff has determined that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

5.0 STATE CONSULTATION

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

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 or a change to a surveillance requirement. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluent that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission made a final no significant hazards consideration finding with respect to this amendment. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

7.0 CONCLUSION

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

Principal Contributor: J. Hopkins

Date: January 19, 1996