

ACCELERATED DISTRIBUTION DEMONSTRATION SYSTEM

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8912140155 DOC. DATE: 89/12/04 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-315 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Indiana & 05000315
 50-316 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2, Indiana & 05000316

AUTH. NAME: KWIATKOWSKI, D. AUTHOR AFFILIATION: Federal Emergency Management Agency
 RECIP. NAME: CONGEL, F.J. RECIPIENT AFFILIATION: Division of Radiation Protection & Emergency Preparedness

SUBJECT: Forwards radiological emergency preparedness rept for 880823-24 exercise.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: IE35D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 2196
 TITLE: Emergency Preparedness-Appraisal/Confirmatory Action Ltr/Exercise Rep

NOTES: see Reports

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
	PD3-1 PD	1 1	GIITTER, J.	1 1
INTERNAL:	AEOD/DOA/IRB	1 1	NRR/DREP/PEPB9D	1 1
	NRR/PMAS/ILRB12	1 1	NUDQCS-ABSTRACT	1 1
	OC/LFMB	1 0	REG FILE .02	1 1
	RGN3 FILE 01	1 1		
EXTERNAL:	LPDR	1 1	NRC PDR	1 1
	NSIC	1 1		

NOTE TO ALL "RIDS" RECIPIENTS:

PLEASE HELP US TO REDUCE WASTE! CONTACT THE DOCUMENT CONTROL DESK,
 ROOM P1-37 (EXT. 20079) TO ELIMINATE YOUR NAME FROM DISTRIBUTION
 LISTS FOR DOCUMENTS YOU DON'T NEED!

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 12 ENCL 11

57



Federal Emergency Management Agency

Washington, D.C. 20472

DEC 4 1988

Mr. Frank J. Congel
Director, Division of Radiation Protection
and Emergency Preparedness
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Congel:

Enclosed is a copy of the exercise report for the August 23-24, 1988, exercise of the offsite radiological emergency response plans, site-specific to the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Station. Berrien County and the State of Michigan fully participated in the exercise. The State of Indiana, as well as the American Electric Power Company partially participated in the exercise. The report was drafted November 23, 1988, by Region V of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and transmitted to FEMA Headquarters. Subsequent report revisions were coordinated with and transmitted to FEMA Headquarters November 22, 1989.

There were no deficiencies observed during the August 23-24, 1988, exercise. However, the report identifies twenty-one Areas Requiring Corrective Action. The FEMA Region V staff has reviewed the schedule of corrective actions provided by the States of Michigan and Indiana in response to the exercise weaknesses identified, included a copy of the corrective actions, and has forwarded a copy of the exercise report to the State.

Based on our review of the final exercise report and schedule of corrective actions, FEMA considers that offsite radiological emergency preparedness is adequate to provide reasonable assurance that appropriate offsite measures can be taken to protect the health and safety of the public living in the vicinity of the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Station, in the event of a radiological emergency occurring at that site. Therefore, the approval of the offsite plans for the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Station granted under 44 CFR 350 on September 28, 1983, continues to be in effect.

8912140155 891204
PDR ADOCK 05000315
F PDC

11
IE 35

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me on 646-2871.

Sincerely,

Dennis H. Kwiatkowski

Dennis H. Kwiatkowski
Assistant Associate Director
Office of Natural and
Technological Hazards

Enclosure

August 16, 1989

DISTRIBUTION
DOCKET FILE
JGIITTER
PD31 GRAY FILE
PSHUTTLEWORTH

DOCKET NO(S). 50-315/316

SUBJECT: DC COOK

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

✓	DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT	DATED
	Notice of Receipt of Application	
	Draft/Final Environmental Statement	
	Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement	
	Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No. _____	
	Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact	
	Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment	
	Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License	
X	Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Conditions See Page(s) <u>31123.</u>	<u>7/26/89</u>
	Exemption	
	Construction Permit No. CPPR— _____, Amendment No. _____	
	Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____	
	Order	
	Monthly Operating Report for _____ transmitted by Letter	
	Annual/Semi-Annual Report: _____ transmitted by Letter	
	Other _____	

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
PROJECT DIRECTORATE III-1
DIVISION OF REACTOR PROJECTS-III,
IV, V & SPECIAL PROJECTS

Enclosures:
As Stated

cc:

OFFICE	LA/PD31:DRSP						
SURNAME	SHUTTLEWORTH						
DATE	8/16/89						

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

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

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

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Regulatory Publications Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration and Resources Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room P-216, Phillips Building, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. The filing of requests

for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By August 25, 1989, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

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

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. A

petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

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

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

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

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

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

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 325-6000 (in

Missouri 1-(800) 342-8700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (Project Director): petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

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

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

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

Date of amendment request:
December 18, 1988

Description of amendment request:
This amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TS) related to fire barriers. The modifications include the following: (1) the title of Sections 3.21 and 4.24 are changed from penetration fire barriers to fire barriers and the terms functional and intact are changed to Operable; (2) Sections 3.21 and 3.21.1 are changed to indicate that these TS cover barriers for both separation of safety-related fire areas and separation of redundant safe shutdown systems required in the event of a fire; (3) Section 3.21.3 is changed to address the applicability of TS 3.0.3 and 3.0.4 for clarification; (4) Section 4.24.1 is modified for clarification; (5) Section 4.24.1.b is added to require the performance of a visual inspection of fire doors and fire dampers once per 18 months; (6) Section 4.24.1.c is added to require that ten percent of each type of sealed penetration be inspected at least once per 18 months and that all penetration seals be inspected once per 15 years. For each of the above changes, appropriate changes to the TS Bases have been made.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided standards in 10 CFR 50.92(c) for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. A proposed amendment to an Operating License for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. Arkansas Power and Light Company (AP&L) has reviewed the proposed change and has determined that:

The proposed change to the title of Sections 3.21, 4.24 and the Bases, and the use of the term "OPERABLE" instead of functional or intact do not involve a significant hazards consideration because operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 in accordance with this change would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

The proposed change would not increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated since this administrative change does not provide any relief from the requirements of the Technical Specifications, or change the intended operation or administrative requirements of the plant or its design bases.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

The proposed change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed since this administrative change does not adversely affect any components or systems which contribute to the safety of the plant.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed change would not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety since this change has no effect on any plant safety parameters, accident mitigation capabilities, or procedures.

The proposed changes to Sections 3.21 and 3.21.1 and their corresponding Bases do not involve a significant hazards consideration because operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 in accordance with this change would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

The proposed change would increase the scope of this Technical Specification to specifically include fire barriers separating both safety related fire areas as well as redundant safe shutdown systems required in the event of a fire. As this change increases the scope of this Technical Specification it would not increase the probability or

consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

The fire barriers required by this Specification restrict the spread of fire to safety-related fire areas and redundant trains of safe shutdown equipment. This change does not add any new plant fire barriers, it only enlarges the scope of the fire barriers covered by Technical Specifications. Therefore, increasing the scope of the Specification will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The existing Technical Specification requirements are not reduced by this change. Instead the requirements are increased and the only possible effect on the margin of safety is to increase it.

The proposed change to Section 3.21.2 and its corresponding Bases does not involve a significant hazards consideration because operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 in accordance with this change would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

The proposed change would add an additional requirement when compensating for an inoperable fire barrier. As this change does not increase the probability of a fire it would not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

This change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed as the new method of compensating for an inoperable fire barrier serves the same purpose as the old method of compensation.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

This change will still provide the same level of confidence that an undetected fire will not spread beyond the Specification fire barriers. Therefore, there is not a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

This proposed change to the surveillance requirements in Section 4.24.1 of the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 Technical Specifications does not involve a significant hazards consideration as it would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

Although the change does increase the interval between surveillances of the individual penetrations, the visual surveillance of the overall barrier will still be performed at the same 18 month interval. Therefore, this change maintains conservative restrictions on the surveillance of the affected fire barriers and does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

This change increases the number of barriers covered by this surveillance. The interval for inspection of individual penetrations is lengthened. However, a representative sample of each type of penetration is still examined at the previous 18 month surveillance interval and thus the integrity of the fire barriers is still assured. Therefore this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

This change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety; rather, it constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications as additional fire barriers are covered by this Technical Specification. The lengthening of the individual penetration seal surveillance interval is adequately compensated for by the surveillance of a representative sample of penetration seals.

The staff has reviewed AP&L's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the analysis. Therefore the staff proposes to determine 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, Esq., Bishop, Cook, Purcell, & Reynolds, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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

Date of amendment request: June 13, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add a note to the Technical Specifications (TS) to clarify the meaning of TS 3.4.1.4 regarding the turbine driven emergency feedwater (EFW) pump operability determination prior to heating the reactor coolant system above 280° F.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed change to the TS would provide an unambiguous requirement to perform a limited test of the turbine driven emergency feedwater pump with available steam pressure to demonstrate the functionality of the pump prior to heating the reactor coolant system above 280° F. This test would require meeting all of the performance criteria of the surveillance test specified by TS 4.8.1(a)1., except the minimum discharge pressure and flow, which can be achieved only with normal operating secondary system steam pressure. This

test requirement is more restrictive than past licensee interpretations of this TS, which held that a functional test could be performed only at full steam pressure in order to meet the discharge pressure and flow criteria. Therefore, this change represents an additional requirement which enhances the safe operation of the plant by providing further assurance of the availability of the turbine driven EFW pump prior to heatup.

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of criteria for no significant hazards consideration determination by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (51 FR 7751). These examples include: Example (ii), a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications: e.g., "a more stringent surveillance requirement."

The new requirement to perform a functional test of the turbine driven EFW pump prior to heating the reactor coolant system above 280° F constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, and control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. Therefore, the proposed amendment is within the scope of the example.

Since the application for amendment involves a proposed change that is encompassed by 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: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., Bishop, Cook, Purcell, & Reynolds, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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

Date of amendment request: December 16, 1988

Description of amendment request: This amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TS) related to fire barriers. The modifications include the following: (1) the title of Section 3/4.7.11 is changed from penetration fire barriers to fire barriers and the terms functional and intact are changed to Operable; (2) Section 3.7.11 is changed to indicate that the TS covers barriers for both separation of safety-related fire

areas and separation of redundant safe shutdown systems required in the event of a fire; (3) Section 3.7.11.a is changed by adding the option to verify the operability of fire detectors with the control room alarm on at least one side of the affected barrier with an hourly fire watch; (4) Section 4.7.11 is changed for clarification; (5) Section 4.7.11.c is added to require the performance of a visual inspection of fire doors and fire dampers once per 18 months; (6) Section 4.7.11.d is added to require that ten percent of each type of sealed penetration be inspected at least once each 18 months and that all penetration seals be inspected once per 15 years. For each of the above changes, appropriate changes to the TS Bases for Section 3/4.7.11 have been made.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards in 10 CFR 50.92(c) for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. A proposed amendment to an Operating License for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Arkansas Power and Light Company (AP&L) has reviewed the proposed change and has determined that:

The proposed change to the title of Section 3.4.7.11 and the Bases, and the use of the term OPERABLE instead of functional or intact does not involve a significant hazards consideration because operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 in accordance with this change would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

The proposed change would not increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated since this administrative change does not provide any relief from the requirements of the Technical Specifications, or change the intended operation or administrative requirements of the plant or its design bases.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

The proposed change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed since this administrative change does not adversely affect any components or systems which contribute to the safety of the plant.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed change would not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety

since this change has no effect on any plant safety parameters, accident mitigation capabilities, or procedures.

The proposed change to Section 3.7.11 and its corresponding Bases does not involve a significant hazards consideration because operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 in accordance with this change would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

The proposed change would increase the scope of this Technical Specification to specifically include fire barriers separating both safety-related fire areas as well as redundant safe shutdown systems required in the event of a fire. As this change increases the scope of this Technical Specification it would not increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

The fire barriers required by this Specification restrict the spread of fire to safety-related fire areas and redundant trains of safe shutdown equipment. This change does not add any new plant fire barriers, it only enlarges the scope of the fire barriers covered by Technical Specifications. Therefore, increasing the scope of the Specification will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The existing Technical Specification requirements are not reduced by this change. Instead the requirements are increased and the only possible effect on the margin of safety is to increase it.

The proposed change to Section 3.7.11.a and its corresponding Bases does not involve a significant hazards consideration because operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 in accordance with this change would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously analyzed.

The proposed change would add an additional method of compensating for an inoperable fire barrier. As this change does not increase the probability of a fire it would not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

This change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed as the new method of compensating for an inoperable fire barrier serves the same purpose as the old method of compensation.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

This change will still provide the same level of confidence that a undetected fire will not spread beyond the Specification fire barriers. Therefore, there is not a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

This proposed change to the surveillance requirements in Section 4.7.11 of the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 Technical

Specifications does not involve a significant hazards consideration as it would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

Although the change does increase the interval between surveillances of the individual penetrations, the visual surveillance of the overall barrier will still be performed at the same 18 month interval.

Therefore, this change maintains conservative restrictions on the surveillance of the affected fire barriers and does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

This change increases the number of barriers covered by this surveillance. The interval for inspection of individual penetrations is lengthened. However, a representative sample of each type of penetration is still examined at the previous 18 month surveillance interval and thus the integrity of the fire barriers is still assured. Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

This change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety; rather, it constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications as additional fire barriers are covered by this Technical Specification. The lengthening of the individual penetration seal surveillance interval is adequately compensated for by the surveillance of a representative sample of penetrations seals.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the analysis. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine 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, Esq., Bishop, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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

Date of amendment request: June 13, 1989

Description of amendment request: This amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TS) for Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 by deleting TS Section 4.3.1.1.4 which contains the surveillance requirements

for the existing Core Protection Calculator (CPC) isolation equipment. Arkansas Power and Light (AP&L) is presently in the process of replacing part of the hardware in the ANO-2 Core Protection Calculator System. This effort is scheduled for completion during the upcoming 2R7 refueling outage, presently scheduled to begin in September of this year. A portion of the hardware upgrade includes new fiber optics devices to provide interchannel isolation for the CPC/Core Element Assembly Calculator (CEAC) data links and the CEA position isolation amplifiers. The use of fiber optics equipment for data transmission offers superior isolation capabilities compared to the existing system, which uses conductive wiring and optical isolators to achieve the required channel isolation. Technical Specification 4.3.1.1.4 contains the surveillance requirements for the specific isolation equipment in the existing CPCS hardware. Testing of the new devices in accordance with the existing TS is neither necessary nor practical, as the new equipment uses non-conducting fiber optics cable. The existing TS will no longer be appropriate upon completion of the CPCS upgrade and is therefore proposed to be removed.

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

(1) The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change would not alter the probability of any previously analyzed accident occurring. The proposed change simply deletes a surveillance requirement which is no longer applicable for the equipment installed in the plant. This will not impact the accident-initiating events described in Chapter 15 of the ANO-2 SAR. Further, the proposed change will not adversely affect the consequences of accidents which have been previously evaluated. The proposed change simply reflects the upgrading of hardware in a plant

protection system, which should increase the system reliability and therefore increase the ability to mitigate the consequences of postulated accidents.

(2) The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The equipment upgrade associated with the proposed change will not change the overall design and protection system function of the CPCS, and the new hardware serves the same purpose as the hardware it replaces; therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. The proposed change simply deletes a surveillance requirement which is no longer appropriate for the specific equipment associated with the CPCS hardware replacement. The new equipment offers superior isolation performance and reliability.

(3) The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed change is associated with replacement hardware which will improve system reliability, and therefore improve overall safety margins. The CPCS will have at least the same capabilities to mitigate accidents as it had prior to the hardware upgrade, as the system software, and therefore, the protection system function, will remain unchanged. The hardware change does not change the overall design basis for any function of the CPCS equipment.

Based on the previous discussion, the licensee concluded that the proposed amendment request does not involve a significant increase in the probability of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; nor involve a significant reduction in the required margin of safety. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards considerations determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. The staff has, therefore, made a proposed determination that the licensee's request does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., Bishop, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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

Date of amendment request: June 15, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment will modify the control element assembly (CEA) drop time requirements of Technical

Specification 3.1.3.4. The change would increase the maximum allowable individual full length CEA drop time from the current 3.2 seconds to 3.5 seconds, and would specify a maximum arithmetic average of all full length CEA drop times of 3.2 seconds. The proposed changes are based on analyses performed by Combustion Engineering which demonstrate that CEA drop time testing acceptance criteria based on average drop times, rather than on the slowest individual CEA drop time, are equally conservative.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards in 10 CFR 50.92(c) for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. A proposed amendment to an Operating License for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Arkansas Power and Light Company (AP&L) has reviewed the proposed change and has determined that:

(1) The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes to the CEA drop time requirements have been evaluated for impact on the ANO-2 accident analyses. The change involves only an acceptance criteria for equipment performance and no physical changes. The CEA drop time acceptance criteria are used to develop trip reactivity insertion rates which are in turn used as inputs to the accident analyses.

The Combustion Engineering analyses have demonstrated that the calculated trip reactivity for a distributed CEA drop pattern is the same as the trip reactivity calculated for the unrealistic non-distributed pattern currently assumed. Since the trip reactivity assumed in the accident analyses is not adversely impacted by consideration of a distributed CEA drop pattern, the proposed limits will not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(2) The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. The proposed change does not involve any new or modified structures, systems or components; rather, it affects only an acceptance criteria for confirming the required performance of the existing CEA hardware. Therefore, the proposed change would not create the possibility of a new or

different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

(3) The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The margins of safety related to CEA insertion are defined by the analyzed events in the Safety Analysis Report which credit the insertion. As demonstrated in Criterion 1 above, the proposed limits on CEA drop time have no adverse impact on the accident analyses. Therefore, the margins of safety reflected in the accident analysis conclusions are not reduced.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. This guidance includes examples (51 FR 7750) of types of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. The change proposed in this amendment is not directly comparable to any of the examples identified in 51 FR 7750.

Based on the previous discussion, the licensee concluded that the proposed amendment request does not involve a significant increase in the probability of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; nor involve a significant reduction in the required margin of safety. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards considerations determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. The staff has, therefore, made a proposed determination that the licensee's request does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., Bishop, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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

Date of application for amendment:
February 15, 1989

Description of amendment request:
The amendments would revise the description of Action 23 associated with Table 3.3.2-1, Isolation Actuation Instrumentation, to differentiate between the actions to be taken in Operational Conditions 1, 2, and 3 and the actions to be taken for Operational Conditions 5 and *. Presently, Action 23 states for Operational Conditions 1, 2, 3, 5, and *, "Establish SECONDARY CONTAINMENT INTEGRITY with the standby gas treatment system operating within one hour."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

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

The licensee provided the following analysis to show that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazard consideration:

1. Action 23 associated with Table 3.2-1 of the Technical Specifications currently does not provide alternative actions for Operational Conditions 5 and * when secondary containment integrity with the standby gas treatment system operating cannot be achieved.

The proposed requirement to establish secondary containment integrity with the standby gas treatment system operating when the unit is in Operational Conditions 5 and * will enhance protection for the health and safety of the public in the event of a fuel handling accident. Currently, if Action 23 cannot be met, several actions may be taken depending upon the circumstances.

If the standby gas treatment system cannot operate, Technical Specification 3.6.6.1, which requires immediate suspension of fuel handling if both subsystems of the standby gas treatment system are inoperable, would be invoked. If the secondary containment integrity cannot be maintained, Technical Specification 3.6.5.1, which requires suspension of fuel handling if secondary containment integrity cannot be established within 8 hours, applies.

The proposed change will require suspension of fuel handling within one hour if secondary containment integrity cannot be maintained, which is more restrictive than Technical Specification 3.6.5.1. If the standby gas treatment system cannot operate, the more restrictive requirements of Technical Specification 3.6.6.1 will still apply.

By suspending fuel handling within one hour if secondary containment integrity cannot be established with the standby gas treatment system operating, the potential for a fuel handling accident that could affect the health and safety of the public is reduced. No other accidents are affected. Therefore, the proposed change decreases the probability of an accident.

The consequences of a fuel handling accident remain unchanged because the fuel handling accident scenario does not change. Only the time in which a fuel handling accident could occur while secondary containment is not maintained is reduced from 8 hours to 1 hour, thereby impacting only the probability of an accident.

2. The additional requirement does not impact how the secondary containment performs its function. It only adds a requirement which will provide additional assurance that the health and safety of the public are maintained if a fuel handling accident were to occur. Thus, no new or different accident possibilities are created.

3. The proposed change provides additional assurance that the health and safety of the public are maintained in the event secondary containment integrity with the standby gas treatment system operating in Operational Conditions 5 and * cannot be achieved. Currently, fuel handling would be suspended within 8 hours if secondary containment integrity cannot be maintained, and immediately if the standby gas treatment system cannot operate. Thus, the proposed amendment increases the margin of safety if secondary containment integrity cannot be maintained, and maintains the current margin of safety if the standby gas treatment system cannot operate.

The licensee has concluded that the proposed amendment meets the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 and, therefore, involves no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has made a preliminary review of the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination. The licensee addressed the three standards and appears to have met them. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Attorney for licensee: R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam

Commonwealth Edison Company,
Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois; Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment request: June 12, 1989

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment identified "inhalation" as the most limiting pathway, with the "child's" thyroid as the critical organ for radiation doses, and restricts the radiation dose to less than or equal to 1500 mrem/year. The proposed amendment changes the Technical Specifications Bases, Paragraph 3.8.A.1 (DPR-19 & DPR-25) and Paragraph 3.8/4.8.A.1 (DRP-29 &

DPR-30), to be more restrictive and consistent with NUREG-0473.

Current Technical Specifications restrict release rates to less than or equal to 1500 mrem/year thyroid dose rate above background to an infant via the cow-milk-infant pathway. The proposed Technical Specifications retain the dose rate of 1500 mrem/year; however, the critical receptor is a child via the inhalation pathway in lieu of an infant via the cow-milk-infant pathway.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The change in the Technical Specifications has been evaluated against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has been determined not to involve a significant hazards consideration because:

1. The proposed change does not involve any relaxation of established safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operations. The proposed amendment revises the pathway for calculation of restricting dose rates to a more limiting receptor pathway, i.e. child inhalation. This change does not involve any accident precursor and, therefore, does not increase the probability of an accident. In addition, NUREG 0473, Revision 3 Draft 7 has identified the child inhalation pathway as a more limiting receptor pathway and, therefore, the use of a more limiting receptor for dose calculation does not increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment changes the pathway for calculating the restricted dose rate, and allows for a change in the computer model for dose calculation. The change to the dose calculation model does not involve a change in safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation. Therefore, it does not create any new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated.

3. The proposed amendment changes the receptor pathway to a more limiting case, i.e. child inhalation, thereby, creating a more conservative dose calculation. The use of a more limiting receptor pathway does not reduce the margin of safety.

Since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are encompassed by the criteria for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the NRC staff has made a proposed determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450 (Dresden), and Dixon Public Library, 221

Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021 (Quad Cities).

Attorney for licensee: Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

NRC Acting Project Director: Paul C. Shemanski

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

Date of application for amendments: June 2, 1989

Brief description of amendment: This amendment request will modify Section 4.3, Reactor Coolant System, of the Technical Specifications for Zion Station. It will allow Zion Station's steam generator tubes to be repaired, if needed, by utilizing the Bechtel-KWU Alliance sleeving methodology. The existing Technical Specifications have been previously separately amended to permit utilization of the Combustion Engineering (CE) and the Westinghouse (WE) processes for steam generator tube sleeving. The addition of the Bechtel-KWU Alliance methodology as an approved alternative repair method would provide Zion with the flexibility necessary to continue with the philosophy of using an integrated refueling outage coordination.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The staff has evaluated this proposed amendment and determined that it involves no significant hazards consideration. According to 10 CFR 50.92(c), a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or 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 margin of safety.

The Commonwealth Edison Company (the licensee) provided the following discussion regarding each of the above criteria for no significant hazards consideration determination.

DISCUSSION - ITEM 1

The creation of the option to utilize the Bechtel-KWU Alliance welded sleeve process to repair a defective steam generator tube has no effect on either the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated. As discussed in Bechtel-KWU Alliance report, BKAT-01-P, Revision 1, the integrity of the steam generator tubes will be equivalent to that of an original

tube, or a tube sleeved by the NRC-approved CE or WE processes. The continued integrity of the sleeves will be verified by the inspection program required as a result of this change.

Thus, since the structural integrity of the tubes will not be adversely affected by this change, there is no increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated. Specifically, the probability of a steam generator tube rupture will be unaltered.

In addition, the steam generator will remain capable of performing its required heat transfer function. The information provided in Section 4.3.5 of BKAT-01-P, Revision 1 demonstrates that the sleeve-induced primary flow reduction resulting from the use of a Bechtel-KWU Alliance sleeve is comparable to the currently approved WE or CE processes. As a result, the choice to install a Bechtel-KWU Alliance sleeve, as opposed to a WE or CE sleeve, will have no significant effect on the steam generator's heat transfer ability.

The sleeving process will allow a repaired steam generator tube to remain in service, rather than completely blocking the tube's flow with plugs. Thus, the act of placing a sleeve in a steam generator tube actually results in a more efficient steam generator relative to plugging the tube.

Based upon the above discussion, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated will be unaffected because the heat transfer capability of the steam generators will not be significantly altered.

DISCUSSION - ITEM 2

As discussed above, both the structural integrity and the heat transfer capability of Zion steam generators will not be significantly affected by the use of the Bechtel-KWU Alliance welded sleeve process instead of the WE or CE sleeve processes. In addition, the steam generator tube sleeves do not interact with any other of Zion's systems. The ability of Zion's safety systems to perform their function will not be altered. Thus, there is no potential for a new or different kind of accident due to the use of the Bechtel-KWU sleeving process to repair Zion's steam generators.

DISCUSSION - ITEM 3

The heat transfer capabilities of Zion's steam generators will not be significantly altered through the utilization of Bechtel-KWU Alliance welded sleeves as opposed to the currently approved WE or CE sleeves. In general, the sleeving process, whether the Bechtel-KWU Alliance, WE, or CE processes are utilized, results in a more

efficient steam generator when compared to the plugging alternative.

As discussed above and in BKAT-01-P, Revision 1, the structural integrity of the steam generator tubes will be unaltered. Use of the Bechtel-KWU Alliance, WE, or CE sleeving processes will produce a primary system boundary with the appropriate integrity.

Since both the structural integrity and the heat transfer capability of Zion's steam generators will not be significantly altered by the choice of sleeving processes, the margin of safety will not be affected.

Therefore, since the application for amendment satisfies the criteria specified in 10 CFR 50.92, Commonwealth Edison Company made a determination that the application involves no significant hazards consideration.

After preliminary review of licensee's submittal, the staff agrees with licensee's overall conclusion. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Waukegan Public Library, 128 N. County Street, Waukegan, Illinois 60085.

Attorney to licensee: Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

NRC Project Director: Paul C. Shemanski, Acting Director

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut; Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-245 and 50-335, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: April 25, 1989 as supplemented June 28, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would change Technical Specification Sections 6.12, "High Radiation Area," for Haddam Neck and Millstone Unit 2 plants and TS Section 6.13, "High Radiation Area," for Millstone Unit 1 plant by (1) defining the dose rate as measured at 45 cm (18 inches) from the source, (2) increasing the Radiation Work Permit requirements for entry into locked High Radiation Areas with dose rates greater than 1000 mR/h by requiring maximum stay time limits or continuous surveillance, (3) allowing an alternative to enclosing and locking large areas with dose rates less than 1000 mR/h and in which an enclosure cannot be reasonably constructed and (4) define locked High Radiation Areas

as those with dose rates greater than 1000 mR/h at 18 inches from the radiation source.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The licensee has reviewed the proposed changes in accordance with 10 CFR 50.92 and has concluded and the staff agrees that they do not involve a significant hazards consideration in that these changes would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence of an accident previously analyzed. These changes are consistent with NRC Standard Technical Specification guidance and Information Notice 88-79. The licensee's current practice of specifying the measurement distance reduces the possibility of overexposure. The proposed change would specify this practice in the Technical Specifications. The proposed change also increases the requirements for entry into locked high radiation areas. Since there are no changes to the way the plant is operated, the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously analyzed is not increased.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed. The change allows an alternative to enclosing and locking large areas with dose rate greater than 1000 mR/h and in which an enclosure cannot be reasonably constructed. It allows the use of barricades, postings, and flashing lights. The proposed change would incorporate the current practice of specifying the measurement distance from the radiation source to determine dose rates. The change would also increase requirements for entry into locked high radiation areas. Since there are no changes in the way the plant is operated, the potential for an unanalyzed accident is not created. No new failure modes would be introduced.

3. Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. Since the proposed changes do not affect the consequences of any accident previously analyzed, there is no reduction in the margin of safety. The change increases Radiation Work Permit requirements for entry into locked High Radiation Areas with dose rates greater than 1000 mR/h by requiring maximum stay time limits or continuous surveillance. In past practice, dose rates for High Radiation Areas (unlocked) were defined as greater than 100 mR/h but less than 1000 mR/h in contact with the radiation source. As proposed, each High Radiation Area, as defined in 10 CFR Part 20, in which the intensity of radiation is equal to or less than 1000 mR/h would be measured at 18 inches from the radiation source. The proposed changes would additionally define locked High Radiation Areas as those with dose rates greater than 1000 mR/h at 18 inches from the radiation source. The proposed change would incorporate the current practice of specifying the measurement from the radiation source to determine dose rates.

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

Local Public Document Room
location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457 and Waterford Public Library, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut 06385.

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz
Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut and Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-245/335/423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2 and 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: May 25, 1989

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

1. Sections 6.10.2.m (Haddam Neck, Millstone Unit Nos. 1 and 2) and 6.10.3 (Millstone Unit No. 3) are being added to the Records Retention section. This section requires lifetime retention of records of reviews performed for changes made to the Radiological Effluent Monitoring and Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (REMODCM) and the Process Control Program (PCP).

2. Sections 6.17 (Haddam Neck), 6.15 (Millstone Unit Nos. 1 and 2), and 6.13 (Millstone Unit No. 3) are being changed to simplify the administrative controls for making changes to the Radiological Effluent Monitoring Manual (REMM).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: On January 31, 1989, the NRC issued Generic Letter (GL) 89-01, "Implementation of Programmatic Controls for Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications in the Administrative Controls Section of the Technical Specifications and the Relocation of Procedural Details or RETS to the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual or to the Process Control Program."

The purpose of GL 89-01 was to provide model TS which simplify the administrative requirements for effluent monitoring programs. The application for license amendments dated May 25, 1989 specifically addresses changes to the REMM and record retention for the REMODCM and the PCP and conforms to the guidance in GL 89-01. The TS associated with other elements of the effluent monitoring programs will be addressed separately, at a future date.

The licensees have reviewed the proposed changes in accordance with 10 CFR 50.92 and have concluded and the staff agrees that they do not involve a significant hazards consideration in that these changes would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously analyzed. These changes are consistent with NRC Generic Letter 89-01 which furthers the NRC's goal as stated in the Commission Policy Statement for Technical Specification improvements. Since there are no changes in the way the plant is operated, the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously analyzed is not increased.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed. The proposed changes simplify the administrative controls for changes to the REMM. Since there are no changes in the way the plant is operated, the potential for an unanalyzed accident is not created. No new failure modes are introduced.

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

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

Local Public Document Room

Location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457 and the Waterford Public Library, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut 06385.

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

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

Date of amendment request: August 14, 1987, as supplemented April 22, 1988.

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendments would change the Oconee Nuclear Station Technical Specification (TS) 3.4.4 to raise the minimum upper surge tank (UST) level from 5 feet to 6 feet. The level setpoint of 6 feet includes an allowance for instrument error.

The amendment request also includes a revision to the bases of TS 3.4. The table of emergency feedwater flow vs. the time required to remove decay heat and reactor coolant pump heat, following reactor trip from 102% rated power would be revised.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided

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

The licensee provided the following discussion regarding the three criteria.

The proposed amendments increase the required UST level from 5 feet to an indicated 6 feet allowing for maximum instrument error. This is an improvement which would assure the availability of the required UST inventory. Therefore, the proposed amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendments involve a change which would increase the required UST level from 5 feet to 6 feet. This change constitutes an additional limitation and restriction which will improve the margin of safety. The amendments do not involve any modification in the system design and procedures which would create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendments are an improvement in the availability and reliability of the water sources for emergency feedwater for decay heat removal and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the analysis.

Accordingly, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the proposed amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina 29691

Attorney for licensee: J. Michael McGarry, III, Bishop, Lieberman, Cook, Purcell and Reynolds, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Duquesne Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 22, 1989

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications of each unit as follows:

(1) Increase the maximum service water (i.e. Ohio River water) temperature limit from 88° F to 90° F for Unit 1, and 86° F to 89° F for Unit 2;

(2) Reduce the required service water flow through the Unit 2 recirculation spray heat exchangers from 12,000 gpm to 11,000 gpm.

(3) Replace Figure 3.6-1 regarding maximum allowable containment air pressure with a new Figure 3.6-1, developed as a result of the study to support change (1).

(4) For Unit 1, increase the minimum refueling water storage tank (RWST) temperature from 43° F to 45° F, while the maximum RWST temperature is specified as 55° F.

(5) For Unit 1, increase the peak accident pressure in the containment from 38.5 to 40.0 psig, as a result of the study to support change (1).

(6) For Unit 1, change the surveillance requirement of the quench spray and recirculation spray pumps to reflect revised allowable margins for pump degradation assumed in the study to support change (1).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

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

The licensee has re-evaluated previously analyzed accidents. No accidents were determined to be caused by high river water temperature. Furthermore, the licensee determined that despite the proposed changes to the technical specifications, the design requirement of the containment depressurization systems will continue to be met, and safety-related equipment which require river water cooling will be capable of performing their design functions at the increased service water temperature limit. Hence the answer to the first criterion is negative.

There is no hardware, software or operational procedure changes as a result of the proposed amendment. Hence the answer to the second criterion is also negative.

The proposed amendments do involve slight relaxation of margins of safety.

However, the licensee's analysis shows that the safety systems will continue to meet design objectives. The relaxation is not significant and the answer is also negative to the third criterion.

The staff therefore proposes to determine that the requested amendments involve no significant hazards considerations.

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 & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz
Florida Power Corporation, et al.,
Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit
No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus
County, Florida

Date of amendment request: June 12, 1989

Description of amendment request:
This amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TS) to reflect the updated 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J method for containment leakage testing. Specifically, the amendment will permit the use of the mass point method to determine containment leakage. The mass point method has been accepted by the staff as an improved alternate test method for determining containment leakage.

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 considerations if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed amendment was analyzed with respect to the above three criteria. With respect to the first criterion, the licensee determined that the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed since the TS will continue to require surveillance testing in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. This change will allow the use of Commission-approved methodologies for containment leakage

testing that have been incorporated into the regulations for general industry use (53 FR 45890).

With respect to the second criterion, the licensee determined that the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated since the amendment involves no physical change to the plant, nor any change in plant operating procedures.

With respect to the third criterion, the licensee determined that the proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety since the margin of safety currently provided by the TS remains the same. The proposed amendment still requires containment leakage testing to be performed at the same frequency, per 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, and in accordance with Commission-approved methodologies.

The staff has performed a preliminary evaluation of the licensee's submittal and believes that the criteria of 10 CFR 50.92 are met. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida 32629

Attorney for licensee: A. H. Stephens, General Counsel, Florida Power Corporation, MAC - A5D, P. O. Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

Florida Power Corporation, et al.,
Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit
No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus
County, Florida

Date of amendment request: June 12, 1989

Description of amendment request:
This amendment would add a new Technical Specification that would address the use of hydrogen purge valves for depressurization of the containment. The new specification ensures limited use of the hydrogen purge valves.

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 considerations if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of

a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The staff has analyzed the proposed change in light of the above three criteria. With respect to the first criterion, the licensee determined that the proposed change would not increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated since this change provides assurance that the hydrogen purge valves are capable of closing during a loss of coolant accident or a steam line break accident within containment. Performance of the proposed surveillance requirements would demonstrate valve operability, thus insuring that off-site dose limits would not be exceeded in the event of an accident during containment purging operations.

With respect to the second criterion, the licensee determined that the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated since the proposed change introduces no new mode of plant operation nor does it require a physical modification to the plant.

With respect to the third criterion, the licensee determined that the proposed change would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety since the change adds a restriction on plant operation to ensure time periods with direct access from the containment to the outside atmosphere are minimized.

The staff has performed a preliminary evaluation of the licensee's submittal and believes that the criteria of 10 CFR 50.92 are met. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida 32629

Attorney for licensee: A. H. Stephens, General Counsel, Florida Power Corporation, MAC - A5D, P. O. Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

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

Date of amendment request: June 13, 1989

Description of amendment request:
This amendment request includes proposed Technical Specification changes related to 10 CFR 50 Appendix J Local Leakage Rate testing (LLRT)

including the relocation of LLRT component and valve lists from the Technical Specifications to the Updated FSAR. Removal of tabular listings from the Technical Specifications is an area of Technical Specifications improvement that has been identified by the Atomic Industrial Forum (AIF) and the NRC. Relocation of these tabular listings to the Updated FSAR would allow future changes to these lists, as permitted by the regulations, to be made without a license amendment. This would relieve both the NRC and GPUN of this administrative burden.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: GPU Nuclear Corporation has determined that this Technical Specification Change Request poses no significant hazards as defined by the NRC in 10 CFR 50.92. This change is considered to be administrative in nature and does not involve significant hazards consideration as evaluated below.

1. Operation of Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit-1, in accordance with this change would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed Technical Specification change does not modify or create any accident initiating condition. This change provides for update of the list of components subject to 10 CFR 50 Appendix J Type "C" tests to add additional components to the list, improvement in the Technical Specifications by relocating lists to the FSAR, and deletion of certain test requirements that are not needed to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J. Deletion of the requirements for Penetration Pressurization System quarterly rotameter readings does not result in changes contrary to the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J or the NRC's Standard Technical Specifications for Babcock and Wilcox Pressurized Water Reactors (NUREG-0103). The changes included in this request are either purely administrative in nature or are of minor technical significance and have no significance related to safe plant operation.

(10 CFR 50.92(c)(1))

2. Operation of Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit-1, in accordance with this change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed Technical Specification change does not modify or create any accident initiating condition. The proposed changes to the LLRT test requirements in Technical Specifications will result in technical specification requirements that meet or exceed the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J.

(10 CFR 50.92(c)(2))

3. Operation of Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit-1, in accordance with this change would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because all Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (USAR) assumptions remain unchanged. The

proposed changes to the LLRT test requirements will result in technical specification requirements that meet or exceed the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J. A minor change in the test requirements for the purge valves would not change the test methodology or the acceptance criteria and would not significantly affect the assurance of the early detection of purge valve seat degradation and inoperability because the additional examinations and increased (quarterly) test frequency of the purge valves beyond the Appendix J test requirements would be retained. Deletion of the requirements for Penetration Pressurization System quarterly rotameter readings is not discussed in the basis for any TMI-1 Technical Specification. Any reduction in test requirements resulting from this change would not significantly affect the timely detection of containment isolation valve or penetration inoperability.

(10 CFR 50.92(c)(3))

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

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz
Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request:
November 7, 1988, December 1, 1988 and May 19, 1989

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.3.6, "Accident Monitoring Instrumentation," to make the action requirements for inoperable containment hydrogen concentration monitors consistent with the requirements of TS 3.6.4.1, "Hydrogen Monitors."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:
The two TS which address containment hydrogen concentration monitors have different action requirements for the same monitors. TS 3.3.3.6, "Accident Monitoring Instrumentation," allows 7 days to restore an inoperable monitor to operable status before proceeding to a lower mode of operation. If two

monitors are inoperable, 48 hours are allowed to restore at least one to operable status. TS 3.6.4.1, "Hydrogen Monitors," allows 30 days and 72 hours, respectively. The 30 day requirement is consistent with Generic Letter 83-37 and is appropriate given the function performed by the hydrogen monitors. The licensee is therefore proposing to revise TS 3.3.3.6 to refer to TS 3.6.4.1 for action requirements when a hydrogen monitor is inoperable.

The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration 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.

In regard to the proposed amendments, the licensee has determined the following:

1. The proposed change will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The change affects only the time limit for restoring an inoperable containment hydrogen concentration monitor to operable status. These monitors are provided for post-LOCA indication and recording. They perform no control or trip functions and are not needed for immediate post-accident mitigative action. Hydrogen buildup following a LOCA is a slow process and alternate means of hydrogen monitoring are available. Even in the total absence of hydrogen monitoring, the hydrogen recombiners could still be operated. The change will, therefore, have no significant negative effect on post-accident hydrogen control and the consequences of a LOCA would remain within previously analyzed limits.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than any accident previously evaluated. The change involves no physical alteration of the plant. The change does not introduce any new equipment into the plant or require any existing equipment to operate in a different manner from which it was designed to operate. The change, therefore, does not create a new failure mode, and a new or different kind of accident could not result.

3. The proposed change does not significantly reduce a margin of safety. The change does not affect safety limits or limiting safety system settings. The proposed time limit for restoring an inoperable hydrogen concentration monitor to operable status is consistent with NRC Generic Letter 83-37. The proposed time limit is appropriate given the nature of the monitored variable.

and the availability of alternate means of monitoring. The change will, therefore, have no significant effect on the availability of post-accident hydrogen control and margins of safety are not reduced.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's determination and concurs with its findings.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Arthur H. Domby, Troutman, Sanders, Lockerman and Ashmore, Candler Building, Suite 1400, 127 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30043.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: May 8, 1989

Description of amendment request: These proposed amendments revise the values for TA (total allowance), Z (the statistical summation of errors assumed in the analysis) and the Allowable Value associated with the low Pressurizer Pressure Safety Injection setpoint, in Technical Specification Table 3.3-3.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration 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.

In regard to the proposed amendment, the licensee has determined the following:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the trip setpoint is not changed, and this change is not a result of a plant modification or design change. The revisions to TA, Z and the Allowable Value are consistent with the evaluated accidents.

The values being changed are used in the determination of whether or not instrument drift is sufficient to cause the instrument to be declared inoperable. The revision to this Technical Specification provides consistency with the manner in which the increased uncertainty associated with the Veritrac instrument was resolved.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because it does not result in a change in equipment and the trip setpoint remains the same.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the setpoint has remained unchanged even though the safety analysis was evaluated by Westinghouse to account for additional uncertainty in the Veritrac instrument temperature compensation. These evaluations show that the revised analysis limits would be bounded by the existing analysis. The revision to TA, Z and Allowable Value are consistent with the safety analysis evaluation and will only effect [affect] the point at which a determination of significant instrument drift would result in the instrument being declared inoperable.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's determination and concurs with its findings.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Arthur H. Domby, Troutman, Sanders, Lockerman and Ashmore, Candler Building, Suite 1400, 127 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30043.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: May 19, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise the action statements of Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.2, "Engineered Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation" and TS 3.7.6, "Control Room Emergency Filtration Systems (CREFS)," concerning the control room emergency filtration system and its associated actuation instrumentation. The change would add exceptions to TS 3.0.4, "Limiting Conditions For Operation and Surveillance Requirements," to allow operational mode changes for those action

statements of TS 3.3.2 and 3.7.6 which permit continued unit operation for an unlimited period of time.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration 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.

In regard to the proposed amendment, the licensee has determined the following:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The change does not affect equipment involved in the initiation of previously evaluated accidents. The probability of such accidents is therefore not increased. The change concerns the Control Room Emergency Filtration System (CREFS) and its associated actuation instrumentation, which function to mitigate the consequences of accidents. The change does not alter CREFS design or operation. The change revises the applicable action statements to permit mode changes if the action statement allows continued unit operation for an unlimited period of time. The action statements were written such that continued operation for an unlimited time is not permitted unless the Technical Specification bases for the CREFS and its actuation instrumentation continue to be met. That is, the CREFS will ensure that equipment qualification temperatures are not exceeded and that the control room would remain habitable during and following all credible accident conditions (including consideration of a single failure) and the instrumentation will ensure a redundant and diverse means to initiate a Control Room Isolation in response to credible accidents in either unit (including consideration of a single failure). The CREFS would therefore respond as previously analyzed if a demand occurred while operating in one of the affected action statements. Operating mode changes within the bounds of the action statements would not degrade the capability of the CREFS to mitigate an accident, hence, the consequences of previously analyzed accidents are not increased by the proposed change.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The change does not introduce any new equipment into the plant or require existing equipment to operate in a different manner from which it was designed to

operate. Since a new failure mode is not introduced by the change, a new or different kind of accident could not result.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The change does not affect safety limits or limiting safety system settings. The Technical Specifications bases for the CREFS and its actuation instrumentation are maintained during operation in the affected action statements. Operating mode changes within the constraints of the action statements do not reduce the level of protection provided by the CREFS; therefore, margins of safety are not reduced.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's determination and concurs with its finding.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Burke County Public Library,
412 Fourth Street, Waynesboro, Georgia
30330.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Arthur H. Domby, Troutman, Sanders, Lockerman and Ashmore, Candler Building, Suite 1400, 127 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30043.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Gulf States Utilities Company, Docket No. 50-458, River Bend Station, Unit 1 West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: June 23, 1989

Description of amendment request: The amendment would add two additional Gould Type HE43 circuit breakers to Technical Specification (TS) Table 3.8.4.1-1, "Primary Containment Penetration Conductor Overcurrent Protection Devices." For convenience and ALARA considerations, it is desirable to provide 480 volt receptacles in the drywell to power tools and other temporary equipment during future outages rather than run temporary power cables into the drywell. The design to provide power for the two receptacles requires the use of a containment electrical penetration. These circuits must be added to TS Table 3.8.4.1-1 for primary containment conductor overcurrent protection devices utilizing Gould Type HE43 circuit breakers. The wiring was implemented during the recent refueling outage; however, the licensee has stated that the circuits are deenergized and will continue to be verified as deenergized during Operational Conditions 1, 2, or 3 until the proposed change is approved. The new receptacles perform no safety-related function, and no safety-related systems,

other than the containment penetrations, are affected by this modification.

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

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

The conduit, cable and equipment associated with this modification are being installed in accordance with all applicable seismic and electrical separation criteria. As such, adequate electrical protection in conformance with the Technical Specification Bases and USAR Section 8.3.1.1.4.3 is provided for all containment penetrations used. Operation or failure of the equipment installed by this modification has no impact on any safety-related system. Because, this proposed change does not result in any new plant operating modes and electrical penetration overcurrent protection is provided as described in the USAR, this proposed change cannot increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

A single failure of the equipment installed by this modification would at worst cause a loss of power to motor control center (MCC) 1NHS-MCC2A. Loss of this nonsafety-related MCC is assumed by the USAR during design basis accident conditions and is therefore, as previously analyzed. No other new, credible failure modes can be identified. The circuit protection design is identical to the as-built configuration for receptacle 1POP-WR2A01 already listed on Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.1-1. Additionally, this proposed change does not introduce any new plant operating modes. Therefore, this proposed change cannot create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because:

Overcurrent protection is provided such that no single failure will cause excessive current in the penetration conductors. This ensures that the overcurrent protection is in accordance with the RBS USAR.

Additionally, the circuit protection design is identical to the as-built configuration for receptacle 1POP-WR2A01 already listed on Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.1-1. The new receptacles perform no safety-related function and no safety-related systems, other than the containment penetrations, are affected by this modification. Further the proposed change does not result in any new plant operating modes. Therefore, the proposed change does not result in any reduction in the margin of safety.

Based on the above considerations, the proposed change does not increase the probability or the consequences of a previously evaluated accident, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated, and does not involve a reduction in the margin of safety. Therefore, Gulf States Utilities Company proposes that no significant hazards are involved.

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

Pacific Gas and Electric Company,
Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323, Diablo
Canyon Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2,
San Luis Obispo County, California

Dates of amendment request: May 12, 1989 and July 3, 1989 (Reference LAR 89-05).

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to change the diesel generator (DG) allowed outage time (AOT) from 72 hours to 7 days. Prior to installation of the sixth DG, this change would apply only to the swing diesel generator (DG 1-3) for performance of preplanned preventive maintenance. After the sixth DG is installed and operational (scheduled for December 1991), the 7-day AOT would apply to all DGs. Specific TS changes would include (1) revising TS 3.8.1.1 and TS 4.8.1.1, and (2) revising the associated Bases accordingly.

This request was previously noticed in the Federal Register on May 31, 1989 at 54 FR 23319. This replaces the previous notice.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

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

The licensee, in its submittal of May 12, 1989, evaluated the proposed changes against the significant hazards criteria of 10 CFR 50.92 and against the Commission guidance concerning application of this standard. Based on the evaluation given below, the licensee has concluded that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration. The licensee's evaluation is as follows:

a. Does the change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The Diablo Canyon offsite and onsite power systems are highly reliable. The 230kV and 500kV systems have been demonstrated to provide reliable offsite power sources for both units. The DCPD DG reliability history indicates that average reliability is higher than the requirements in Regulatory Guide 1.155, Station Blackout, and is higher than the industry average.

The risk and reliability evaluation determined that the probability of an accident previously evaluated does not significantly change by increasing the DG AOT from 72 hours to 7 days. The relative risk evaluation demonstrated that the relative risk remained low with an increased AOT from 72 hours to 7 days because of the improved maintenance possible with the 7-day AOT and the avoidance of multiple 72-hour AOTs.

Increasing the DG AOT does not involve physical alteration of any plant equipment and does not affect analysis assumptions regarding functioning of required equipment designed to mitigate the consequences of accidents. Further, the severity of postulated accidents and resulting radiological effluent releases will not be affected by the increased AOT.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

b. Does the change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Extending the DG AOT from 72 hours to 7 days does not necessitate physical alteration of the plant or changes in parameters governing normal plant operation.

Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated for Diablo Canyon.

c. Does the change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

As discussed above, the risk and reliability evaluations determined that the change in core melt frequency for a 7-day AOT compared with a 72-hour AOT is insignificant.

Therefore, this change does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC Staff has reviewed the proposed changes, including the additional restrictions proposed in the licensee's letter of July 3, 1989, and the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and finds them acceptable. Therefore, the Staff proposes to determine that these changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorneys for licensee: Richard R. Locke, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120 and Bruce Norton, Esq., c/o Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120.

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-388
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,
Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 9, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specification 3.6.6.2 to reflect addition of two drywell cooling fans and to add circuit breakers in Table 3.6.4.1-1 of the Technical Specifications.

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; (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 licensee's request and concurs with the following

basis and conclusion provided by the licensee in its June 9, 1989 submittal.

The proposed change does not:

(1) Involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

FSAR Sections 9.4.5 and 6.2.5 provide discussion regarding drywell cooling system and combustible gas control in containment respectively. Both Sections have been reviewed for impact.

This modification will improve the capability of the Drywell Atmosphere Recirculation and Cooling System. The safety-related function of the system, that is, hydrogen mixing following LOCA, is not changed except recirculation fans 2V418 A&B, instead of unit cooler fans 2V415 A&B, will provide the air mixing in the CRD undervessel area. Fan motor horse power is reduced to 5/2.5 hp from the present 10/5 hp. However, air flow capability of fans 2V418 A&B is the same as that of fans in 2V415 A&B. This will provide for same hydrogen mixing capability.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. The change is in accordance with existing design criteria and will not adversely affect the function of any system. Electrical separation, seismic integrity and all other design criteria will be met.

(3) Involve a reduction in the margin of safety. Technical Specification Bases discussed in Sections 3/4.6.1.7, "Drywell Average Air Temperature"; 3/4.6.6, "Primary Containment Atmosphere Control"; and 3/4.6.4, "Electrical Equipment Protective Devices"; have been reviewed for impact.

This change will improve the capability of the Drywell Atmosphere Recirculation and Cooling System to maintain the drywell atmosphere average temperature below the requirement of Technical Specification Section 3/4.6.1.7.

Based on the above considerations, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes involve 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, 2300 N Street NW., Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-388
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,
Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 16, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed request involves changes to Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES) Unit 2 Technical Specifications

in support of Cycle 4 operations. Specifically, changes to the following areas of Technical Specifications are requested.

- Index
- Safety Limits (B.2.1)
- Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (3/4.2.1 and B3/4.2.1)
- APRM Setpoints (3/4.2.2 and B3/4.2.2)
- Minimum Critical Power Ratio (3/4.2.3 and B3/4.2.3)
- Linear Heat Generation Rate (3/4.2.4)
- Recirculation System (3/4.4.1 and B3/4.4.1)
- Fuel Assemblies (5.3.1)

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; (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 licensee's request and concurs with the following basis and conclusion provided by the licensee in its June 16, 1989 submittal.

The following three questions are addressed for each of the proposed Technical Specification changes:

I. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

II. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

III. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

- Specification 3/4.2.1, Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate

The changes to this specification are editorial in nature in that they reflect the removal of the remaining General Electric (GE) fuel from the SSES Unit 2 core.

I. No. The changes to this specification and its associated figures are solely due to the fact that no GE fuel will reside in the Unit 2 Cycle 4 (U2C4) core. Therefore, the specification is written to address the limits for ANF 9X9 fuel, the only fuel type in the U2C4 core. The deletion of the footnote referencing single loop operation (SLO) is due to the fact that the MAPLHGR limits for ANF fuel do not change for SLO. None of these editorial changes have any impact on safety analyses.

II. No. See I above.

III. No. See I above.

- Specification 3/4.2.2, APRM Setpoints

The changes to this specification are editorial in nature in that they reflect the removal of the remaining GE fuel from the SSES Unit 2 core.

I. No. The changes to this specification are solely due to the fact that no GE fuel will reside in the U2C4 core. The definition of "T" for GE fuel is therefore deleted. This editorial change has no impact on any safety analysis.

II. No. See I above.

III. No. See I above.

- Specification 3/4.2.3, Minimum Critical Power Ratio

The changes to this specification provide new operating limit MCPR curves based on cycle-specific transient analyses.

I. No. Limiting core-wide transients were evaluated with ANF's CONTRANSA code... and this output was utilized by the XCOBRA-T methodology (see Summary Report Reference 20) to determine delta CPRs. Both CONTRANSA and XCOBRA-T have been approved by the NRC in previous license amendments. All core-wide transients were analyzed deterministically (i.e., using bounding values as input parameters).

Two local events, Rod Withdrawal Error and Fuel Loading Error, were analyzed in accordance with the methods described in XN-NF-80-19 (A) Vol. 1.... This methodology has been approved by the NRC.

Based on the above, the methodology used to develop the new operating limit MCPRs for the Technical Specifications does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

II. No. The methodology described can only be evaluated for its effect on the consequences of analyzed events; it cannot create new ones. The consequences of analyzed events were evaluated in I above.

III. No. As stated in I above, and in greater detail in the attached Reload Summary Report, the methodology used to evaluate core-wide and local transients is consistent with previously approved methods and meets all pertinent regulatory criteria for use in this application.

Based on the above, the use of the methodology used to produce the U2C4 MCPR operating limits will not result in any decrease in any margin of safety.

- Specification 3/4.2.4, Linear Heat Generation Rate

All proposed changes to this specification are editorial.

I. No. The proposed changes simply remove all references to GE fuel. This has no impact on safety since it is entirely administrative in nature.

II. No. See I above.

III. No. See I above.

- Specification 3/4.4.1, Recirculation System (Two Loop Operation)

The changes to this specification reflect cycle specific stability analysis and the extrapolation of the limit presented in figure 3.4.1.1.1-1, Thermal Power/Core Flow Limitations, to rated power conditions.

I. No. The 55 million lbs/hr. optional limit proposed for deletion is an administrative change. It was included as a quick reference for the operator in order to assure he was within the flow limit in the figure. The actual limit is provided by the figure, which remains, but has been revised for Cycle 4 operation.

COTRAN core stability calculations performed for U2C4 predict stable reactor operation outside of the detect and suppress region of operation in SSES Unit 2. The detect and suppress region is conservatively defined by the area above and to the left of the 80% Rod line, the 45% constant flow line, and the line connecting the 68% Power/45% Flow, 73.25% Power/50% Flow points extrapolated to 100% Rated Core Thermal Power.

Operation below, to the right of, or on the boundary of this region is supported by COTRAN calculations which result in decay ratios of less than or equal to 0.75 as required by the NRC SER on COTRAN.... This region is slightly larger than the region previously approved for SSES Unit 2. The results of this analysis are presented in Summary Report Reference 4. PP&L has also developed administrative controls to comply with NRC Bulletin 88-07, Supplement 1....

In addition to the detect and suppress region definition, PP&L has performed stability tests in SSES Unit 2 during initial startup of Cycles 2 and 3 to demonstrate stable reactor operation with ANF 9x9 fuel. The test results for U2C2.... show very low decay ratios with a core containing 324 ANF 9x9 fuel assemblies.

Extrapolation of the figure to rated conditions was conservatively implemented to ensure that decay ratio boundaries for the entire U2C4 operating region were provided.

Based on the above, operation within the limits specified by the proposed changes and PP&L's administrative controls will ensure that the probability and consequences of unstable operation will not increase.

II. No. The methodology described above can only be evaluated for its effect on the consequences of unstable operation; it cannot create new events. The consequences were evaluated in I above.

III. No. The methodology used to determine the regions of potentially unstable operation and stable operation is based on the guidance provided in the NRC SER for COTRAN. Also, PP&L has implemented administrative controls to assure compliance with NRC Bulletin 88-07, Supplement 1. This along with the tests and analyses described in I above assures SSES Unit 2 complies with General Design Criteria 12, Suppression of Reactor Power Oscillations. Therefore, the proposed change will not result in any decrease in safety margin.

- Specification 3/4.4.1, Recirculation System (Single Loop Operation)

I. No. The original GE SLO analysis required the adjustment of APRM scram, APRM Rod block, and Rod Block Monitor setpoints in SLO to bound changes in the assumed drive flow to core flow relationship between two loop and single loop operation. The GE analysis indicated that the two loop to single loop change is typically less than 7% drive flow for a given core flow. SSES-specific data taken by PP&L indicates that an 8.5% drive flow change would bound differences between two loop and single loop operation. Therefore, Specifications 3.4.1.1.2a.2.4 and 6 incorporate setpoint adjustments to account for this 8.5% change.

Specification a.3 is revised to delete MAPLHGR as a "revised specification limit."

This is an administrative change. LOCA analyses performed by ANF..... indicated that the two loop MAPLHGR limits are applicable to SLO for ANF fuel. The limits for GE fuel are deleted since GE fuel is no longer in the Unit 2 core.

Specification a.5 is revised to delete the 1.37 Cycle 3 limit which was provided based on a PP&L decision to conservatively treat the Recirculation Pump Seizure Accident as an anticipated operational occurrence for which a delta CPR had to be determined. For Cycle 4, PP&L has decided to treat the pump seizure event as an accident, consistent with the guidance of the Standard Review Plan. Therefore, this change in approach will continue to ensure compliance with NRC guidance.

Changes to 3.4.1.1.2b and c, Actions c and e, Surveillance 4.4.1.1.2.2, and Figure 3.4.1.1.2-1 reflect the replacement of the Thermal Power Limitations figure for SLO with a reference to the two-loop figure. This is because the core stability analysis results have been determined to be applicable for both single and two loop operation.....

Based on the above, appropriate limits have been proposed to assure that operation under single loop conditions will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

II. No. The revised APRM setpoints are based on actual data which renders them more restrictive. Application of the two loop MAPLHGR limits, MCPFR limits, and stability boundaries as specified for SLO is based on NRC approved methods. Neither these nor the supporting editorial changes can create the potential for a new event.

III. No. As stated in II above, the new APRM setpoints are more restrictive and more accurate and therefore cannot result in a significant reduction in safety margin. The other changes are based on analyses which ensure that no significant reduction in safety margin has occurred based on their inputs, applied conservatisms, and calculational methodologies as documented in this proposal.

• Specification 5.3.1. Fuel Assemblies

The proposed changes are editorial in nature in that they reflect the removal of the remaining GE fuel from the Unit 2 core.

I. No. The changes to this specification are wholly editorial. The reference to 62 rods applied only to GE 8x8 fuel bundles, which will not reside in the U2C4 core. References to the initial core loading are unnecessary and are proposed to be deleted. Based on their editorial nature, the proposed changes cannot involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

II. No. See I above.

III. No. See I above.

Based on the above considerations, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes involve 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, 2300 N Street NW.,
Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Walter R.
Butler

Pennsylvania Power and Light
Company, Docket No. 50-388
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,
Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 16,
1989

Description of amendment request:
The amendment request proposes to delete valves and a footnote from Table 3.6.3-1, "Primary Containment Isolation Valves", and a paragraph in Bases Section 3/4.6.2 related to the valves being deleted.

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; (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 licensee's request and concurs with the following basis and conclusion provided by the licensee in its June 16, 1989 submittal.

I. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

As stated previously (See licensee's June 16, 1989 application), a decision was made to cancel the RHR waterhammer backpressure control valve modification based upon reduced SRV leakage and improved suppression pool temperature measuring methods. The improvements noted reduce the frequency and duration of cycles that the RHR system operates in suppression pool cooling to within the design basis as stated in the FSAR. Therefore, the deletion of the proposed valves (HV-25129 A&B) from Table 3.6.3-1 does not affect the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Since the waterhammer modification is being cancelled, the deletion of the revised Section B 3/4.6.2 is an administrative change.

The moving of valves (HV-251F011 A&B) from Section B (Manual Isolation Valves) of Table 3.6.3-1 to Section C (Other Valves) does not impact the containment isolation function of these valves. Therefore this change is administrative in nature.

The removal of the HV-251F011 A&B and HV-251F026 A&B valves from Table 3.8.4.2.1-1

is due to the fact that they are no longer motor operated and therefore are not required to have thermal overload protection.

II. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. Since improvements have been made to the plant, and the RHR system operates within the design bases as stated in the FSAR, the deletion of the proposed valves does not create any new concerns. The removal of the revised Bases section and the rearrangement of valves on Table 3.6.3-1 are administrative changes and do not create new concerns.

Since the power from valves HV-E11-2F011 A&B and HV-E11-2F026 A&B is removed and leakage requirements for containment integrity and isolation do not change, no new concerns are created by this proposal.

III. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Since the RHR system functions within the design basis, the overall safety margin is not reduced by not installing the proposed valves. The deletion of the Bases section and the revision to Table 3.6.3-1 are administrative changes and do not reduce the margin of safety. Since the containment isolation and integrity are assured to the same relevant criteria as discussed previously, the overall safety margin has not been reduced due to the proposed changes to Table 3.8.4.2.1-1.

Based on the above considerations, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes involve 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, 2300 N Street NW.,
Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Walter R.
Butler

Pennsylvania Power and Light
Company, Docket No. 50-388
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,
Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 19,
1989

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment request consists of a one time waiver of the requirements of Technical Specification Section 4.0.2.b and would permit exceeding the 3.25 year combined interval for 3 consecutive surveillance intervals.

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; (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 licensee's request and concurs with the following basis and conclusion provided by the licensee in its June 19, 1989 submittal.

I. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The 3.25 surveillance interval extension criteria of Technical Specification 4.0.2 was not taken credit for in the evaluation of the probability or severity of events analyzed in the plant accident analysis (FSAR Chapter 15).

Additionally, the 18 month refuel interval was originally chosen to correspond to expected operating cycle length such that these surveillances would be performed during the shutdown period (Reference Generic Letter 83-27). Since no technical basis is specified for the 18 month interval other than conformance with expected operating cycle length, deleting the 3.25 requirements for Unit 2 18 month surveillances on a one time basis does not involve a significant decrease in the effectiveness of the monitoring provision. Generic Letter 83-27 indicates that this is acceptable to the Staff "... for plant-specific conditions where adequate justification is given."

II. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated since the refuel surveillance interval will still be constrained by the maximum 1.25 interval extension criteria of Technical Specification 4.0.2.

III. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Deletion on a one-time basis of the requirement for three consecutive surveillance intervals not exceeding 3.25 times the interval from the refueling interval for Unit 2 18 month surveillances will not significantly effect equipment reliability. The current criteria allows a 22.5 month interval. By virtue of Technical Specification 4.0.2.a, the staff has already accepted that a 22.5 month interval will provide a sufficient level of protection.

Based on the above considerations, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes involve 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, 2300 N Street NW.,

Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-388
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,
Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 22, 1989

Description of amendment request: The amendment request proposes changes to Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES) Unit 1 Technical Specifications to correct errors in figures for MCPR values introduced as a result of the licensee's analysis in support of Amendment No. 90, dated May 15, 1989 and to incorporate some editorial changes. The licensee states it determined an error in its interpretation of licensing analysis of end-of-cycle reactor pump trip (EOC-RPT) event and found that Figure 3.2.3-1 and 3.2.3-2 should reflect minimum MCPR value of 1.43 instead of 1.42 requested in its February 2, 1989 request for Technical Specification changes to support Unit 1 Cycle 5 (U1C5) operation.

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; (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 licensee's request and concurs with the following basis and conclusion provided by the licensee in its June 22, 1989 submittal.

I. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

As stated previously, the results provided in the analysis supporting U1C5 are correct. Therefore, the analytical methodology used to develop delta CPRs, which was previously approved by the NRC, is not in question. The proposed change corrects an error in converting the analytical results to the MCPR operating limit curve when EOC-RPT is inoperable. Correction of this error results in a more restrictive limit at end-of-cycle; this will not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The increased application of Figure 3.2.3-1 from 40% to 30% total core flow is the result

of a more accurate definition of the SSES Unit 1 two pump minimum speed operating line. The change to include 30% total core flow was performed to ensure an operating limit was provided which bounds the redefined line. This will not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The changes to Specification 3.2.1 (APLHGR), 3.2.4 (LHGR), and 3.4.1.1.2 (SLO) are all editorial changes which reflect the removal of all GE fuel from the SSES Unit 1 core. Specification 3.2.1 is revised to remove an unnecessary reference to ANF fuel, and to remove a cross-reference footnote to SLO since this limit will no longer change for SLO. Specification 3.2.4 also deletes unnecessary references to ANF fuel. Finally, Specification 3.4.1.1.2 deletes the reference to MAPLHGR, because it no longer represents a "revised specification limit" during SLO. All of these changes are editorial in nature, and can therefore have no impact on any previous safety analysis.

II. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

As discussed in I above, the methodology used to develop the delta CPRs that form the basis for the MCPR figures is correct as approved by the NRC for U1C5. The correction proposed will ensure proper limits based on the methodology; it cannot create a new event. The increased flow range for Figure 3.2.3-1 is the result of more accurate information as to the location of the two pump minimum speed line. Addition of this new lower limit ensures proper restrictions for this flow range; it cannot create a new event. The editorial changes, by nature, cannot create new events.

III. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The two changes to the MCPR figures provide corrections based on more accurate information. The change to the MCPR curves with EOC-RPT inoperable results in a more restrictive minimum limit. The increased flow range in Figure 3.2.3-1 results in a limit that was previously not provided. The rest of the changes are editorial in nature. None of the above changes will result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

Based on the above considerations, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes involve 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, 2300 N Street NW., Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-388
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,
Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: June 23, 1989

Description of amendment request:
The amendment request proposes changes to Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES) Unit 2 Technical Specifications to incorporate the interim NRC requirements as outlined in Bulletin 88-07, Supplement 1, "Power Oscillations in Boiling Water Reactors (BWRs)". The revisions will replace the existing Technical Specifications requirements to detect and suppress power oscillations and to clarify Actions and Surveillance requirements. Specifically, the licensee has proposed the following changes.

• Specification 3.4.1.1.1: Rewrite the LCO statement to read as follows:

3.4.1.1.1 Two reactor coolant system recirculation loops shall be in operation with the reactor at a THERMAL POWER/core flow condition outside of Regions I and II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1.

Add Footnote "+" to OPERATIONAL CONDITION 2 in the APPLICABILITY.

Replace ACTIONS a, b, and c with the following new actions:

a. In OPERATIONAL CONDITION 1:

1. With:

a) No reactor coolant system recirculation loops in operation, or
b) Region I of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1 entered, or
c) Region II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1 entered and core thermal hydraulic instability occurring as evidenced by:

1) Two or more APRM readings oscillating with at least one oscillating greater than or equal to 10% of RATED THERMAL POWER peak-to-peak, or

2) Two or more LPRM upscale alarms activating and deactivating with a 1 to 5 second period, or

3) Observation of a sustained LPRM oscillation of greater than 10w/cm² peak-to-peak with a 1 to 5 second period, or

d) Region II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1 entered and less than 50% of the required LPRM upscale alarms OPERABLE, immediately place the reactor mode switch in the shutdown position.

2. If Region II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1 is entered and greater than or equal to 50% of the required LPRM upscale alarms OPERABLE, immediately exit the region by:

a) Inserting a predetermined set of high worth control rods, or

b) Increasing core flow.

3. With less than 50% of the required LPRM upscale alarms OPERABLE, follow ACTION a.1.d upon entry into Region II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1.

b. In OPERATIONAL CONDITION 2 with no reactor coolant system recirculation loops in operation, return at least one reactor coolant system recirculation loop to operation, or be in HOT SHUTDOWN within the next 6 hours.

c. With any pump discharge valve not OPERABLE, remove the associated loop from operation, close the valve and comply with the requirements of Specification 3.4.1.1.2.

d. With any pump discharge bypass valve not OPERABLE, close the valve and verify closed at least once per 31 days.

• Footnote "****": Delete.

• Footnote "+": Add new Footnote to read as follows:

The LPRM upscale alarms are not required to be OPERABLE to meet this specification in OPERATIONAL CONDITION 2.

• Specification 4.4.1.1.1.2: Delete the requirement.

• Specification 4.4.1.1.1.3: Redesignate this Specification as 4.4.1.1.1.2.

• Specification 4.4.1.1.1.4: Replace the existing requirement with the following:

4.4.1.1.1.3 At least 50% of the required LPRM upscale alarms shall be determined OPERABLE by performance of the following on each LPRM upscale alarm:

1) CHANNEL FUNCTIONAL TEST at least once per 92 days, and

2) CHANNEL CALIBRATION at least once per 184 days.

• Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1: Replace with new figure entitled "Thermal Power Restrictions".

• Specification 3.4.1.1.2: Revise the introductory part of the LCO statement to read as follows:

3.4.1.1.2 One reactor coolant recirculation loop shall be in operation with the pump speed [less than or equal to] 80% of the rated pump speed, and the reactor at a THERMAL POWER/core flow condition outside of Regions I and II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1, and ...
Also, delete 3.4.1.1.2 b and c. (Other changes to page 3/4 4-1c are provided for information only; they were previously provided in the referenced proposed amendment.)

Add Footnote "+" to OPERATIONAL CONDITION 2 in the APPLICABILITY.

Delete ACTIONS a, c, and e and add the following new actions:

a. In OPERATIONAL CONDITION 1:

1. With:

a) No reactor coolant system recirculation loops in operation, or

b) Region I of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1 entered, or

c) Region II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1 entered and core thermal hydraulic instability occurring as evidenced by:

1) Two or more APRM readings oscillating with at least one oscillating greater than or equal to 10% of RATED THERMAL POWER peak-to-peak, or

2) Two or more LPRM upscale alarms activating and deactivating with a 1 to 5 second period, or

3) Observation of a sustained LPRM oscillation of greater than 10w/cm² peak-to-peak with a 1 to 5 second period, or

d) Region II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1 entered and less than 50% of the required LPRM upscale alarms OPERABLE, immediately place the reactor mode switch in the shutdown position.

2. If Region II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1 is entered and greater than or equal to 50% of the required LPRM upscale alarms OPERABLE, immediately exit the region by:

a) inserting a predetermined set of high worth control rods, or

b) increasing core flow by increasing the speed of the operating recirculation pump.

3. With less than 50% of the required LPRM upscale alarms OPERABLE, follow ACTION a.1.d upon entry into Region II of Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1.

b. In OPERATIONAL CONDITION 2 with no reactor coolant system recirculation loops in operation, return at least one reactor coolant system recirculation loop to operation, or be in HOT SHUTDOWN within the next 6 hours.

e. With any pump discharge valve not OPERABLE, remove the associated loop from operation, close the valve and verify closed at least once per 31 days.

f. With any pump discharge bypass valve not OPERABLE, close the valve and verify closed at least once per 31 days.

Redesignate current ACTION b as c.

• Specification 4.4.1.1.2.2: Replace the existing requirement with the following:

4.4.1.1.2.2 At least 50% of the required LPRM upscale alarms shall be determined OPERABLE by performance of the following on each LPRM upscale alarm:

1) CHANNEL FUNCTIONAL TEST at least once per 92 days, and

2) CHANNEL CALIBRATION at least once per 184 days.

• Specification 4.4.1.1.2.4: Delete and renumber accordingly.

• Specification 4.4.1.1.2.6: Delete and renumber accordingly.

• Specification 4.4.1.1.2.8: Delete and renumber accordingly.

• Footnote "****": Delete.

• Footnote "+": Add new Footnote to read as follows:

The LPRM upscale alarms are not required to be OPERABLE to meet this specification in OPERATIONAL CONDITION 2.

• Figure 3.4.1.1.2-1: Delete.

• Specification 3.4.1.4b: Revise to read as follows:

When only one loop has been idle, unless the temperature differential between the reactor coolant within the idle and operating recirculation loops is less than or equal to 50° F, the operating loop flow rate is less than or equal to 50% of rated loop flow and the reactor is operating at a THERMAL POWER/core flow condition below the 80% Rod Line shown in Figure 3.4.1.1.1-1.

The Index and Bases sections have been updated on the marked-up pages consistent with the above described changes.

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; (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 licensee's request and concurs with the following basis and conclusion provided by the licensee in its June 23, 1989 submittal.

The following three questions are addressed below for each of the proposed Technical Specification changes:

I. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

II. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

III. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

• Specification 3/4.4.1.1.1, Recirculation Loops - Two Loop Operation

This specification has been revised to replace the existing stability controls on the recirculation system with (at a minimum) those recommended in NRC Bulletin 88-07, Supplement 1.

I. No. The changes to the LCO provide the appropriate limits to ensure that proper actions are taken if SSES Unit 2 is operating in a region of the power/flow map where an instability is more likely to occur. The boundaries of these regions are based upon NRC approved limits for ANF methodology.

Action a is deleted as an editorial change; its purpose as a cross reference is adequately covered by the Applicability sections for the two-loop and single-loop specifications.

New Action a.1 requires when operating in Operational Condition 1 an immediate manual scram if operation in natural circulation occurs, if Region I of the new Figure "Thermal Power Restrictions" is entered, if power range monitoring instrumentation exhibits evidence of instability or if Region II of the Figure is entered and inadequate instability monitoring capability is available. These actions will ensure that the MCPFR Safety Limit is not violated, so that an increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated will not occur.

Action a.2 requires an immediate exit of Region II if entered. This is consistent with the Bulletin, and does not require an immediate scram because no indications of power oscillation have occurred. Action a.3 is provided simply to avoid entry into Specification 3.0.3 should new Surveillance 4.4.1.1.1.4 be failed. It is not appropriate for any more restrictive requirements to be applied to these alarms when the unit is operating outside Regions I and II.

New Action b reflects the current requirements associated with natural circulation operation in Operational Condition 2 and clarifies that a recirculation loop may be attempted to be returned to service during the allowed outage time. This change is an administrative clarification.

New Actions c and d incorporate actions that previously appeared as Surveillance Requirements. This transfer is proposed in

order to avoid invoking Specification 3.0.3 due to the lack of a specific action if the pump discharge or bypass valves failed. These "new" actions and the associated deletion of Surveillance Requirement 4.4.1.1.1.1 are entirely administrative in nature.

New Footnote "+" was added to clarify that the LPRM upscale alarms are not required to be operable in Operational Condition 2 since an instability event is not a concern at low power levels.

Existing Surveillance 4.4.1.1.1.4 is deleted since a baseline noise level will no longer be used to detect and suppress power oscillations. The new surveillance is provided to ensure operability of the newly required LPRM upscale alarms, and frequencies of testing were chosen based on NRC approved methods for determining surveillance intervals for similar instrumentation (ref. GE NEDC 30851P-A).

Based on the above, none of the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The stability related changes are consistent with current NRC guidance and approved analytical methods where applicable, and the transferring of certain surveillances to actions will preclude unnecessary shutdowns due to Specification 3.0.3.

II. No. The proposed changes relating to stability use the current guidance contained in NRC Bulletin 88-07 Supplement 1, which will ensure that a new or different kind of event will not occur. They accomplish this by requiring reactor scrams in unstable regions and additional instability detection capability.

The editorial changes shifting Surveillance Requirements to Actions cannot create a new event.

III. No. See I above. The stability changes are designed to protect the margin of safety to the MCPFR Safety Limit. The editorial changes improve safety margin by precluding unnecessary plant shutdowns.

• Specification 3/4.4.1.1.2, Recirculation Loops - Single Loop Operation

This specification has been revised to replace the existing stability controls on the recirculation system with (at a minimum) those recommended in NRC Bulletin 88-07, Supplement 1.

I. No. The changes to the LCO provide the appropriate limits to ensure that proper actions are taken if SSES Unit 2 is operating in a region of the power/flow map where an instability is more likely to occur. The boundaries of these regions are based upon NRC approved limits for ANF methodology.

Action a is deleted as an editorial change; its purpose as a cross reference is adequately covered by the new Actions a and b.

New Action a.1 requires an immediate manual scram when operating in Operational Condition 1 if operation in natural circulation occurs, if Region I of the new Figure "Thermal Power Restrictions" is entered, if power range monitoring instrumentation exhibits evidence of instability, or if Region II of the Figure is entered and inadequate instability monitoring capability is available. These actions will ensure that the MCPFR

Safety Limit is not violated, so that an increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated will not occur.

Action a.2 requires an immediate exit of Region II if entered. This is consistent with the Bulletin, and does not require an immediate scram simply because no indications of power oscillation have occurred. This action does not allow the start of a recirculation loop to exit Region II. Action a.3 is provided simply to avoid entry into Specification 3.0.3 should new Surveillance 4.4.1.1.2.2 be failed. It is not appropriate for any more restrictive requirements to be applied to these alarms when the unit is operating outside Regions I and II.

New Action b reflects the current requirements associated with natural circulation operation in Operational Condition 2.

New Actions c and f incorporate actions that previously appeared as Surveillance Requirements. This transfer is proposed in order to avoid invoking Specification 3.0.3 due to the lack of a specific action if the pump discharge or bypass valves failed. These "new" actions and the associated deletion of Surveillance Requirements 4.4.1.1.2.6 and 4.4.1.1.2.8 are entirely administrative in nature.

New Footnote "+" was added to clarify that the LPRM upscale alarms are not required to be operable in Operational Condition 2 since an instability event is not a concern at low power levels.

The revision to existing Action b is purely editorial in nature.

Existing Actions c and e and Surveillance 4.4.1.1.2.2 are deleted since a baseline noise level will no longer be used to detect and suppress power oscillations. The new actions and surveillance are provided to ensure operability of the newly required LPRM upscale alarms, and frequencies of testing were chosen based on NRC approved methods for determining surveillance intervals for similar instrumentation (ref. GE NEDC 30851P-A).

Based on the above, none of the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The stability related changes are consistent with current NRC guidance and approved analytical methods where applicable, and the transferring of certain surveillances to actions will preclude unnecessary shutdowns due to Specification 3.0.3.

II. No. The proposed changes relating to stability use the current guidance contained in NRC Bulletin 88-07 Supplement 1 to ensure that an unanalyzed event will not occur. They accomplish this by requiring reactor scrams in unstable regions, additional instability detection capability, and precluding a recirculation pump start during single loop operation in a potentially unstable region of the power/flow map.

The editorial changes shifting Surveillance Requirements to Actions cannot create a new event.

III. No. See I above. The stability changes are designed to protect the margin of safety to MCPFR Safety Limit. The editorial changes

improve safety margin by precluding unnecessary plant shutdowns.

• **Specification 3.4.1.4, Idle Recirculation Loop Startup**

Action has been revised to clarify the thermal power/core flow condition where an idle recirculation loop can be started.

I. No. This requirement is consistent with new Action a.2 of Specification 3.4.1.1.2, Single Loop Operation which was reviewed above. The requirement to preclude a recirculation pump start in a potentially unstable region of the power/flow map will ensure that a new or different kind of event will not occur, and is consistent with the guidance in NRC Bulletin 88-07 Supplement 1.

II. No. See I above.

III. No. See I above.

Based on the above considerations, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes involve 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, 2300 N Street NW., Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Docket No. 50-277, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit No. 2, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: May 15, 1989

Description of amendment request: The licensee requests that the Technical Specifications be modified to reflect the results of material analyses conducted as part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary material surveillance program pursuant to 10 CFR 50, Appendix G and Appendix H. The requested changes will alter the reactor vessel pressure-temperature operating limits. Miscellaneous administrative changes are also proposed.

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; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3)

involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The licensee has provided a discussion of the proposed changes as they relate to these standards; the discussion is presented below.

Standard 1: The proposed revisions do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the revised thermal and pressurization limits prohibit conditions where brittle fracture of reactor vessel materials is possible. Consequently, there will be no increase in the probability or consequences of previously evaluated accidents since the primary coolant pressure boundary integrity will be maintained as assumed in the safety design analyses.

The RT_{MDT} used to evaluate the new pressure/temperature limits for the beltline material was based on the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.99, Revision 2, which is the latest guidance on RT_{MDT} determinations. The revised pressure/temperature limits curves were conservatively generated in accordance with the fracture toughness requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix G, as supplemented by Appendix G to Section III of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code. The proposed minimum allowable temperature at which head bolting studs may be under tension is also in accordance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix G, as supplemented by Appendix G to Section III of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code.

Removal of Figure 3.6.4 is of no safety significance because it was for information only and is no longer appropriate.

Standard 2: The proposed revisions do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the revised thermal and pressurization limits do not create any new kind of operating mode or introduce any new potential failure mode. Conditions where brittle fracture of primary coolant pressure boundary materials is possible will be avoided. The proposed changes reduce the conservative margin that was incorporated into the development of the current limits. The current limits have been shown by review of material characteristics and by more recent and more accurate tests and analyses to be overly restrictive.

Standard 3: The proposed revisions do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed pressure/temperature limits still provide sufficient safety margin. The revised pressure/temperature limits, although less restrictive than the current limits, were established in accordance with current regulations and the latest regulatory guidance on RT_{MDT} determinations. Thus, the proposed changes merely reduce overconservative limits to acceptable limits. Because operation will be within these limits, the reactor vessel materials will behave in a non-brittle manner, thus, preserving the original safety design bases.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis.

Accordingly, the Commission has proposed to determine that the above changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The licensee also proposes certain administrative changes to the technical Specification pages involved with the changes discussed above. These administrative changes include rewording TS 3.6.A.3 to more accurately describe the vessel materials and appertinances involved, revision of the "neutron flux specimen" terminology on TS 4.6.A.2 to "surveillance specimen", revisions to TS page 144 to reflect removal of a surveillance capsule, deletion of referral to a figure that is proposed to be removed, addition of Figure 3.6.5 to the list on TS page iv(a), revision of the Bases and other changes of a formatting and typographical nature. The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the criteria for no significant hazards consideration determination by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (51 FR 7751). These examples include: Example (i) "A purely administrative change to technical specification: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, corrections of an error, or a change in nomenclature." These proposed changes are examples of such administrative changes and since these proposed changes are encompassed by an example for which no significant hazard exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that it involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for Licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr. 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20006.

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

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

Date of amendment request: May 31, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Low Pressure Coolant Injection (LPCI) System surveillance test requirements to reflect the Recirculation System loop selection logic modification installed during the Reload 1/Cycle 2 refueling outage. Other changes to

various surveillance test requirements throughout the Technical Specifications (TS) would, where appropriate, replace the term "demonstrate" with the term "verify" so that each term is used consistently according to stated guidelines. The effect would be to reduce the need for redundant and unnecessary tests when related equipment is made or found to be inoperable.

The proposed change to reflect the loop selection modification would affect Specification 4.5.A.3 by replacing the LPCI test criteria which states that "three Residual Heat Removal (RHR) pumps shall deliver at least 23,100 gpm against a system head corresponding to a reactor vessel pressure of 20 psig" with the criteria which states that "each RHR pump shall deliver at least 9,900 gpm against a system head corresponding to a reactor vessel to primary containment differential pressure of greater than or equal to 20 psid." Other related changes would affect Specifications 3.5.A.3, 4.5.A.2, 4.5.A.3.a, 4.5.A.3.b, 3.5.A.3.1 and 3.5.A.3.2 to reflect the change from the "LPCI mode" concept to the division of the LPCI system into two subsystems which then incorporate actions which would be necessary if one of these subsystems is made or found to be inoperable. Thus, the criteria is similar to the Core Spray System/Subsystem criteria, Limiting Conditions for Operation, and Surveillance Test Requirements. No system changes are required.

The other proposed change, the appropriateness of replacing the word "demonstrate" with the word "verify," was evaluated throughout the TS. Where a specification requires testing at a specific frequency or the intent is clearly to require performance of an actual test to determine component or system operability, no TS change was proposed and the word "demonstrate" is retained. However, if the TS criteria is such that operability could be determined by ensuring that the associated surveillance tests have been performed with satisfactory results within the specified time interval, the term "verify" is proposed. For example, Specification 4.10.D.1.b requires a shutdown margin demonstration when two control rods are withdrawn from the reactor core for maintenance. Since the intent of the requirement is to perform a test, no change was made (demonstration was retained). In contrast, if a subsystem or component is inoperable, the proposed change would delete the requirement to actually perform a test of redundant systems or

equipment to prove operability if the surveillance tests have been performed within the required test interval (verify is used). This change does not affect the existing normal surveillance testing requirements, nor does it affect the testing performed when equipment is returned to service from an inoperable condition.

Other proposed changes would incorporate related modifications to various Bases sections where needed. Also, Bases 4.5 would be modified to eliminate the discussion concerning required testing which is based on the degree of operability and nature of the reason for out of service equipment. This would be replaced with: "Consistent with the definition of operable in Section 4.0.C, demonstrate means conduct a test to show; verify means that the associated surveillance activities have been satisfactorily performed within the specified time interval."

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration 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 previously evaluated; or (3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has evaluated the proposed amendment against the standards provided above and has made the following determination:

A. LPCI Pump Flow Surveillance

Operation of the FitzPatrick Plant in accordance with the proposed Amendment would not involve a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10 CFR 50.92 since it would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the technical specification changes are administrative in nature.

The new minimum allowable LPCI (RHR) pump flows are the same values used in the current licensing reload analyses. No accidents as analyzed in the FSAR (Final Safety Analysis Report) are adversely affected by these changes.

The LPCI modifications associated with these changes improved the overall reliability of the LPCI system. These changes update plant modifications that have already been reviewed and approved by the NRC in Operating License Amendments 8, 14 and 30.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the changes are administrative in nature. The minimum LPCI pump flows proposed in this application are the same as used in recent licensing reload analyses. LPCI's ability to mitigate a loss of coolant accident has been improved through the elimination of the most limiting equipment failure.

3. Involve a significant reduction in margin of safety because the changes are administrative. Analyses reviewed and approved by the NRC clearly show that the associated LPCI loop-selection-logic modification improve LPCI's ability to perform its intended function and therefore the margin of safety.

B. Demonstrate/Verify Terminology

Operation of the FitzPatrick Plant in accordance with the proposed Amendment would not involve a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10 CFR 50.92 since it would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. This change is administrative in nature; it improves consistency within the Technical Specifications and with the NRC established positions on equipment operability. No accidents as analyzed the FSAR are adversely affected by these changes since these changes do not involve a modification to the plant or Operating Procedures.

The effectiveness of surveillance testing has not been reduced by these changes. The actual reduction in test frequency is not significant. Verification is adequate to assure that the system is capable of performing its intended function. Less frequent tests will reduce wear and tear on components and will reduce the probability of inadvertently leaving the tested system misaligned.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the change is administrative. No modifications to the structures, systems or components are associated with these changes. Minor changes to plant operating procedures may be required to reflect this definition of operable.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because no modifications to any plant structures, systems or components are associated with these changes. Minor changes to plant operating procedures may be required to reflect this definition of operable.

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

Local Public Document Room

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

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

Public Service Company Colorado,
Docket No. 50-267, Fort St. Vrain
Nuclear Generating Station, Weld
County, Colorado

Date of amendment request: June 9, 1989

Description of amendment request:
This amendment request addresses early shutdown of Fort St. Vrain. It prohibits the plant from being operated in the power mode after June 30, 1990.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:
The licensee has submitted a no significant hazards consideration analysis in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Parts 50.91 and 50.92. The licensee's analysis of significant hazards considerations follows:

This amendment request is prompted by NRC letter, Heitner to Williams, dated 04/19/89 (G-89137). That letter advised PSC of the need for an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-34; to wit: "The licensee is not authorized to operate the reactor (above 5 percent of full power) for electric power production after June 30, 1990." PSC proposes a modification to the NRC's suggested amendment statement to reflect a more conservative 2% power restriction after shutdown.

The proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration because operation of FSV in accordance with this change would not:

1. involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The early shutdown of Fort St. Vrain will not adversely affect any plant system design or function, nor will it adversely affect safety.
2. create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The early shutdown of Fort St. Vrain will not result in any new failure modes.
3. involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The early shutdown of Fort St. Vrain will have no adverse effects on any margin of safety. Inclusion of this amendment in the license is based on an NRC request.

Additionally, the restriction included in this proposed change prohibiting operation above 2% of full power further avoids any significant hazards consideration. Although PSC does not intend to take the reactor critical after final shutdown, and unforeseen circumstances requiring criticality would be accommodated by the 2% power level restriction. Long term operation at 2% power or any other power level is not being proposed. Remaining below 2% avoids any significant heat being added to the core.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination. Based on the review and

the above discussions, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Greeley Public Library, City Complex Building, Greeley, Colorado

Attorney for licensee: J.K. Tarpey, Public Service Company Building, Room 900, 550 15th Street, Denver, Colorado 80202

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

Public Service Electric & Gas Company,
Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek
Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: June 6, 1989

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would (A) increase the hydrostatic pressure from 1.0 P(a) to 1.10 P(a) for containment isolation valves provided with a water seal from the suppression pool, (B) clearly define as-left penetration leakage for these same valves, and (C) delete an incorrect cross-reference in Section 4.6.1.2.1.

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; (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. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.92 the licensee has reviewed the proposed changes and has concluded as follows that they do not involve a significant hazards consideration:

The proposed changes to the [Hope Creek Generating Station (HCGS)] Technical Specifications:

1. Do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

A. The maximum calculated accident pressure for the drywell is identified in UFSAR Section 6.2.1.1.3.1 as 48.1 psig (P(a)). This pressure is assumed to occur in the event of a design basis accident, a recirculation system line break. UFSAR Section 15.6.5.5.1.2.2 assumes that the radiological consequences associated with such an accident are in part limited by the integrity of the primary containment. Since the subject valves form a part of the primary containment, it is necessary to periodically test their leakage. The proposed change

simply increases the hydrostatic test pressure and does not affect the 10 gpm TS leakage criteria nor alter the TS required actions in the event that such a limit is exceeded. Any leakage associated with the subject valves would still be into a closed system outside primary containment from which leakage is still processed and filtered by the Filtration, Recirculation, and Ventilation System (FRVS) in the Reactor Building prior to discharge to the environment. Again this change does not affect the function of the FRVS nor the leakage criteria from engineered safety features components outside the primary containment.

10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.C.2 requires a hydrostatic test pressure of 110% of the maximum calculated accident pressure. In the case of HCGS, this requirement translates into a test pressure of 52.9 psig. However, the HCGS TS currently only specify a test pressure of 1.0 P(a), 48.1 psig; therefore, a TS change is necessary to comply with Appendix J testing requirements.

From the discussion provided, PSE&G has concluded that the proposed change involves an additional limitation - namely that the subject valves must be capable of withstanding a test pressure 10% greater than that currently required while still only permitted to leak, in total, no more than 10 gpm. Since the proposed change does not affect this leakage criteria nor the actions required in the event the criteria is not met, PSE&G has concluded that the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

B. PSE&G has been and will continue to test and measure the leakage associated with each containment penetration in order to assure that containment integrity is maintained. However, the wording of TS 3.6.1.2.e could be misconstrued to require hydrostatic leakage from each in-series containment isolation valve to be included in the total leakage criteria of 10 gpm. Such an interpretation ignores the fact that leakage associated with such a penetration is calculated using the valve with the highest leakage. Therefore, the proposed change would provide sufficient clarity to correctly permit penetration leakage rates to be used in the 10 gpm leakage criteria. Since this change does not affect the physical condition associated with penetration leakage nor the criteria for total hydrostatic leakage, PSE&G has concluded that the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

C. The proposed change is administrative in nature and does not affect the requirement to demonstrate operability of purge supply and exhaust valves with resilient seals. Therefore, PSE&G has concluded that the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not involve any plant modifications other than the increase in

the test pressure for the subject valves. In addition, the testing configuration is not changing and the results of hydrostatic tests must still meet the 10 gpm leakage criteria stipulated in the TS. The requirements specified in the associated TS Action Statements should leakage exceed the acceptance criteria are not affected by the proposed changes. As a result, PSE&G has concluded that the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes are necessary to: (a) comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, (b) clearly indicate the method of determining total hydrostatic leakage, and (c) correct administrative errors in the TS. As a result, the margin of safety is not compromised by the proposed changes. In the case of the increased test pressure, an additional margin of safety is provided since testing hydrostatically sealed valves at a test pressure 10% greater than the maximum accident pressure provides greater assurance that the maximum leakage expected from the valve(s) will not exceed conditions expected to occur during or following an accident. As a result, PSE&G has concluded that the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

As discussed above, PSE&G has concluded that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications do not involve a significant hazards consideration since the changes (i) do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (ii) do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, and (iii) do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The staff reviewed the licensee's determination that the proposed license amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Accordingly, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Pennsville Public library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, New Jersey 08070

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

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

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

Date of amendment request: June 8, 1989

Description of amendment request: The licensee has proposed to modify the Action Statement of the original request (dated September 12, 1988 and noticed

on February 22, 1989, 54 FR 7645) to require plant shutdown after 30 days with 1, 2, or 3 vent paths inoperable and to require plant shutdown after 72-hours with 4 vent paths inoperable.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The original proposal would have allowed operation of the plant up to 30 days with 4 vent paths inoperable. The new proposal changes the Action Statements to require plant shutdown after 72-hours with 4 vent paths inoperable. The addition of this Action Statement is more conservative and follows more closely the guidance of Generic Letter 83-37.

In the initial request the licensee had determined that the proposed change did not constitute a significant hazards consideration. The staff reviewed the licensee's analysis and concurred with the licensee's determination that the proposed amendment did not involve a significant hazards consideration. The staff had proposed to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration [54 FR 7645 dated February 22, 1989].

The licensee has reviewed the original Significant Hazards Consideration and determined ...

the original Significant Hazards Consideration remains valid and that the proposed changes do not constitute a Significant Hazards Consideration.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and concurs with the licensee's determination that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration and the original significant hazards consideration remains valid. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

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

Date of amendment request: October 16, 1987

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS's) relating to organization of facility staff.

Specifically, the proposed amendment would involve Technical Specification Sections 6.2.2b and 6.2.2c, licensed operator staffing, and Table 6.2-1. (Table 6.2-1 has been deleted per amendment No. 115). The amendment requested that the appropriate Technical Specifications be revised to reflect existing operating procedures which require at least one operator to be in the control panel area when fuel is in the reactor, at least two licensed operators, one of which is a licensed senior operator, to be in the Control Room while the plant is in operational modes 1 thru 4, and at least two senior operators to be onsite while the plant is in modes 1 thru 4. This request is in compliance with the NRC requirement addressed in 10 CFR Part 50.54, paragraphs (m) and (k) which address licensed operator staffing at nuclear power plants.

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

The licensee has provided the following analysis in support of a no significant hazards consideration determination:

The proposed changes would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the addition of the proposed changes increases both the number and qualification requirements of control room operators necessary to satisfy the minimum shift crew requirements. These changes support the likelihood of detecting abnormal events early enough to mitigate potentially adverse conditions.

Also, the proposed changes would not (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because these changes which increase control room staffing requirements do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

Finally, the proposed changes would not (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed

changes increase the control room staffing requirements and, therefore, will not reduce the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's proposed no significant hazards determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis.

Furthermore, the Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of criteria for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration (51 FR 7751). As stated in example (vii), "A change to conform a license 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 associated with this amendment are within the scope of this example.

Accordingly, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes involve no 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, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: John N. Hannon

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: February 2, 1989

Description of Amendment request: The proposed amendment deletes valves RHR-32, RHR-33 and Reactor Head Spray Check Valve 10-29 from Table 4.7.2.b of the Technical Specifications. This table pertains to primary containment isolation valves not subject to Type C leakage tests. RHR-32 and -33 are in a line that is closed off by a blank flange, thus, no longer require surveillance testing. Check Valve 10-29 is in a disconnected line that no longer serves any function.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards determination exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92(c). A proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously

evaluated, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

The removal of the Reactor Vessel Head Spray Valves (RHR-32 and RHR-33) from Table 4.7.2.b of the Technical Specifications will simply remove the requirement to test the valves to ensure they will close if needed to isolate the primary containment. Since the valves are maintained closed and this amendment would remove the requirement to open the valves for these surveillances, further assurance is provided that the valves will remain in their isolated position. The removal of the check valve (10-29) from the Table will ensure continuity in the Technical Specifications in recognizing that the Reactor Head Spray function has been disconnected. Thus, the proposed change does not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Operation of the RHR System is not reduced from existing requirements and is still bounded by the assumptions used in the safety analysis, thus the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any event previously evaluated. Elimination of subject surveillances will remove the requirement to open the motor-operated valves, which will ensure that the integrity of this penetration is maintained at all times. Thus, the proposed change involves no decrease in any plant margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Based on this review, the staff therefore determines that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

Attorney for License: John A. Ritscher, Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Project Director: Richard H. Wessman

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation Docket No. 50-271 Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: April 27, 1989 and June 23, 1989.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would extend the expiration date of the Operating License from December 11, 2007 to March 21, 2012.

Section 103.c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorizes the issuance of facility operating licenses for a period of up to 40 years. The current license term

for the Vermont Yankee facility began with the date of issuance of the construction permit, December 11, 1967, and ends on December 11, 2007. Accounting for the four years and three months required for plant construction, this represents an effective operating license term of only 35 years and 9 months.

Current NRC policy is to issue operating licenses for a 40-year period, commencing with the date of issuance of the operating license. For Vermont Yankee, this date was March 21, 1972. Accordingly, it is proposed that the Vermont Yankee operating license be amended to change the expiration date to March 21, 2012 consistent with current NRC policy and the originally engineered design life of the plant.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92(c). A proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or 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 margin of safety.

The licensee's analyses contained in the April 27, 1989 letter states the following:

The proposed amendment to the Vermont Yankee operating license does not involve any changes in the design or operation of the facility, but instead, only contemplates a change to the expiration date of the current license. This extension is within the range permissible by the Commission's regulations, specifically 10 CFR, Section 50.51. In addition, a finding of no significant hazards consideration is consistent with recent NRC actions on applications of this type. The proposed extension will have no significant impact on the safe operation of the plant or present an undue risk to the health and safety of the public.

The proposed license amendment to permit the 40-year operating life does not constitute a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10 CFR, Section 50.92 for the following reasons:

a. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

Age-related degradation was identified as the only mechanism having potential impact on the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated. Changes in the population size and distribution were identified as the only parameter having

potential impact on previous conclusions concerning the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Conservatism have been incorporated in the design, construction, and operations of the Vermont Yankee facility. Furthermore, programs have been developed and implemented to: (1) evaluate and maintain the service life of structures, systems, and components; (2) conduct technical analyses for verifying the adequacy of structures, systems, and components; and/or (3) allow surveillance, maintenance, and inspection of the facility. Such programs assure that the Vermont Yankee facility will be operated as intended by its design and the Technical Specifications. That is, regardless of the age of the overall facility, these programs assure that the structures, systems, or components will be refurbished and/or replaced to maintain component functional capability and the margins of safety required by the Technical Specifications.

No changes to the above programs are necessary for assuring that during the proposed amendment term, Vermont Yankee continues to perform as intended by its design and Technical Specifications. Therefore, the proposed amendment will have no significant impact on plant safety.

In 1988, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation conducted a study to update the population figures found in the Environmental Report and Final Safety Analysis Report and to project populations through the year 2012. As the report indicates, the projected population in the 50-mile area surrounding the Vermont Yankee facility is expected to remain unchanged during the proposed amendment term. There are no changes to the exclusion area boundaries, the increase in population in the Low Population Zone is projected as being negligible, and the nearest population center is expected to remain more than 1-1/3 times the current five-mile Low Population Zone (LPZ) radius from the facility as required by 10 CFR 100.11(a)(3). Based on the results of this study, the off-site exposures from releases due to postulated accidents are expected to remain well within the limits set forth in 10 CFR, Part 100.

Because there will not be significant changes in the population and its distribution surrounding the plant, and Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation will continue to operate the plant in accordance with its design and Technical Specifications, the potential radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated remain unchanged.

The proposed amendment will not result in an increase in the probability or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR because: (1) facility operations will be continued in accordance with the facility's approved design and Technical Specifications, and (2) changes to the population and distribution surrounding Vermont Yankee are expected to be negligible and will not impact on the previously determined LPZ boundary.

b. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Conservatism have been incorporated in the design, construction, and operations of Vermont Yankee. Furthermore, programs have been developed and continue to be implemented to assure that the facility is operated as intended by design and in accordance with the Technical Specifications. In particular, the In-Service Inspection/Testing, Environmental Qualification, and Maintenance Programs assure that facility structures, systems, and components will be refurbished or replaced, as appropriate. That is, regardless of the age of the facility, these programs ensure that structures, systems and components are refurbished and/or replaced to maintain component functional capability and the margins of safety required by the Technical Specifications. No changes to these programs are necessary for assuring that Vermont Yankee will continue to perform as designed and in accordance with the Technical Specifications during an additional four years and three months of operation. Therefore, there is no possibility that a different type of accident is created.

c. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The margins of safety identified in the Technical Specifications have been incorporated into the facility's design, construction, and operations. With respect to operations, such margins are the basis for the facility operating and emergency procedures, as well as the Vermont Yankee In-Service Inspection/Testing, Environmental Qualification, and Maintenance Programs.

The inspection, surveillance, and maintenance requirements of these programs assure that, regardless of the age of the overall facility, the functional capabilities of structures, systems, and components will be maintained throughout the life of the facility through refurbishment and/or replacement, as appropriate, to meet the Technical Specifications. No changes to these programs are necessary to assure that during the additional four years and three months of operation, Vermont Yankee will continue to perform as intended by its design and the Technical Specifications.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the Technical Specification bases.

Conclusion

Based on the above considerations, we contend that the extension of Vermont Yankee's operating license in accordance with the proposed amendment will 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 reduction in a safety margin. Therefore, we conclude that there is no significant hazards consideration associated with the proposed amendment to the Vermont Yankee operating license.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and agrees with it. Therefore, we conclude that the amendment satisfies the three criteria listed in 10 CFR 50.92. Based on that conclusion the

staff proposes to make a no significant hazards consideration determination.

Local Public Document Room

location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

Attorney for licensee: R. K. Gad, III, Esq., Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Project Director: Richard H. Weissman

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

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

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

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendments, (2) the amendments, and (3) the Commission's related letters, Safety Evaluations and/or Environmental Assessments as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear

Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Projects.

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

Date of application for amendments: June 22, 1988

Description of amendments: The amendments delete the residual heat removal/service water discharge differential pressure instrument (transmitter and indicator) from the Technical Specifications for each unit.

Date of issuance: July 13, 1989

Effective date: July 13, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 135 and 165

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 31, 1989 (54 FR 23309). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 13, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units No. 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: February 22, 1989

Brief description of amendments: The proposed amendments replace the existing license conditions on fire protection with the standard condition noted in Generic Letter 88-10 and remove requirements for fire detection systems, fire suppression systems, fire barriers and fire brigade staffing requirements as per guidance contained in Generic Letters 88-10 and 88-12.

Date of issuance: June 30, 1989

Effective date: June 30, 1989 and to be implemented within 60 days

Amendment Nos.: 106 and 101

Provisional Operating License Nos. DPR-19 and DPR-25. The amendments revised the License and the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 5, 1989 (54 FR 13762). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374, LaSalle County Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, LaSalle County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: October 7, 1988

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise the LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications by allowing operation of both units with suppression pool temperatures of up to 105° F. The current suppression pool temperature limit during normal operation is 100° F.

Date of issuance: July 7, 1989

Effective date: July 7, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 67 and 49

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-11 and NPF-18. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 30, 1988 (53 FR 53090). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut; Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al; Millstone Units 1, 2, and 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: March 13, 1989 as supplemented April 28, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications (TS) by removing Figure 6.2-1, Offsite Organization, and description of the offsite and onsite organizations functional requirements in TS 6.2.1 and facility staff qualifications in 6.2.2. In addition, TS 6.2.1, will also require that lines of authority, responsibility, and communication shall be defined, documented and updated for the onsite and offsite organizations in the Quality Assurance Topical Report.

Date of Issuance: June 26, 1989

Effective date: June 26, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 118, 33, 142 and 36

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-61, DPR-21, DPR-65 and NPF-49. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15825). By letter dated April 28, 1989 the licensee

as discussed with the NRC staff, revised the Topical Report's organizational charts and provided a description of the Unit Superintendent's duties.

The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 26, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457, and Waterford Public Library, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut 06385.

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: November 3, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified the Technical Specifications by replacing Figure 3/4 7-1 "Nuclear Service Water System" with a more legible one and correcting a typographical error.

Date of issuance: July 10, 1989

Effective date: July 10, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 99 and 81

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 11, 1989 (54 FR 1021). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 10, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Duquesne Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: April 21, 1989

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications of both units to delete Table 4.5-5, "Reactor Vessel Material Irradiation Surveillance Schedule," and associated surveillance requirement 4.4.9.1.c. This table will be included in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report of each unit. Meanwhile, there is no change in the reactor vessel material surveillance program, which will continue to be governed by 10 CFR 50, Appendix H.

Date of issuance: July 12, 1989

Effective date: July 12, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 142 for Unit 1; 18 for Unit 2

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 31, 1989 (54 FR 23312). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 12, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 683 Franklin Avenue, Alliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

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: April 18, 1989, as supplemented on May 18, 1989 and June 19, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment removes cycle-specific core parameters from the Technical Specifications, adds a reference to a Core Operating Limits Report which contains cycle-specific parameter limits that have been established by NRC-approved methodology, and adds an administrative requirements to submit a Core Operating Limits Reports to the NRC prior to each core reload.

Date of Issuance: July 6, 1989

Effective date: July 6, 1989

Amendment No.: 150

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 17, 1989 (54 FR 21308). The May 18 and June 19, 1989 submittals were not noticed in the Federal Register because they provided clarifying wording in the amendment language and did not change the scope and intent of the original submittal.

The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 6, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Gulf States Utilities Company, Docket No. 50-458, River Bend Station, Unit 1 West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: August 29, 1986 as revised May 2, 1989 and supplemented May 25, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment added Technical

Specifications (TSs) for the Suppression Pool Pumpback System (SPPS) to TS 3/4.5.3, Suppression Pool. The Bases were also modified to add the SPPS.

Date of issuance: July 10, 1989

Effective date: July 10, 1989

Amendment No.: 38

Facility Operating License No. NPF-47. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 22, 1988 (51 FR 37512) superseded May 31, 1989 (54 FR 23314).

The May 24, 1989 submittal provided additional clarifying information and did not change the finding of the original notice or the scope of the amendment request.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 10, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Indiana Michigan Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50-315 and 50-316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of application for amendments: March 4, 1989.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise the TSs to reflect the installation of a new meteorological monitoring system and provide proper reference to meteorological tower locations and the locations of instrumentation used for determining temperature, wind speed, and wind direction. The TS Bases are also revised to clarify the channel check requirements of the new meteorological monitoring system.

Date of issuance: July 5, 1989

Effective date: July 5, 1989

Amendments Nos.: 127 and 113

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 5, 1989 (54 FR 13766). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 28, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: December 28, 1988 and as clarified by letter dated May 30, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment modifies the Operating License and the Technical Specifications to reflect the operating limits for the Cycle 11 operation at a power level of 2700 MWt.

Date of issuance: July 10, 1989

Effective date: The day of issuance.

Amendment No.: 113

Facility Operating License No. DPR-36. Amendment revised the Operating License and the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 1, 1989 (54 FR 5165). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 10, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: October 19, 1988

Brief description of amendment: Amendment revises Technical Specifications 3.2.6 and 4.2.6 and their Bases to bring them into conformance with the staff positions delineated in NRC Generic Letter 88-01, "NRC Position on IGSCC in BWR Austenitic Stainless Steel Piping."

Date of issuance: July 7, 1989

Effective date: July 7, 1989

Amendment No.: 107

Facility Operating License No. DPR-63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 31, 1989 (54 FR 23316). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 59-228, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

Date of application for amendment: June 3, 1988, as amended by letters dated September 28 and November 15, 1988.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment deletes Figure 6.2-1 "Management Organizational Chart," and Figure 6.2-2 "Nuclear Site Organization," in accordance with Generic Letter 88-06, "Removal of Organization Charts From Technical Specifications." Administrative changes to Section 6.1, 6.2, 6.5, 6.8, and 6.7 are included and Specification 6.9 is being revised to make the Unit 1 Specifications consistent with 10 CFR 50.4. By letter dated November 15, 1988, the licensee amended the amendment application to propose additional administrative changes to the Specifications. These changes reflect the creation of the position of Executive Vice President-Nuclear Operations. This title replaces all current references to Senior Vice President in the Specifications.

Date of issuance: July 10, 1989

Effective date: July 10, 1989

Amendment No.: 108

Facility Operating License No. NPF-63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 17, 1989 (54 FR 21311). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 10, 1989.

No Significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

Philadelphia Electric Company, Docket No. 50-352, Limerick Generating Station, Unit 1, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: November 4, 1988 as supplemented March 29, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The Amendment revised the Technical Specifications to permit operation of the reactor with one of two reactor recirculation loops in service under certain specified conditions.

Date of issuance: June 30, 1989

Effective date: Within 30 days of date of issuance.

Amendment No. 30

Facility Operating License No. NPF-39: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 8, 1989 (54 FR 9919). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19404.

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: August 19, 1987

Brief description of amendment: The amendment extends the expiration date of the operating license from May 20, 2010 to October 17, 2014.

Date of issuance: July 10, 1989

Effective date: July 10, 1989

Amendment No.: 133

Facility Operating License No. DPR-59: Amendment revised the Technical Specification.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 11, 1987 (52 FR 44247) and a corrected notice issued December 23, 1987 (52 FR 48891). The Commission prepared an Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact which was published in the Federal Register on May 4, 1989 (54 FR 19265). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 10, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: April 12, 1989

Brief description of amendment: Revised Technical Specifications Table 4.11.2.1.3-1, Table Notation (d), to reflect taking the tritium sample from the spent fuel pool area rather than from the ventilation exhaust.

Date of issuance: July 10, 1989

Effective date: July 10, 1989

Amendment No. 28

Facility Operating License No. NPF-57: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 31, 1989 (54 FR 23322). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 10, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Pennsville Public Library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, New Jersey 08070

System Energy Resources, Inc., et al., Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: April 18, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications by increasing the suppression pool low water level trip setpoint and allowable value for actuation of the suppression pool makeup system.

Date of issuance: July 3, 1989

Effective date: July 3, 1989

Amendment No. 60

Facility Operating License No. NPF-29: This amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 31, 1989 (54 FR 23325). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 3, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-260, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of application for amendment: February 24, 1989 (TS 263)

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes calibration frequencies for instrument lines containing transmitters manufactured by Tobar, Inc. to more conservative intervals. It also includes administrative changes to instrument numbers, and deletes instrument checks for four instrument channels.

Date of issuance: July 7, 1989

Effective date: July 7, 1989, and shall be implemented within 60 days

Amendment No.: 167

Facility Operating License No. DPR-52: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15838). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: April 17, 1988 (TS 89-16)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Section 6, Administrative Controls, of the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TS). The changes, to Specifications 6.2.3.2 and 6.2.3.4 for the Independent Safety Engineering Group (ISEG), limit the group to five full-time engineers and have the group report its recommendations to the Manager of Nuclear Manager's Review Group. The ISEG is also renamed to Independent Safety Engineering (ISE).

Date of issuance: July 5, 1989

Effective date: September 3, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 119, 108

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 17, 1989 (54 FR 21316). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 5, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of application for amendment: June 17, 1987

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the NA-2 Technical Specifications (TS) in accordance with Virginia Electric and Power Company's Statistical DNBR Evaluation Methodology for a less restrictive negative moderator temperature coefficient.

Also, the continued use of these TS at NA-1 for Cycle 8 and Cycle 9, etc., is hereby approved.

Date of issuance: June 30, 1989

Effective date: June 30, 1989

Amendment No.: 100

Facility Operating License No. NPF-7: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 30, 1988 (53 FR 48339). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: The Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket No. 50-338, North Anna Power Station, Unit No. 1, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of application for amendment: November 30, 1988, as supplemented June 19, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the heatup and cooldown curves and associated low temperature overpressurization setpoints to be valid for a period up to 10 effective full power years. In addition, the staff finds that the submittals supporting your amendment request comply with Generic Letter 88-11 and the methods specified in Regulatory Guide 1.99, Revision 2.

Date of issuance: June 30, 1989

Effective date: June 30, 1989

Amendment No.: 117

Facility Operating License No. NPF-4: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 30, 1988 (53 FR 53104). The June 19, 1989 letter provided supplemental information which did not change the staff's initial determination that the proposed amendment did not involve no significant hazards considerations.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: The Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket No. 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Unit No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of application for amendment: February 23, 1989

Brief description of amendment: This amendment modifies TS Table 3.8-1 by deleting components from the table which had previously been removed and by correcting one typographical error.

Date of issuance: July 7, 1989

Effective date: July 7, 1989

Amendment No.: 101

Facility Operating License No. NPF-7: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 3, 1989 (54 FR 18961). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: The Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of application for amendments: July 20, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments clarify the NA-1&2 TS 3.4.6.1 regarding reactor coolant system leakage detection systems and bring the TS into closer agreement with Regulatory Guide 1.45 and Revision 4 of the Westinghouse Standard TS.

Date of issuance: July 7, 1989

Effective date: July 7, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 118 and 102

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 16, 1988 (53 FR 46160). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: The Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901. Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of July, 1989.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Gus C. Linaas,

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects-
1/II Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
[Doc. 89-17363 Filed 7-25-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-D

DISTRIBUTION
DOCKET FILE
PD31 GRAY FILE
JSTANG
PSHUTTLEWORTH

July 18, 1989

DOCKET NO(S). 50-315/316

SUBJECT: DC COOK

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

✓	DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT	DATED
	Notice of Receipt of Application	
	Draft/Final Environmental Statement	
	Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement	
	Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No. _____	
	Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact	
	Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment	
	Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License	
X	Biweekly Notice of Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Conditions See Page(s) 25385	6/14/89
	Exemption	
	Construction Permit No. CPPR— _____, Amendment No. _____	
	Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____	
	Order	
	Monthly Operating Report for _____ transmitted by Letter	
	Annual/Semi-Annual Report: _____ transmitted by Letter	
	Other _____	

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

PROJECT DIRECTORATE III-1
DIVISION OF REACTOR PROJECTS - III,
IV, & SPECIAL PROJECTS

Enclosures:
As Stated

cc:

OFFICE►	LA/PD31:DRSP					
SURNAME►	SHUTTLEWORTH					
DATE►	7/18/89					

100-110000

Mr. Milton Alexich
Indiana Michigan Power Company

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant

cc:

Regional Administrator, Region III
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
799 Roosevelt Road
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

Mr. S. Brewer
American Electric Power
Service Corporation
1 Riverside Plaza
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Attorney General
Department of Attorney General
525 West Ottawa Street
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Township Supervisor
Lake Township Hall
Post Office Box 818
Bridgeman, Michigan 49106

W. G. Smith, Jr., Plant Manager
Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant
Post Office Box 458
Bridgman, Michigan 49106

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Resident Inspectors Office
7700 Red Arrow Highway
Stevensville, Michigan 49127

Gerald Charnoff, Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

Mayor, City of Bridgeman
Post Office Box 366
Bridgeman, Michigan 49106

Special Assistant to the Governor
Room 1 - State Capitol
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Nuclear Facilities and Environmental
Monitoring Section Office
Division of Radiological Health
Department of Public Health
3500 N. Logan Street
Post Office Box 30035
Lansing, Michigan 48909

issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from May 18, 1989 through June 2, 1989. The last biweekly notice was published on May 31, 1989 (54 FR 23306).

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

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

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

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Regulatory Publications Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration and Resources Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room P-216, Phillips Building, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW..

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION**

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

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law (P.L.) 97-415, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. P.L. 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be

Washington, DC. The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By July 14, 1989 the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

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

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of

the amendment under consideration. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

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

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

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

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

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

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the

Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 325-6000 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (*Project Director*): petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

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

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

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

Date of application for amendments:
April 28, 1989.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendments would delete the organization charts from Technical Specifications (TS), incorporate organizational changes to Section 6.0, Administrative Controls, and update TS Section 6.5.4.9 to reflect current 10 CFR 50.72 and 10 CFR 50.73 reporting requirements.

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

involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L) has reviewed the proposed changes to the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Technical Specifications and has determined that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration for the following reasons:

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because deletion of the organization charts, updating of individual titles, and removal of two Plant Nuclear Safety Committee (PNSC) members from the Technical Specifications does not affect plant operation. As in the past, the NRC will continue to be informed of organizational changes through other required controls. The Code of Federal Regulations, Title 10, Part 50.34(b)(6)(i) requires that the organizational structure be included in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). Chapter 13 of the FSAR provides a description of the organization and detailed organization charts. As required by 10CFR5071(e), the company submits annual updates to the FSAR. Appendix B to 10CFR50 and 10 CFR 50.54(a)(3) govern changes to the organization described in the Quality Assurance Program. Some of these organizational changes require prior NRC approval. Also, it is CP&L's practice to inform the NRC of organizational changes affecting the nuclear facilities prior to implementation. The company intends to continue this practice for future organizational changes.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes are administrative in nature and involve no physical alterations of plant configuration or changes to setpoint or operating parameters.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because CP&L, through its Quality Assurance Programs, its commitment to maintain only qualified personnel in positions of responsibility, and other required controls assure that safety functions will be performed at a high level of competence.

Therefore, removal of the organization charts from the Technical Specifications will not affect the margin of safety.

Also, revising Section 8.0 to reflect current organization by revising individual titles, removing two Plant Nuclear Safety Committee (PNSC) members, and adjusting the quorum requirements will not affect the function of the organization or PNSC. The PNSC will continue to review, overview, evaluate, and maintain plant operational safety; therefore, the margin of safety will not be affected.

Updating the Technical Specifications to reflect current 10 CFR 50.72 and 10 CFR 50.73 reporting requirements which superseded the old reporting requirement of 24-hour written notification will not affect the margin of safety.

The licensee has concluded that the proposed amendment meets the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 and,

therefore, involves no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has made a preliminary review of the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. In addition, the NRC staff has observed from the proposed amendment that two members to be removed from the PNSC quorum are: Manager of Technical and Administrative Support and Assistant to Plant General Manager. These two positions had been dissolved due to a recent reorganization; however, the technical expertise on the PNSC quorum remains the same as before and, therefore, the effectiveness of the PNSC to evaluate changes to the plant operational safety issues will not be affected. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Attorney for licensee: R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam

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

Date of application for amendments: May 1, 1989.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would permit the licensee to use any Type A Containment Integrated Leak Rate Test methodology permitted by Appendix J of 10 CFR Part 50. Currently, the licensee can only use the "Mass Point" method, in accordance with the Technical Specifications. Appendix J permits the Total Time method, the Point-to-Point method, or the Mass Point method. The modified technical specification would simply reference Appendix J.

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

a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L) has reviewed the proposed changes to TS and has determined that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration for the following reasons:

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability of any accident previously evaluated. ANSI N45.4-1972 specified data analysis methodologies (Total Time or Point-to-Point), ANSI/ANS 56.8-1987 specified Mass Point data analysis methodology, and BN-TOP-1, Revision 1, specified reduced duration criteria, using the Total Time data analysis method. Each of these is an NRC Staff endorsed methodology for the calculation of primary containment integrated leakage rates during tests. These methods, or any other calculational method used to determine containment leakage rate during testing, are not considered to be an initiator of any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of any accident previously evaluated. As stated in 10CFR50, Appendix J, the purpose of the required tests is to assure that "...leakage through the primary reactor containment and systems and components penetrating primary containment shall not exceed allowable leakage rate values..." 10CFR50, Appendix J endorses the data analysis methodologies (Total Time and Point-to-Point) specified in ANSI N45.4-1972 as well as the Mass Point method specified in ANSI/ANS 56.8-1987. Thus, the proposed change meets the purpose of the rule and therefore, does not significantly increase the consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed amendment only provides for the use of NRC Staff endorsed and approved methodologies for the calculation of containment leakage rates during tests. No possibility of a new or different kind of accident is created since the technique used to calculate leak rates during tests, in itself, is not considered to be an initiator of an accident, transient, incident, or event.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The proposed amendment allows BSEP to use either BN-TOP-1, Revision 1, which requires use of the Total Time method when performing reduced duration tests, or the Mass Point method with a minimum test duration of 24 hours.

As stated in the NRC February 17, 1988 SER, "The Mass Point method has been recognized by the professional community as superior to the two other methods, Point-to-Point and Total Time, which are referenced in ANSI N45.4-1972 and endorsed by the current regulations." The preference is based on the fact that the Total Time method is

dependent on selection of the first point and its [sic] relation to the remaining points, while the Mass Point method places equal emphasis on each point. Therefore, with the Mass Point method, an error in the first point is not as critical. This means that the upper 95% confidence interval of the leakage for the Total Time method may be higher than that of the Mass Point method. However, this does not decrease the margin of safety in that the acceptance criteria of an integrated leak rate test is based on leakage at the upper 95% confidence interval being less than the acceptance criteria. Therefore, any data scatter in the Total Time method is accounted for in the statistical analysis and must be within set limits for the test to pass. Such an error would typically yield test results which would pass using the Mass Point method, but would not pass using the Total Time method. Thus, to successfully perform a reduced, duration BN-TOP-1, Revision 1, test, the test data must be more consistent than what is required for successful performance of a Mass Point test. For this reason, CP&L has concluded that the proposed amendment does not significantly decrease the margin of safety.

The licensee has concluded that the proposed amendment meets the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 and, therefore, involves no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has made a preliminary review of the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Appendix J permits the use of any one of the three test methods. The TS change will reference Appendix J. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Attorney for licensee: R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam

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

Date of amendment request: April 27, 1989

Description of amendment request: The request proposes to amend the Technical Specifications (TS) to add surveillance requirements to Table 4.1-3 for the automatic bus transfers on the auxiliary feedwater (AFW) system valve V2-16A and service water (SW) system valve V6-16C. The proposed change would require a refueling interval test of the thermal and magnetic trip of

elements of the molded case circuit breakers associated with valves V2-16A and V6-16C.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

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

Carolina Power & Light Company has reviewed the proposed TS change request and determined that this change does not constitute a significant hazards consideration based upon the following:

1. 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 analyzed because the testing proposed is performed while the reactor is in cold shutdown/refueling and the systems tested are not required to be operable. In addition, there is no accident previously analyzed that is initiated by the AFW or SW systems components involved. Also, since no accidents for which AFW provides a mitigation function occur while the reactor is in cold shutdown/refueling, no accident consequences can increase. The SW valve involved is redundant to other valves which isolate cooling to the nonsafety-related secondary system plant auxiliaries following a station blackout coincident with a Safety Injection actuation to minimize the nonsafety loads on SW during that event. The testing to be performed is done at a time when accidents coincident with station blackout are not postulated, therefore, no accident consequences can be increased.

2. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because no changes to existing equipment are involved, and the breakers being tested and their associated valves will be verified operable prior to returning the plant to a condition requiring their operability, therefore, no failure mechanisms are introduced.

3. Operation of the facility, in accordance with the proposed amendment, would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety since the testing noted will not alter any accident mitigating function required, and assures the breakers will perform their intended function. The existing margin of safety is preserved.

In addition, the proposed amendment is similar to Example II of amendments likely to involve no significant hazards consideration:

"[a] change that constitutes an additional ... control not presently included in the technical specifications," as published in the Federal Register on March 6, 1986.

The licensee has concluded that the proposed amendment meets the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 and, therefore, involves no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has made a preliminary review of the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Accordingly, the Commission proposed to determine that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: April 11, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed Technical Specification changes will revise the limit of maximum fuel enrichment. This amendment request deals only with handling and storage of the higher enriched fuel. Plant operation using the higher enriched fuel will be demonstrated to be acceptable by a cycle specific reload safety evaluation performed prior to fuel loading. Specifically, the proposed changes will be as follows: (1) change Technical Specification 5.3.1, which currently requires that reload fuel have a maximum enrichment of 4.20 weight percent U-235, to allow a maximum enrichment of 5.0 weight percent U-235; (2) add to Technical Specification 5.6.1, concerning design requirements of the Spent Fuel Storage Racks, an additional requirement to require that a maximum core geometry infinite multiplication factor for PWR fuel assemblies be less than or equal to 1.470 at 68° F; and (3) revise the numbering sequence of Section 5.6.1, Criticality, to eliminate duplicate specification numbers.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided standards in 10 CFR 50.92(c) for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists. A

proposed amendment to an Operating License for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, 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.

As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided the following no significant hazards consideration determination:

1. The proposed changes relate only to the consequences of an accident as they do not in any way impact the manner in which any systems or components involved in the initiation of an accident function. To evaluate the impact on consequences, three distinct areas are covered: 1) maintaining the fuel rack Keff less than or equal to 0.95; 2) maximum heat load generated by the fuel in the fuel pools; and 3) impact on radiological dose.

The proposed change specifies a new Technical Specification requirement on the maximum reactivity an assembly may have at any time in its life. Credit can be taken for burnable poison integral to the fuel in determining an assembly's reactivity.

This new requirement assures that Keff will remain below 0.95 in the fuel racks; therefore, the consequences of storage of higher enriched fuel remains unchanged.

An evaluation has been performed to determine the impact of higher enriched fuel on the pool heat load analysis presented in the FSAR.

An evaluation assuming batch average discharge exposures up to 50,000 MWD/MTU (lead rod exposures of 60,000 MWD/MTU) has shown that the current heat loads assumed in the FSAR remain bounding.

Westinghouse has performed an evaluation to determine the potential impact of higher enrichment (and burnup) on the radiological consequences of the accidents presented in the FSAR. They have concluded that the impact of enrichments up to 5.0 w/o and lead rod burnups up to 60,000 MWD/MTU can be bounded by assuming a 4 percent increase in radiological dose. The potential increase in consequences is not significant based on the large margins to the 10CFR100 limits present in the existing analyses. Furthermore, it is concluded that if one takes into consideration that the current FSAR analyses are based on a power level of 2900 MWT (for determining fission product inventory in the gap) instead of 2775 MWT, the current FSAR radiological dose consequences are bounding.

The changes to the numbering sequence of Section 5.6.1 are administrative in nature and, therefore, cannot involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment does not create any new scenarios for system or equipment malfunctions. The changes are integral to the fuel and do not create any new

or special handling, storage, or operating concerns.

The changes to the numbering sequence of Section 5.6.1 are administrative in nature and, therefore, cannot create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. The proposed changes do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety. Evaluations have been performed that show the Keff in the racks can be maintained less than 0.95, that the change will not result in any spent fuel pool heat loads greater than those previously analyzed and that radiological dose consequences remain well within the 10CFR100 guidelines, and are not significantly different than those currently reported.

The licensee has concluded that the proposed amendment meets the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 and, therefore, involves no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has made a preliminary review of the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605.

Attorney for licensee: R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam

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

Date of application for amendments: April 7, 1989

Description of amendments request: These amendments would remove two motor operated valves from Technical Specification Tables 3.8-2a and 3.8-2b.

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

The proposed amendment removes motor-related valves OSX063A and OSX063B from Technical Specification Tables 3.8-2a and 3.8-2b. A modification was performed which converted the valves from motor-operated valves to manual valves by removing the electrical connections. The valves are maintained locked open and no longer require thermal overload protection devices and, therefore, do not meet the criteria for inclusion in Specification 3.8.4.2.

The basis for operability of the thermal overload protective devices on motor-operated valves is to ensure that these devices will not prevent safety related valves from performing their function. These valves are the essential service water inlet valves to the control room chillers. These valves were originally designed to isolate essential service water from the chillers if the essential service water temperature was near freezing. It has been determined that this function was not necessary because essential service water temperatures during winter conditions do not decrease to a point requiring chiller isolation. The modification converted the motor-operated valves to manual locked open valves, thereby, ensuring an essential service water supply to the control room chillers and minimizing the potential of an electrical or mechanical failure interrupting the water supply. Since the valves perform their required function and no longer have thermal overload protective devices, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed. The proposed amendment is essentially administrative in nature, removing valves from a Technical Specification table that no longer applies. This amendment does not affect the valves' functional ability to provide essential service water to the control room chillers.

The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The change to the Technical Specifications is administrative and does not affect a margin of safety. Converting the valves from motor-operated to manual locked open enhances their reliability to provide essential service water to the control room chillers, since the service water supply path is less susceptible to electrical or mechanical failures.

Therefore, based upon the above analysis, the staff concludes that the proposed amendment to the Technical Specification does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney to licensee: Michael Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment request: December 21, 1988 as supplemented May 4, 1989.

Description of amendment request: The December 21, 1988 application was previously noticed in the Federal Register on May 17, 1989 (54 FR 21300). As originally submitted, the proposed amendment would remove excessive testing requirements for other systems or subsystems of the Emergency Core Cooling Systems or Standby Gas Treatment Systems when one system or subsystem is inoperable. The current supplement to the original submittal provides clarification to the wording of the footnote in proposed Table 4.5.1 concerning High Pressure Coolant Injection (HPCI) surveillance requirements and clarification of how the proposed amendment meets the intent of Standardized Technical Specification Section 4.5.1 provisions related to the Emergency Core Cooling System line "keep fill" requirements and valve position verifications. In addition, the following two changes were requested in this submittal to be added to the proposed amendment. One change proposes that a surveillance requirement (SR) be added to the Containment Cooling Service Water System (CCSW), to assure system readiness that is similar to the Standard Technical Specification for the Residual Heat Removal Service Water System (STS SR 4.5.1.a.3). The second change which is purely administrative inserts the words "not used" under Section 3/4.5.G to indicate that it was deleted by a previous amendment.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92(c). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards considerations if operation of the facility

in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee addressed the above three standards in the amendment application as follows:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, because:

The additional LCO action statement for the HPCI system and proposed SR for the CCSW system aid in the early detection of potential inoperability of essential systems. These additions and the Technical Specification Section 3/4.5.G administrative change will not affect the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

(2) Create the possibility of a proposed or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because:

No new modes of operation will be created by these changes nor will the plant be allowed to operate beyond prescribed limits. These supplemental changes to the previously proposed amendment are all enhancements or administrative in nature. Therefore, the probability of new or different accidents has not been created.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because: Implementing the proposed supplemental changes will not create any challenge to the existing safety analyses. The addition of valve position verifications can only aid in the early detection of inoperability of the CCSW system. The proposed HPCI system LCO action statement will not allow reactor startup to continue until HPCI operability is assured. The Technical Specification Section 3/4.5.G change is purely administrative. Therefore, the margin of safety is maintained.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards analyses given above. Based on this review, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendments meet the three 10 CFR 50.92(c) standards and do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450.

Attorney for licensee: Michael L. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller

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

Date of amendment request: December 28, 1988, as clarified May 10, 1989

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification 4.16 to add a new surveillance test for the Safety Injection System low head injection line check valves 897A-D and Residual Heat Removal check valves 838A-D. The proposed amendment would also make certain editorial changes (e.g., delete underlines, add commas, move text to another page, etc.) which are administrative in nature.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

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

The licensee provided the following analysis of the proposed changes:

In accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.92, the proposed Technical Specification changes are deemed to involve "no significant hazards considerations."

1. Operation of Indian Point Unit 2 in accordance with these changes would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed Technical Specification test requirement is currently required by the February 11, 1980 Confirmatory Order Item A.5. This proposed amendment merely transfers the test requirement from the Confirmatory Order to the Indian Point Unit 2 Technical Specifications. Moreover, the consequences of doing or not doing this testing have been previously reviewed by NRC in various submittals; namely our March 14, 1980 response to NRC's February 25, 1980 Generic Letter "LWR Primary Coolant System Pressure Isolation Valves, and NRC's Confirmatory Order dated February 11, 1980 and subsequent Commission rescission of that Order dated July 5, 1985. By committing to test the SIS low head injection line check valves 897A-D and the RHR check valves 838A-D whenever RCS pressure has decreased to within 100 psig of the RHR system design pressure, the probability of coincident disc rupture of the two series check valves, as analyzed in the Indian Point Probabilistic Safety Study (IPPSS), is reduced to approximately 2.9×10^{-7} /reactor year from 4.4×10^{-4} /reactor year. The latter value is based on IPPSS methodology using five year average failure rates to represent the "no testing" case, which is consistent with WASH-1400. Since Indian Point Unit 2 has a normally closed motor-operated valve in the

injection flow path in addition to the two series check valves, the probability of an intersystem loss-of-coolant accident (Event V) via this path, as analysed in the IPFSS, is further reduced to approximately 2.6×10^{-6} reactor year. All failure rates quoted above are mean values.

2. Operation of Indian Point Unit 2 in accordance with these changes would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed Technical Specification test requirement is currently required by NRC's February 11, 1980 Confirmatory Order, Item A.5, and is required to address the intersystem loss-of-coolant accident (Event V) identified in the WASH-1400.

By transferring the requirement to perform the particular test from the Order Item A.5 to the Technical Specifications, a new or different kind of accident from that previously evaluated cannot be created.

3. Operation of Indian Point Unit 2 in accordance with these changes would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed Technical Specification test requirement, which is currently required by the February 11, 1980 Confirmatory Order Item A.5, does not reduce nor change the margin of safety from that existing now. The proposed amendment only transfers the requirement to perform the particular test from the Order Item A.5 to the Technical Specifications. It has previously been demonstrated that by performing the test the margin of safety increases.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether "significant hazards considerations" exist by providing certain examples at 48 FR 14870 (April 8, 1983: Interim Final Rule) and at 51 FR 7744 (March 6, 1986: Final Rule).

Example (ii) of 51 FR 7744 (Vol. 51, No. 44, Page 7751), which applies to the addition of the surveillance requirement in the Indian Point Unit 2 Technical Specifications, states: "(ii) a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications, e.g., a more stringent surveillance requirement."

In addition, example (i) of 51 FR 7744, which applies to the editorial changes, states: "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."

Therefore, since this application for amendment satisfies the criteria specified in 10 CFR 50.92, and is similar to examples for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the licensee has made a determination that the application involves no significant hazards considerations.

The staff agrees with the licensee's analysis. Therefore, based on the above, the staff proposes that the proposed amendment will 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: Brent L. Brandenburg, Esq., 4 Irving Place, New York, New York 10003

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of amendment request: April 28, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would change the elevation at which seismic monitor 1M1MT 5010 is located from 613' +8 9/16" to 588' +8 1/8". This elevation is stated in Item 2.a. of Technical Specification (TS) Tables 3.3-7 and 4.3-4. The relocation of the monitor was required because of operability concerns associated with its previous location. A description of the inoperability and the plans to relocate the monitor were submitted by Duke Power Company in a special report dated February 24, 1989. The changes are applicable to Unit 1 only. Unit 2 is included administratively because the TSs are combined in one document for both units.

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 proposed amendments would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the new location of the monitor meets the intent of Regulatory Guide 1.12. The monitor will be operable and capable of performing its intended safety function. The new location would not have any impact on the operation of station and would not affect the previously evaluated accidents.

The proposed amendments would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the monitor relocation would not introduce any new modes of operation.

Moreover, the monitor would be operable and capable of performing its intended safety function.

The proposed amendments would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed changes would alleviate the operability concern of the monitor. As such, they may enhance the safety margin.

Based on the above considerations, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

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

Date of amendment request: May 9, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications and associated Basis pages to permit use of upgraded Westinghouse fuel design in fuel cycle 8 and future cycles. The upgraded fuel design features include the VANTAGE 5H design features, reconstitutable top nozzles, debris filter bottom nozzles, snag resistant grids and standardized fuel pellets. The licensee provided a Westinghouse report titled "Plant Safety Evaluation for Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 1 Fuel Upgrade and Increased Peaking Factors" to support the requested changes.

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

The licensee stated that the proposed changes have been assessed from a core design and safety analysis standpoint.

Extensive reanalyses were undertaken to demonstrate compliance with the revised technical specifications. The methods used to perform the analyses have been previously approved by the NRC. The results, which include transition core effects, show changes in the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The results are all within NRC acceptance criteria. The major components that determine the structural integrity of the fuel assembly are the grids. Mechanical testing and analysis of the VANTAGE 5H Zircaloy grid and fuel assembly have demonstrated that the VANTAGE 5H structural integrity under seismic/LOCA loads will provide margins comparable to the currently used STD 17 x 17 fuel assembly design, and will meet all design bases. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not result in an increase in the probabilities or consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

The proposed changes are improvements over, and are comparable to the existing core design. These changes do not significantly affect the overall method and manner of plant operation. Thus no new accidents could result from these changes.

Finally, while new analyses were performed, the acceptance criteria would not be changed from existing criteria. The new analyses show that the upgraded core design results in no significant change in safety margin.

The staff therefore proposes to determine that the requested amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

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 & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz
Duquesne Light Company, Docket No. 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: May 4, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the reactor trip system overtemperature delta T and overpower delta T response times listed in Table 3.3-2 from 4.0 seconds to 5.5 seconds. The current design basis requirements for each of these reactor trip total response time is 6.0 seconds. This total response time is defined as the delay from when the temperature in the reactor coolant loop

exceeds the trip setpoint until the control rods are free to fall into the core. An evaluation of the results of the initial startup test indicated that the 6.0 second time response assumed in the FSAR was not met. The licensee determined that the control rods were responding slower than expected. The proposed amendment would increase the above response times by 1.5 seconds to accommodate the slower response.

The licensee has evaluated the design-basis accidents affected by this increase and concluded that the negative effects on the consequences on these accidents are minimal and that all safety acceptance criteria continue to be met.

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

As stated above, since reanalyses of design-basis accidents show that the increased response times have minimal effects, it follows that the proposed amendment would not involve any increase in the probability or consequences of previously analyzed accidents.

No hardware, software or operational procedures are changed. Hence no new accidents could be created. Finally, since no previously analyzed accidents are affected, no safety margins need to be reduced.

The staff therefore proposes to determine that the requested amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

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 & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: May 9, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment revises the action requirements and surveillance requirements of Technical Specification 3/4.6.1.6, "Containment Structural Integrity" and its bases. The proposed changes to action requirements would eliminate unnecessary shutdowns by allowing for the performance of engineering evaluations of non-conforming conditions. The proposed changes to surveillance requirements incorporate plant-specific design, installation, and material considerations, and provide greater detail regarding test methods and acceptance criteria.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided Standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration 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.

In regard to the proposed amendment, the licensee has determined the following:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change revises the action requirements and surveillance requirements of the Containment Structural Integrity Technical Specifications. The change does not involve any physical alteration of the containment or any change to a setpoint or operating parameter. The change does not add any new equipment which could be the source of a malfunction or accident. Since the change does not affect equipment involved in the initiation of previously evaluated accidents, the probability of such accidents is not increased. With respect to the consequences of previously evaluated accidents, the change ensures that the mitigation capability of the containment is not decreased. The proposed changes to action statements b and c are as restrictive as those in the current Technical Specifications in the sense that a condition of significant structural integrity degradation is

required to be corrected within 72 hours or the unit(s) shut down. For conditions not involving significant degradation, the proposed action statements do not dictate unit shutdown; however, continued structural capability is required to be verified within 72 hours. The proposed action statements continue to require an engineering evaluation of deviations from acceptance criteria. The proposed surveillance requirements provide greater detail regarding test methods and acceptance criteria, and incorporate Vogtle-specific design, installation, and material considerations. Removal of the upper limit on lift-off forces eliminates needless entry into an action statement for a condition not involving abnormal degradation. Revisions to tendon detensioning and retensioning requirements minimize the possibility of damage during testing. Performing visual inspections of end anchorages and adjacent surfaces during tendon surveillance as opposed to during Type A testing will result in more uniform application of test criteria. Based on the above discussion, the proposed action requirements and surveillance requirements assure that containment structural integrity will be maintained at or above the level required by the current Technical Specifications. The containment will, therefore, continue to be capable of mitigating accidents as discussed in FSAR Chapters 6 and 15. Hence, the consequences of previously evaluated accidents are not increased.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The change does not add any new equipment to the plant or require any existing equipment to be operated in a different manner from which it was designed to operate. Since a new failure mode is not introduced by the change, a new or different kind of accident could not result.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The change does not affect any safety limits or limiting safety system settings. The change does not involve a reduction of acceptance criteria where the potential for significant structural integrity degradation exists. The proposed action statements and surveillance requirements assure that the capability to withstand the maximum containment pressure of 41.9 psig in the event of a main steam line break is maintained over the life of the facility. Margins of safety are therefore not decreased.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's determination and concurs with its findings.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed change involves no significant hazards considerations.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Arthur H. Domby, Troutman, Sanders, Lockerman and Ashmore, Candler Building, Suite 1400, 127 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30043.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

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

Date of amendment request: April 24, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Specification 3.12.A.1.b to correctly identify the High Pressure Water Fire Protection System boundary. As currently written, this specification could be misinterpreted to imply the existence of water flow alarms on the hose station risers. System design includes water flow alarms on the water spray and sprinkler systems, but does not include such alarms on the hose station risers.

The design of the system has been reviewed and approved in the Fire Protection Safety Evaluation Report issued by the NRC on August 1, 1979. Additionally, the monthly surveillance requirements in Specifications 4.12.A and 4.12.D ensure the integrity of the hose station and riser.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: In accordance with the Commission's Regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, the Commission has made a determination that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations. To make this determination the staff must establish that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has evaluated the proposed amendment and determined that it is purely administrative in nature and provides a clarification to the Technical Specifications. Operation of the James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant hazards consideration as stated in 10 CFR 50.92, since it would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The intent of the proposed change is purely administrative in nature to clarify the Technical Specifications. There are no changes to setpoints, safety limits, surveillance requirements, or limiting conditions for operation. These changes will have no impact on previously evaluated accidents.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change is purely administrative in nature and is intended to clarify and improve the quality of the Technical Specification. The change cannot create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed changes are purely administrative in nature and clarifies and improves the quality of the Technical Specifications. This change does not contain any setpoint or safety limit changes regarding isolation or alarms. The proposed change does not affect the environmental monitoring program. This change does not affect the plant's safety systems and does not reduce any safety margins.

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of amendment request: April 24, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would remove the Technical Specification (TS) requirement to perturb the reactor vessel water level as part of the monthly functional test for the reactor water low level scram instruments. The test involves changing the reactor water level setpoint using the feedwater control system and visually noting that the level change is reflected by appropriate level instruments. The licensee noted that the test is an operational inconvenience, is not a regulatory requirement, is not required by the Standard Technical Specifications, and is superfluous to the existing level instrument checks required by TS Section 4.1, Table 4.1-1, Note (8). Specifically, the proposed amendment would remove the reference to Note (5) from Table 4.1-1 on page 44 and delete Note (5) from the "Notes for Table 4.1-1" on page 45a.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: In accordance with the Commission's

Regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, the Commission has made a determination that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations. To make this determination the staff must establish that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has evaluated the proposed TS change and determined that they are administrative in nature and promote consistency with the Standard Technical Specifications. The proposed changes do not involve modification of any existing equipment, systems, or components; nor do they alter the conclusions of the plant's accident analyses or radiological release analyses. Further, operation of the FitzPatrick Plant in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant hazards consideration as stated in 10 CFR 50.92 since it would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed Technical Specification changes to delete the requirements in Table 4.1-1 to perturb the reactor water level after functional tests of water level scram instruments is administrative in nature. The operability of the level sensors and trip channels are being adequately verified by other surveillance requirements which are consistent with the RPS design basis, the Standard Technical Specifications, and the vendor's (GE) recommendations for ATTS components (General Electric Topical Report NEDO-21617-A and accompanying NRC letter of approval dated June 27, 1978).

The proposed changes do not involve modification of any existing equipment, systems, or components; nor do they alter the conclusions of the plant's accident analyses or radiological release analyses as documented in the FSAR or the NRC Staff's SER.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not introduce any new failure modes. They do not involve modification to any of the plant's equipment, systems, or components; nor do they place the plant in an unanalyzed configuration.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed changes affect the capability for checking the operational availability of the sensor inputs to the Reactor Protection System (RPS). Consistent with the IEEE-279-1971, the deletion of the perturbation requirement does not degrade the RPS design basis because each of the reactor water level sensors are

being cross-checked with each other on a daily basis. The proposed change deletes a superfluous testing requirement and does not involve modification of the plant's systems, equipment, or components.

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: May 5, 1989

Description of amendment request: Increase the channel functional test surveillance intervals for various Control Rod Block instrumentation.

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; (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. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.92 the licensee has reviewed the proposed changes and has concluded as follows that they do not involve a significant hazards consideration:

1. Do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

As detailed in NEDC-30851P-A, Supplement 1 the sequence of events necessary for an unmitigated rod withdrawal error includes failure of the Local Power Range Monitor (LPRM), failure of the Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) upscale trips, failure of the APRM upscale rod block, dual channel failure of the Rod Block Monitor, and of course operator failure to recognize and respond to any of these events. The BWR Owner's Group evaluated the impact of increased STIs on the probability of control rod block failure and concluded that a rather

small increase in scram frequency results. However, both the absolute and relative increase is acceptably low and offset by the benefits of extending the Reactor Protection System (RPS) test intervals [(see NEDC-30851P and the PSE&G to NRC submittal dated February 6, 1989.)] Therefore, it can be concluded that the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The consequences of an unmitigated rod withdrawal error were also addressed in NEDC-30851P-A, Supplement 1. Specifically, such an incident is very mild compared to the limiting reactivity accident - a control rod drop accident. The BWR Owner's Group indicated that the severity of a control rod drop accident bounds a rod withdrawal error due to the higher rate of reactivity addition. HCGS Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Section 15.4.9 and Tables 15.4-15 and 15.4-21 provides the plant specific evaluation of the control rod drop accident. As a result of consequences of a rod withdrawal error were shown to be substantially less than those associated with a dropped rod accident and less than 1% of the specified site boundary dose limits. This low consequence combined with the low probability of an unmitigated rod withdrawal error results in a negligible increase in risk which is offset by decreased risks associated with reduced testing of rod block and RPS instrumentation.

2. Do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The increased Control Rod Block surveillance test intervals do not alter the function of the instrumentation nor involve any type of plant modification. Additionally, no new modes of plant operation are involved with these changes. Therefore, it can be concluded that the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than any accident previously evaluated.

3. Do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed and approved the generic study contained in Licensing Topical Report NEDC-30851P-A, Supplement 1 and has concurred with the BWR Owner's Group that the proposed changes do not significantly affect the reliability or availability of the Control Rod Block instrumentation. Hence it can be concluded that the proposed changes do not adversely affect plant safety margins.

The staff reviewed the licensee's determination that the proposed license amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Accordingly, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Pennsville Public Library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, New Jersey 08070

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

1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20006

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

Public Service Electric & Gas Company,
Docket No. 50-311, Salem Generating
Station, Unit No. 2, Salem County, New
Jersey

Date of amendment request: May 5,
1989

Description of amendment request:
The licensee proposes to revise Section
4.7.9.e.1 of the Salem Unit 2 Technical
Specifications. The change will delete
an aspect of mechanical snubber
surveillance test acceptance criteria
which requires a verification that the
snubber drag force has not increased
more than 50% since the previous
functional test. This change was
approved for Salem Unit 1 on an
emergency basis on May 12, 1989.

*Basis for proposed no significant
hazards consideration determination:*
The existence of the 50% drag force
increase criterion in the mechanical
snubber inservice inspection program
represents an unnecessary constraint on
the verification of snubber operability.
A snubber with a drag force greatly
below the specified limit may
experience an increase in drag force that
is small in absolute terms, but exceeds
50% of the previous test result. This
results in an increase in the test
population under the present program.

The snubber manufacturer (Pacific
Scientific) has published a test report
related to mechanical snubber drag
force loading (Test Report 871, dated
April 13, 1984). The results of these tests
indicate that an increase in drag force
from one inspection period to the next
does not establish a trend that can be
used to predict pending snubber failure.
The proposed change does not change
the following aspects of the snubber
surveillance program:

1. Visual inspections and associated
acceptance criteria, which include
manual certification of freedom of
movement where possible.
2. Retesting of any snubbers and/or
replacements which failed the previous
test.
3. Testing of all snubbers of the same
design as a snubber selected for
functional testing that fails to move or
fails to lockup due to a design or
manufacturing defect.
4. Verification that the drag force is
less than the specified allowable value.
5. Verification that activation is
achieved within the range of velocity or
acceleration specified for both tension
and compression.

6. Verification of acceptable release
rate or ability to withstand load without
displacement, as applicable.

7. Compliance with ASME Section XI
per Technical Specification 4.0.5.

The measures listed above comprise
an adequate program for assuring
snubber operability. Verifying that drag
force is within its specified allowable
limit (Item 4 above) is the primary
means of determining that the drag force
is acceptable. The requirement being
deleted by this proposed change may
cause an unnecessary increase in the
snubber test population even if the drag
force is well below the acceptance
criteria. This represents an
inappropriate use of resources and an
increase in radiation worker exposure.

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

The licensee has analysed the
proposed amendment to determine if a
significant hazards consideration exists:

1) 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.

The aspects of the snubber inspection
program discussed (in Section III) above
address the needed snubber functional
requirements and should therefore be deemed
acceptable for determining snubber
operability. The proposed change does not
adversely affect the snubber inspection
program. The relevant specified parameters
for each snubber subjected to functional
testing will still be verified to be within
allowable limits. Consequently, the proposed
change does not increase the likelihood of
snubber inoperability, nor does it increase
the adverse effects of such inoperability on
the associated systems.

The snubbers are included in the system
design to mitigate the effects of a seismic
event and allow for thermal expansion of the
piping. The functional testing described
above will determine the capability of the
snubber to meet these requirements. The 50%
drag force load comparison currently
required by Technical Specification 4.7.9.e.1
does not supplement the operability
determination of the snubber and can be
deleted without adverse impact on the
associated system.

Therefore, it may be concluded that the
proposed change does not involve a

significant increase in the probability or
consequences of an accident previously
evaluated.

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

The proposed change does not involve
changes to the design or application of
snubbers. It does not involve any design or
configuration changes to the plant. No new
accident scenarios or new component failure
mechanisms are introduced. Therefore, it may
be concluded that the proposed change does
not create the possibility of a new or different
kind of accident from any previously
evaluated.

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

Snubbers provide assurance that the
structural integrity of the fluid systems
subjected to dynamic loads is maintained.
The margin of safety associated with
snubbers is related to the specified allowable
limits imposed on performance parameters,
including maximum allowable drag force.
This change proposes to delete a test
acceptance criterion related to a change in
the measured drag force, and does not
increase the maximum allowable value.
Therefore, it may be concluded that the
proposed change does not involve a
reduction in a margin of safety as defined by
the Technical Specifications.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's
submittal and significant hazards
analysis and concurs with the licensee's
determination that the proposed
amendment does not involve a
significant hazards consideration.
Therefore, the staff proposes to
determine that the proposed amendment
involves no significant hazards
consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mark J.
Wetterhahn, Esquire, Conner and
Wetterhahn, Suite 1050, 1747
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20006
NRC Project Director: Walter R.
Butler

Sacramento Municipal Utility District,
Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear
Generating Station, Sacramento County,
California

Date of amendment request: February
28, 1986, revised May 14, 1987, as
supplemented August 31, 1988

Description of amendment request:
The proposed Technical Specification
amendment would change Table 3.6-1 of
the Rancho Seco specifications. Table
3.6-1 contains a list of containment
isolation valves with a notation

indicating the maximum permissible closure time for each valve. The proposed change would include administrative changes to the table, add 12 previously installed valves to the table, decrease the maximum closure time for the reactor coolant pump seal return valve from 71 seconds to less than 60 seconds, and revise the maximum permissible closure time for selected valves. The maximum closure time for these valves is presently between 3 and 21 seconds and the proposed change would increase the permissible maximum closure time to 25 seconds.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists as stated in 10 CFR Part 50.92. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a 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; (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 the amendment request follows:

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

The proposed amendment would increase the maximum closure time to 25 seconds for selected containment isolation valves that are not in direct flow paths from the containment atmosphere to the environment. The increase in closure time to 25 seconds of these selected isolation valves has, by licensee analysis, been determined to result in offsite doses that remain within 10 CFR Part 100.11 limits. The licensee determined that at a maximum closure time of 25 seconds, these selected containment isolation valves would not allow a radiation release to the Exclusion Area Boundary (EAB) or Low Population Zone (LPZ) during the worst accident condition (LOCA) that would exceed the limits of 10 CFR Part 100.11. This change would not involve an increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated but does slightly increase the radiological releases above the values from the previous analysis. The licensee contends that the radiation releases to the EAB and LPZ under the worst

accident conditions would result in radiation exposures that are well below the guideline values allowed by 10 CFR Part 100.11.

The proposed amendment would decrease the maximum closure time of the reactor coolant pump seal return valve (SFV-24004) from 71 seconds to less than 60 seconds. This is a more restrictive requirement and complies with Standard Review Plan (SRP) 6.2.4, therefore, not increasing the probability or consequences of an accident.

The proposed amendment would add 12 valves to Table 3.6-1. These containment isolation valves were installed during the 1983 refueling outage and adding the valves to Table 3.6-1 is purely administrative.

Based on the above, the proposed amendment does not, therefore, significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Standard 2 - Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident From Any Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from what had been previously evaluated. The increase of maximum closure times of the selected containment isolation valves does not introduce a design or operational change that could result in a new or different accident potential that would be worse than the LOCA already considered.

The proposed amendment would add 12 valves to Table 3.6-1. These containment isolation valves were installed during the 1983 refueling outage. Adding the valves to Table 3.6-1 does not change the function of the valves and is considered to be purely administrative.

Based on the above, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Standard 3 - Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety

The proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Although increasing the maximum closure times of the containment isolation valves from the presently specified range of from 3 to 21 seconds, to 25 seconds, does represent a slight increase in exposure, licensee calculations confirm that there remains an adequate margin to the guideline exposures established in 10 CFR Part 100.11. Additionally, the proposed amendment would add 12 valves to Table 3.6-1. These containment isolation valves were installed during the 1983

refueling outage. Adding these valves to Table 3.6-1 does not affect the design bases or function of the valves, and is considered to be purely administrative. Based on the above, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

Local Public Document Room
Location: Martin Luther King Regional Library, 7430 24th Street Bypass, Sacramento, California 95822.

Attorney for licensee: David S. Kaplan, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, P. O. Box 15830, Sacramento, California 95813

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of amendment requests: May 15, 1989 (TS 269)

Description of amendment requests: The proposed amendment would change the BFN technical specifications (TS) for Units 1, 2, and 3 to administratively revise the pilot cell voltage in 4.11.B.3.a(3). In addition, this proposed amendment would update TS SR 4.7.E.4 to include a newly installed damper in the control room emergency ventilation system.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided Standards for determining whether a significant hazards determination exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92(c). 10 CFR 50.91 requires that at the time a licensee requests an amendment, it must provide to the Commission its analyses, using the standards in Section 50.92, on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. Therefore, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 10 CFR 50.92, the licensee has performed and provided the following analysis:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of any accident previously evaluated. These proposed changes do not change or amend any safety analysis for BFN.

Damper FCO-150 G is being added as a result of a Design Change Notice. This damper is required to close upon initiation of the control room emergency ventilation system (CREVS). Adding the damper to the CREVS system assists in the isolation function of the control room in the event of an accident requiring CREVS to operate. The

addition of this damper does not invalidate the safety analysis nor bases in which BFN was licensed for.

The battery pilot cell voltage in BFN Surveillance Requirement 4.11.B.3.a(3) is currently 24 volts which is incorrect. The correct value is 2.0 volts. This is an administrative error which was not corrected in the BFN August 30, 1988 submittal. Changing this value is consistent with the current plant configuration which has been verified through surveillance testing. This change does not change the operation of any safety-related equipment. It only corrects an error in order to more accurately reflect the batteries currently installed in the plant.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The addition of the damper FCO-150 G, and changing the pilot cell voltage to 2.0 volts more accurately reflect the current design and operations of BFN. These changes do not create any new accident mode or release pathway of radioactive effluents to the environment.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve any significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed amendment brings the technical specifications more in compliance with the actual design and operation of BFN.

The addition of damper FCO-150 G, and changing the pilot voltage to read 2.0 volts are administrative in nature. Consistent with 10 CFR 50.36, damper FCO-150 G is being added to the TS. The addition of this additional damper not only reflects the current plant configuration but also provides additional isolation capability for the main control room. This will enhance the overall safety to the main control room operators. Revising the pilot cell voltage brings the current TS in compliance with the physical capabilities of the battery.

These changes provide an overall enhancement to plant safety with proper operation of plant equipment. These changes do not significantly decrease the margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the application for amendments involves no significant hazards considerations.

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

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

NRC Assistant Director: Suzanne Black

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

Date of amendment requests: May 15, 1989 (TS 270)

Description of amendment requests:

The proposed amendment would change the BFN technical specifications (TS) for Units 1, 2, and 3 to update surveillance requirement 4.8.A.3 and revise the Bases section 3.6/4.8 to comply with 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix H for reactor vessel test specimen testing frequency.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided Standards for determining whether a significant hazards determination exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92(c). 10 CFR 50.91 requires that at the time a licensee requests an amendment, it must provide to the Commission its analyses, using the standards in Section 50.92, on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. Therefore, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 10 CFR 50.92, the licensee has performed and provided the following analysis:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of any accident previously evaluated. This is an administrative change in that it only updates the BFN technical specification to comply with the 10 CFR 50 Appendix H. This proposed amendment does not change or modify any safety related equipment, its operation, or safety analysis in which BFN is licensed for.

Updating the TS to ASTM E 185-82 increases the frequency for reactor vessel specimen withdrawal from 8 effective full power years (EFPY) to 6 EFPY. This increase in frequency does not involve any safety issue. The procedures and methods of withdrawing these specimens will remain the same.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. This change is administrative in that it only updates BFN reactor vessel specimen program to ASTM E 185-82. Implementation of this change does not change any equipment or modify any actions required for mitigation of any accident currently analyzed in the BFN FSAR. This change does not create any additional radiation release pathways to the environment.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve any significant reduction in a margin of safety. The change updates the BFN reactor vessel specimen withdrawal program in accordance with 10 CFR 50 Appendix H requirements. BFN has agreement with NRC to withdraw the first specimen from each unit after 8.0 EFPY. After the first specimen is pulled from each unit, subsequent specimens will be pulled at a 6.0 EFPY.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and agrees with the licensee's analysis. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the application for amendments involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room

location: Athens Public Library, South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611.

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

NRC Assistant Director: Suzanne Black

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

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

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

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendments, (2) the amendments, and (3) the Commission's related letters, Safety Evaluations and/or Environmental Assessments as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington.

DC 20555. Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Projects.

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

Dates of application for amendments: August 11, 1986, as supplemented July 22, 1987.

Description of amendments: The amendments extend the expiration dates of the licenses from August 16, 2012 to June 25, 2017 for Unit 1 and from August 16, 2012 to March 31, 2021 for Unit 2.

Date of issuance: May 19, 1989

Effective date: May 19, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 81 and 73

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 24, 1988 (51 FR 33939). Because the July 22, 1987 submittal only clarified certain aspects of the original request, the substance of the changes noticed in the Federal Register and the proposed no significant hazards determination were not affected. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 19, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Arizona Public Service Company, et al, Docket Nos. STN 50-528, STN 50-529 and STN 50-530, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2 and 3, Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of application for amendments: November 9, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Technical Specifications Section 3/4.4.5, "Reactor Coolant System Leakage" by changing the operability requirements of the containment radioactivity monitoring systems and the associated action statement.

Date of issuance: May 23, 1989

Effective date: May 23, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 43, 28, 17

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-41, NPF-51 and NPF-74: Amendments changed the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 8, 1989 (54 FR 9913). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1989

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: December 12, 1986

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changed the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 Technical Specifications to remove the text of several temporary specifications which are no longer applicable, regarding gross iodine determination, the sodium thiosulfate system, and the borated water storage tank. The amendment also made several changes to correct typographical errors, and revised wording to provide consistent terminology. It was noted that several of the typographical errors no longer existed and no change was therefore necessary.

Date of issuance: May 25, 1989

Effective date: May 25, 1989

Amendment No.: 121

Facility Operating License No. DPR-51. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 22, 1987 (52 FR 13333). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 25, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of applications for amendment: December 12, 1986

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changed the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 Technical Specifications (TS) which describe the design features of the Spent Fuel Storage Pool. These changes update the TS to conform with Amendment No. 43 which increased the spent fuel storage capacity for the plant.

Date of issuance: May 23, 1989

Effective date: May 23, 1989

Amendment No.: 95

Facility Operating License No. NPF-6. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15821). The Commission's related evaluation of

the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Dates of amendment requests: March 20 and 24, 1985

Brief description of amendments: The amendments deleted the remaining portions of the Appendix "B" Technical Specifications for Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2, which consisted of a description of land use management for the site and the transmission line right of ways.

Date of issuance: June 1, 1989

Effective date: June 1, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 122 and 96

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-51 and NPF-8. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 29, 1985 (50 FR 25481) and May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20970). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 1, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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 amendments: April 14, 1988 as supplemented on April 28, 1987

Brief description of amendments: These amendments modify Technical Specification 3/4.8.2.3, "Electrical Power Systems: D.C. Distribution - Operating," by deleting the dummy load profile for the 18-month station battery service test from TS Surveillance Requirement 4.8.2.3.2.d.2 and instead now specify that the load profile is documented in Chapter 8 of the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Units 1 and 2 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) and shall be update in accordance with the 10 CFR 50.71(e). Modifications of the UFSAR load profile shall be made in accordance with the process described in 10 CFR 50.59.

Date of issuance: May 18, 1989.

Effective date: 14 days after the licensee's issuance of a notarized letter the Commission providing official certification of the completion, approval and implementation, in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59, of a new station battery design load study for current plant conditions.

Amendment Nos.: 137 and 120

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-53 and DPR-69. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 18, 1988 (53 FR 40982). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 18, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland.

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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 amendments: January 20, 1987 as supplemented on January 12, and June 28, 1988

Brief description of amendments:

These amendments delete the current requirement of Units 1 and 2 Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement 4.6.4.1.2.c to verify that the containment purge air inlet valves (CPA-1410-CV and CPA-1411-CV) and the containment purge air outlet valves (CPA-1412-CV and CPA-1413-CV) close to their actuation positions upon receiving a safety injection actuation system (SIAS) test signal. In addition, reference to the SIAS action of the containment purge valves would be deleted from TS Tables 3.3-3, "Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation," Table 3.3-4, "Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation Trip Valves," and Table 4.3-2, "Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Surveillance Requirements."

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 138, 121

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-53 and DPR-69. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 1, 1989 (54 FR 18615). The Commission's related evaluation of these amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland.

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of application for amendments: February 1, 1989

Description of amendments: The amendments delete instrument tag numbers from the Technical Specifications, delete one-time TS exceptions that were added as footnotes, and provide other editorial and administrative changes.

Date of issuance: May 22, 1989

Effective date: May 22, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 130 and 160

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 5, 1989 (54 FR 13759). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 22, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

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

Date of application for amendments: September 4, 1987, as amended and supplemented by letters dated April 5, 1988, February 20, 1989 and March 20, 1989.

Description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to (1) modify specifications having cycle-specific parameter limits by replacing the values of those limits with a reference to the Core Operating Limits Report for the values of those limits and (2) delete the redundant linear heat generation rate limit from the specifications.

Date of issuance: May 25, 1989

Effective date: May 25, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 131 and 161

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15822). The Commission's related evaluation of

the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 25, 1989

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Date of application for amendment: February 22, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would modify (1) the most negative moderator temperature coefficient (MTC) limiting condition for operation (LCO), (2) the associated surveillance requirements (SR), and (3) the affected basis. The purpose of this LCO and SR is to ensure that the most negative MTC at end-of-cycle (EOC) remains within the bounds of the Harris safety analysis, in particular, for those transients and accidents that can lead to a moderator temperature decrease (cooldown) or, equivalently, a moderator density increase.

Date of issuance: May 22, 1989

Effective date: May 22, 1989

Amendment No.: 11

Facility Operating License No. NPF-63. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15823). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 22, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Attorney for the Licensee: R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, P. O. Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Local Public Document Room

location: Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 50-454 and 50-455, Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois; Docket Nos. 50-456 and 50-457, Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment: December 23, 1987, supplemented April 3, 1989

Brief description of amendment: These amendments modify Technical Specification Tables 3.3-1 and 4.3-1, as requested in Generic Letter 85-09, for Reactor Trip System Automatic

actuation using shunt trip coil attachments.

Date of issuance: May 22, 1989

Effective date: May 22, 1989

Amendment No.: 28 for Byron and 17 for Braidwood

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-37, NPF-68, NPF-72 and NPF-77: The amendment revised the Technical Specification

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15824). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 22, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: For Byron Station, Rockford Public Library, 215 N. Wyman Street, Rockford, Illinois 61101; for Braidwood Station, the Wilmington Township Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481.

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

Date of application for amendments: March 25, 1985, supplemented April 17, 1989 and May 10, 1989.

Brief description of amendments:

These amendments revise Tables 3.1-1 and 4.1-1 of the Technical Specifications for Zion units to address operability and surveillance requirements for Reactor Trip Breakers in accordance with Generic Letter 85-09.

Date of issuance: May 30, 1989

Effective date: May 30, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 116, 105

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-39 and DPR-48: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20973) and April 28, 1989 (54 FR 18367). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Waukegan Public Library, 128 N. County Street, Waukegan, Illinois 60085.

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

Date of application for amendment: April 26, 1986, supplemented May 30, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment adds a new Technical Specification (TS) section on Reactor Coolant System Leakage Detection

Systems. This TS will provide limiting conditions of operation and surveillance requirements for the Reactor Coolant System Leakage Detection Systems. With the issuance of the Technical Specification, Systematic Evaluation Program (SEP) Topic V-5, "Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary Leakage Detection" is considered closed.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 116

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 21, 1988 (51 FR 18681). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

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

Date of application for amendment: September 30, 1988, as supplemented December 30, 1988, January 20, 1989, February 7, 1989, March 3, 1989, and April 14, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Indian Point Unit 2 Technical Specifications to allow a fuel design transition to Westinghouse 15x15 Optimized Fuel Assemblies fuel.

Date of issuance: May 18, 1989

Effective date: May 18, 1989

Amendment No.: 140

Facility Operating License No. DPR-26: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 8, 1989 (54 FR 8187). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 18, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of application for amendment: November 21, 1985

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the TSs to require specific alternate shutdown system equipment and instrumentation to be

operable whenever the reactor coolant temperature is at or above 325° F and imposes periodic surveillance requirements to demonstrate operability of the system. The changes add Specification 3.25, including Table 3.25.1 and Specification 4.20, including Table 4.20.1. Other requests related to the emergency lighting facility are denied.

Date of issuance: May 19, 1989

Effective date: May 19, 1989

Amendment No.: 122

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-20: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15826). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 19, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Van Zoeren Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

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

Date of application for amendment: March 10, 1987

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Technical Specifications to clarify the sampling requirements for service water discharge, deletes the surveillance requirement for testing the Hi Range Noble Gas Monitor high alarm annunciator, and makes editorial corrections to the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications implemented by Amendment No. 85 to the Provisional Operating License.

Date of issuance: May 30, 1989

Effective date: May 30, 1989

Amendment No.: 123

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-20: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15826). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Van Zoeren Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

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

Date of application for amendment: February 25, 1987

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Technical Specifications to account for

modifications made to the recirculation actuation system (RAS). Those modifications altered the RAS from a two-out-of-four logic to a one-out-of-two-taken-twice logic. This amendment also includes an editorial correction related to a change previously approved by Amendment 31.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 124

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-20. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 8, 1987 (52 FR 11357). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Van Zoeren Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

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

Date of application for amendment: March 14, 1983, supplemented by letters dated May 13, 1985 and February 2, 1988.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Appendix A TSs relating to periodic testing of the station batteries. The proposed changes would add specifications 4.7.2.c and 4.7.2.d. Additionally, a change was made to the Basis to identify the purpose of the battery surveillance requirements, and a sentence was rearranged to improve clarity.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 125

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-20. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 23, 1983 (48 FR 38399). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Van Zoeren Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi-2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: March 10, 1989

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises TS Section 4.3.8.2c to allow a one-time extension to the disassembly and inspection interval for the turbine overspeed protection system valves, specifically, the turbine control

valves, high pressure turbine stop valves, low pressure turbine intercept valves, and low pressure turbine stop valves, until the first refueling outage, currently scheduled to begin in September 1989. These tests would have become overdue after May 20, 1989.

Date of issuance: May 19, 1989

Effective date: May 19, 1989

Amendment No.: 33

Facility Operating License No. NPF-43. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 5, 1989 (54 FR 13763). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 19, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Monroe County Library System, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi-2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: April 21, 1989

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revised the TSs to reflect a design modification to the Reactor Building's railroad bay air lock doors. The modifications to the doors are a result of the licensee discovering the air supply to the inflatable seals on the doors was not safety related.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 34

Facility Operating License No. NPF-43. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 28, 1989 (54 FR 18382). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Monroe County Library System, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

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

Date of application for amendments: April 6, 1989, as supplemented April 21, 1989.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified the Technical Specifications to identify special Rod Cluster Control Assemblies which will be inserted in the Unit 2 core prior to Cycle 3 operation.

Date of issuance: May 23, 1989

Effective date: May 23, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 64 and 58

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15827). Because the April 21, 1989, submittal clarified certain aspects of the original request, the substance of the changes noticed in the Federal Register and the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination were not affected. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: August 29, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modify Technical Specification Tables 4.3-8 and 4.3-9 by adding a footnote regarding the location of the alarm annunciators for radiation monitors EMF-57 and EMF-58 and correct a reference in Table 4.11.1 to EMF-58 which should be EMF-57.

Date of issuance: May 26, 1989

Effective date: May 26, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 65 and 59

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 14, 1988 (53 FR 50325). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 26, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: March 16, 1987, as supplemented April 24, 1987

Brief description of amendments: The amendments changed the Technical Specifications (TS) regarding functional testing of fuses and relocated the

method of testing low voltage circuit breakers from the surveillance requirement section to the TS Bases.

Date of issuance: May 25, 1989

Effective date: May 25, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 96 and 78

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 8, 1989 (54 FR 9916). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 25, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Duquesne Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: January 5, 1989

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Specification 3/4.1.3.1 regarding movable control assemblies limiting condition for operation to: (1) permit continued operation if one or more control rods are inoperable but trippable, and (2) make several administrative changes or corrections.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 141 for Unit 1; 17 for Unit 2.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 22, 1989 (54 FR 7833). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of applications for amendment: March 31, 1983, as supplemented June 22, 1983, and December 31, 1984, as superseded April 25, 1988 and revised November 28, 1988.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment removes Table 3.6.1, Containment Isolation Valves, from the TS and relocates it to the FSAR. References to Table 3.6.1 in other TS are

also removed. In addition, the amendment clarifies the requirement for stroke retest of valves following maintenance and adds surveillances which ensure that the isolation time of each power-operated valve is within its approved limits and that all purge isolation valves are verified shut at least once every 31 days when in Modes 1, 2, 3, or 4.

Date of issuance: May 22, 1989

Effective date: May 22, 1989

Amendment No.: 114

Facility Operating License No. DPR-72: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 21, 1983 (48 FR 56504), and November 30, 1988 (53 FR 48330). The November 28, 1988 letter provided clarifying information which did not alter the staff's initial determination of no significant hazards considerations. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 22, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida 32629

Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of application for amendment: June 22, 1983, as superseded April 25, 1988 and clarified March 31, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment adds operability, action and surveillance requirements for the chlorine and sulfur dioxide toxic gas detection systems.

Date of issuance: May 30, 1989

Effective date: May 30, 1989

Amendment No.: 115

Facility Operating License No. DPR-72: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 7, 1988 (53 FR 34604). The March 31, 1989 letter provided clarifying information which did not change the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida 32629

Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of application for amendment: March 31, 1983, as supplemented June 22, 1983.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment provides TS for a reactor building high radiation monitor, a reactor building wide-range pressure monitor, and a reactor building flood level monitor. These changes are made in response to NUREG-0737, Item II.F.1.1.

Date of issuance: May 30, 1989

Effective date: May 30, 1989

Amendment No.: 116

Facility Operating License No. DPR-72: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 21, 1983 (48 FR 54504). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida 32629

Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of application for amendment: February 16, 1984

Brief description of amendment: This amendment provides additional requirements for decay heat removal redundancy in the Crystal River 3 TS.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 117

Facility Operating License No. DPR-72: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 25, 1984 (49 FR 17859). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room Location: Crystal River Public Library, 668 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida 32629

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-321, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Appling County, Georgia

Date of application for amendment: May 4, 1984, as amended September 12, 1984, August 19, 1987 and May 16, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modified the Technical Specifications to change the definition of Operable.

Date of issuance: May 25, 1989

Effective date: May 25, 1989

Amendment No.: 162

Facility Operating License No. DPR-57. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 7, 1987 (52 FR 37545). Because the May 16, 1989 submittal clarified certain aspects of the original request, the substance of the changes noticed in the Federal Register and the proposed no significant hazards determination were not affected. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 25, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: March 17, 1987

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Section 3.3, Reactor Coolant, of the Appendix A Technical Specifications regarding the requirements of Generic Letter 84-11. Specifically, the amendment limits the reactor coolant leakage system to a 2 gpm increase in unidentified leakage rate within any 24 hour period while operating at steady state power.

Date of Issuance: May 23, 1989

Effective date: May 23, 1989

Amendment No.: 133

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 20, 1987 (52 FR 18960). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Ocean County Library,

Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, New Jersey 08753.

Indiana Michigan Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50-315 and 50-316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of application for amendments: May 28, 1987

Brief description of amendments: The amendments will modify the Engineered Safeguards Features (ESF) and Storage Pool Ventilation System Technical Specifications (3/4.7.6.1 and 3/4.9.12, respectively). The proposed amendments will update the licensee's ventilation system testing standards and clarify several aspects of system operation. In addition, the amendment would also make several editorial and typographical changes.

Date of issuance: May 19, 1989

Effective date: May 19, 1989

Amendments Nos.: 124, 111

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 15, 1987 (52 FR 26588). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 19, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Indiana Michigan Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50-315 and 50-316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of application for amendments: January 16, 1987 and supplemented on June 25, September 28, and November 25, 1987, October 31, 1988, and January 24, March 23, and April 6, 1989.

Brief description of amendments: Letters from Indiana Michigan Power Company (the licensee) dated September 28, 1984 and April 24, 1985 for the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 & 2 established initial groundwork addressing concerns regarding diesel generator reliability in Generic Letter 84-15. In a letter dated January 16, 1987, the licensee submitted a Technical Specifications (TSs) change request attempting to more closely reflect the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) enclosed in Generic Letter 84-15. Additional information and improved TSs are included in letters dated June 25, and September 28, 1987. A letter dated November 25, 1987, requests TS changes to two specific portions of the original submittal concerning diesel generator fuel oil

surveillance testing and the ten year diesel generator fuel oil storage tank cleaning. Additional information on the ten year diesel generator fuel storage tank cleaning is contained in a letter dated January 24, 1989. The portions of the TSs submittal dated January 16, 1987, concerning simulated load testing of the station batteries and N-train batteries were resubmitted in a letter dated April 29, 1988, to ensure timely compliance with an INPO commitment and to reduce outage time and were issued as Amendment Nos. 123 and 110 to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74, respectively. A letter dated March 23, 1989, provides clarified and corrected TS pages for the 10-year tank cleaning and inspection portion. The licensee provided corrected TSs covering diesel generator surveillance testing in a letter dated April 6, 1989.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendments Nos.: 125 and 112

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 26, 1987 (52 FR 5857), July 29, 1987 (52 FR 28380) and December 30, 1987 (52 FR 49227). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Maude Preston 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: October 13, 1986

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Duane Arnold Energy Center Technical Specifications to conform to the Standard Technical Specifications for Boiling Water Reactors and to the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code requirements for Inservice Testing of pumps and valves. The surveillance intervals for certain pumps and valves were revised to reflect the use of the 1980 Edition (Winter 1981 Addendum) as required by 10 CFR 50.55a(g)(4)(ii).

Date of issuance: June 1, 1989

Effective date: June 1, 1989

Amendment No.: 160

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 6, 1989 (54 FR 13966). The

Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 1, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of amendment request: January 27, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the Technical Specifications to specify revised Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance requirements for the 250 Volt DC batteries and battery chargers.

Date of issuance: May 24, 1989

Effective date: May 24, 1989

Amendment No.: 130

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15830). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 24, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: January 13, 1989

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises Sections 3.1.4 and 4.1.4 Core Spray System; Section 3.3.7, Containment Spray; and the associated Bases for Sections 3.1.4, 4.1.4, and 3.3.7. In addition, the proposed amendment provides new limiting conditions for operation for the Core Spray system in the cold shutdown and refueling conditions and with the suppression pool inoperable.

Date of issuance: May 16, 1989

Effective date: May 16, 1989

Amendment No.: 105

Facility Operating License No. DPR-63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 24, 1989 (54 FR 8030). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 16, 1989

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of application for amendment: March 14, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications (TS) as follows: (1) TS 4.3.4.2, "Turbine Overspeed Protection," is deleted and replaced with a reference to the requirements of the "Turbine Overspeed Protection Maintenance and Testing Program," and (2) TS 6.5.1.6, "Responsibilities," is supplemented by adding item (j) which requires that the Plant Operations Review Committee (PORC) provide for "Review of Unit Turbine Overspeed Protection Maintenance and Testing Program and revisions thereto." In addition, a footnote is added to the applicability for TS 3.3.4 to state that the Turbine Overspeed Protection System need not be operable "... in MODE 2 and 3 with all main steam line isolation valves and associated bypass valves in the closed position and all other steam flow paths to the turbine isolated."

Date of issuance: May 23, 1989

Effective date: May 23, 1989

Amendment No.: 34

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15832). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: March 10, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes Facility Operating License No. NPF-49, Paragraph 1.A., to delete the City of Burlington, Vermont, as a licensee for Millstone Unit 3.

Date of issuance: May 25, 1989

Effective date: May 25, 1989

Amendment No.: 35

Facility Operating License No. NPF-49. Amendment revised paragraph 1.A of the Facility Operating License.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15831). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 25, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Northern States Power Company, Docket No. 50-283, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

Date of application for amendment: April 13, 1984 as supplemented by letters dated August 17, 1984; August 30 and November 27, 1985; February 19, 1987; June 8 and July 5, 1988.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Technical Specifications to add Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements for installed control room habitability equipment in accordance with the provisions of TMI Action Plan Item III.D.3.4 (NUREG-0737).

Date of issuance: May 30, 1989

Effective date: May 30, 1989

Amendment No.: 85

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21833) and September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38404). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County, California

Date of application for amendments: December 19, 1988, as supplemented by letter dated March 23, 1989 (Reference LAR 88-10)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications to add operability and surveillance requirements for the Undervoltage Trip and Shunt Trip Attachments for compliance with the

guidance contained in Generic Letter 85-09.

Date of issuance: May 23, 1989.

Effective date: May 23, 1989.

Amendment Nos.: 38 and 37.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82: Amendments changed the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15833). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: California Polytechnic State University Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-387
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station,
Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment:
February 24, 1989

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications supporting modifications to eliminate the steam condensing of the residual heat removal system operation.

Date of issuance: May 22, 1989

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented prior to startup, following the Unit 1 fourth refueling and inspection outage, expected to occur on June 2, 1989.

Amendment No.: 91

Facility Operating License No. NPF-14: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15834). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 22, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Docket No. 50-352, Limerick Generating Station, Unit 1, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment:
August 19, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications to change the reporting requirements for iodine spiking from a short term to an item to be included in the Annual Report. The amendment also eliminates the existing requirement to shut down a plant if coolant iodine

activity limits are exceeded for 800 hours in a 12 month period.

Date of issuance: May 19, 1989

Effective date: May 19, 1989

Amendment No.: 20

Facility Operating License No. NPF-39: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 12, 1987 (52 FR 7691). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 19, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: Yes, however, the requests for hearing were considered by an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board and the amendment proceeding terminated on May 5, 1988. LBP-88-12, 27 NRC 495(1988), *aff'd*, ALAB-897, 28 NRC 33(1988).

Local Public Document Room

location: Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Docket No. 50-352, Limerick Generating Station, Unit 1, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment:
January 23, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to permit use of filters with an increased pore size when periodically testing the amount of particulate contamination in the diesel generator fuel oil.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 21

Facility Operating License No. NPF-39: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 22, 1989 (54 FR 7641). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

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

Date of application for amendments:
October 17, 1988

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revised the Environmental Technical Specifications

and Bases contained in Appendix B to the Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-58 to reflect the issuance by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania of National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit PA-0009733 on September 27, 1985.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendments Nos.: 146 and 148

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-58: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 27, 1989 (54 FR 18179). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in the Commission's letter dated May 31, 1989.

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.

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

Date of application for amendment:
September 30, 1988, as supplemented November 16, 1987 and April 14, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specifications 3/4.3.3.6 and 3/4.7.6.1, "Chlorine Detection Systems," and "Control Room Emergency Ventilation System," respectively, concerning control room habitability.

Date of issuance: May 15, 1989

Effective date: May 15, 1989

Amendment No.: 152

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 6, 1987 (52 FR 16951). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 15, 1989.

No Significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Portland State University Library, 731 S. W. Harrison St., Portland Oregon 97207

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of amendment request:
November 20, 1987, as supplemented May 27 and August 12, 1988.

Description of amendment request: The amendment permits the use of

upgraded fuel assemblies which incorporate features of Westinghouse Vantage 5 fuel assemblies, and allows extended fuel burnup and higher nuclear peaking factors.

Date of issuance: May 24, 1989

Effective date: May 24, 1989

Amendment No.: 153

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 24, 1988 (53 FR 5495). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 24, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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: May 16, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment reduces the allowable outage times for the Main Control Room Emergency Ventilation System to 14 days with one filter train inoperable and three days with both trains inoperable.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 129

Facility Operating License No. DPR-59: Amendment revised the Technical Specification.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 27, 1989 (54 FR 18182). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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: December 6, 1984, as supplemented and superseded (in part) by letters dated October 18, 1985 and October 20, 1986.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment incorporates changes in response to the acceptance criteria and guidance of Generic Letters 83-02 and

83-36, "NUREG-0737 Technical Specifications." The following items are addressed by this amendments: Limit Overtime (II.A.1.3); Radiation Signal on Purge Valves (II.E.4.2.7), RCIC Restart and RCIC Suction (II.K.3.13 and II.K.3.22), Penetrations (II.E.4.1), Report Safety and Relief Valve Failures and Challenges (II.K.3.3), Post Accident Sampling (II.B.3), Noble Gas Effluent Monitors (II.F.1.1), Sampling and Analysis of Plant Effluents (II.F.1.2), Containment High-Range Monitor (II.F.1.3), Containment Pressure Monitor (II.F.1.4), Containment Water Level Monitor (II.F.1.5), and Containment Hydrogen Monitor (II.F.1.6).

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment No.: 130

Facility Operating License No. DPR-59: Amendment revised the Technical Specification.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 19, 1987 (51 FR 41866). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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: April 10, 1988 and supplemented August 5, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deletes the requirement to disconnect an emergency bus from its normal power source and connect it to its reserve power source when the associated Emergency Diesel Generator system is inoperable.

Date of issuance: June 1, 1989

Effective date: June 1, 1989

Amendment No.: 131

Facility Operating License No. DPR-59: Amendment revised the Technical Specification.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 24, 1986 (51 FR - 33957). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 1, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Penfield Library, State

University College of Oswego, Oswego, New York.

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of application for amendments: October 17, 1985 and supplemented December 18, 1986

Brief description of amendments: The amendments changed the Technical Specifications pertaining to the reactor trip system instrumentation and surveillance.

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: Units 1 and 2, effective as of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days of the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: 97 and 74

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75: These amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 12, 1988 (51 FR 5277) and April 27, 1989 (54 FR 28183). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Public 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 application for amendment: February 24, 1989.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the rod insertion limits for the Cycle 19 fuel reload to ensure that all criteria for the reload are met. Since the change is not applicable to future cycles, it is presented as a change with a limited period of applicability.

Date of issuance: May 22, 1989

Effective date: Date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 36

Facility Operating License No. DPR-18: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15837). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 22, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Rochester Public Library, 115

South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of application for amendment: October 14, 1985 as supplemented February 13, 1986

Brief description of amendment: The amendment approved use of the Babcock and Wilcox Integrated Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program, withdrew the Exemption to Appendix H of 10 CFR Part 50 granted January 10, 1983, and deleted all references to current reactor vessel material surveillance requirements.

Date of issuance: May 16, 1989

Effective date: May 16, 1989

Amendment No.: 104

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54: Amendment revised the License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 8, 1988 (51 FR 36103). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 16, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Martin Luther King Regional Library, 7340 24th Street Bypass, Sacramento, California 95822.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of application for amendment: October 7, 1988, as supplemented November 18, 1988, and March 27, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment clarifies the operational mode applicability of TS 3.4 and the definition of auxiliary feedwater (AFW) train, revises the surveillance requirements and frequency of verifying the AFW System flow path, and revises the surveillance requirement for AFW pump testing.

Date of issuance: May 23, 1989

Effective date: May 23, 1989

Amendment No.: 105

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15837). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Martin Luther King Regional

Library, 7340 24th Street Bypass, Sacramento, California 95822.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of application for amendment: March 19, 1985, as supplemented by letters dated June 17 and November 25, 1985

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revised Technical Specification 4.17, "Steam Generators," to provide for a more extensive inspection of steam generator tubes by defining special tube areas to complete 100% inspection where degradation is expected. Normal random sampling inspection of tubes will be done on other areas of the steam generator. This amendment also incorporated miscellaneous changes to paragraph numbers, section titles, and phrases for consistency.

In addition, this amendment revised the reporting requirements for the inspection results to make the reporting requirements consistent with 10 CFR 50.72(b)(2) and extended the deadline for reports on tube plugging to 30 days following each inservice inspection.

Date of issuance: May 23, 1989

Effective date: May 23, 1989

Amendment No.: 106

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 18, 1988 (51 FR 22242). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 23, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Martin Luther King Regional Library, 7340 24th Street Bypass, Sacramento, California 95822.

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

Date of application for amendment: June 10, 1985, as supplemented December 6, 1985 and May 16, July 14, July 28, and November 18, 1988 and April 5, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment to Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Technical Specifications (TS) would reduce the number and severity of starts of the emergency diesel generators, thereby decreasing engine wear and increasing reliability, and restructures the action and surveillance statements for clarity and usability.

Date of issuance: May 30, 1989

Effective date: May 30, 1989

Amendment No.: 77

Facility Operating License No. NPF-12: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 17, 1985 (50 FR 29018). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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 application for amendments: August 26, 1986, as supplemented November 21, 1986 and February 1, 1988

Brief description of amendments: The amendments add license conditions which require implementation of an integrated implementation schedule program plan for scheduling all capital modifications.

Date of issuance: May 15, 1989

Effective date: May 15, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 72 and 60

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15: Amendments changed the licenses.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 22, 1987 (52 FR 13349). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 15, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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 application for amendments: April 26, October 11 and October 24, 1988, as supplemented March 20, 1989.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the following Technical Specifications to increase the interval for the 18 month surveillance tests to at least once per refueling interval, which is defined as 24 months: 3/4.1.2.2, "Boration Systems, Flow Paths-Operating," 3/4.1.3.4, "CEA Drop Time," 3/4.5.1, "Safety Injection Tanks," 3/4.5.2, "ECCS Subsystems - T₁

Greater Than or Equal to 350° F," 3/4.6.2.1, "Containment Spray System," 3/4.6.2.3, "Containment Cooling System," 3/4.6.3, "Containment Isolation Valves," and 3/4.6.4.2, "Electric Hydrogen Recombiners."

Date of issuance: May 31, 1989

Effective date: May 31, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 73, 61

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15: Amendments changed the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 8, 1989 (54 FR 9929-30 and 54 FR 9932-33) and March 22, 1989 (54 FR 11842). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 31, 1989

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: General Library, University of California, P.O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-529, 50-260 and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Brief description of amendments: The proposed change adds requirements 1.0.MM.6 per guidance of Generic Letter 88-01.

Date of issuance: May 19, 1989

Effective date: May 19, 1989

Amendments Nos.: 166, 165, 137

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 1, 1989 (54 FR 5175). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated: May 19, 1989

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Athens Public Library, South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611.

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

Date of application for amendments: October 24, 1988 as supplemented by letter dated March 24, 1989. (TS 258)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the expiration date for the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN) Operating Licenses DPR-33 (Unit 1) from May 10, 2007 to December 20, 2013, for BFN Operating License DPR-52 (Unit 2) from May 10, 2007 to June 28, 2014, and for BFN Operating License DPR-68 (Unit 3) from July 31, 2008 to July 2, 2016. The supplemental information

supplied in the March 24, 1989 letter did not change the substance of the Notice of Consideration of an amendment issued in the Federal Register on TVA's application for extension of operating license dates.

Date of issuance: May 19, 1989

Effective date: May 19, 1989

Amendments Nos.: 187, 186, 138

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-33, DPR-52 and DPR-68: Amendments revised the license for each facility.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 11, 1989 (54 FR 1024). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 19, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Athens Public Library, South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-527 and 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendments: January 25, 1984 (TS 52)

Brief description of amendments: These amendments modify Section 3/4.4, Reactor Coolant System, of the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TS). The changes add limiting conditions for operation (LCO), action statements if the LCO is not met and surveillance requirements for the reactor coolant system vents (RCSV). These are TS 3/4.4.11. A section on the RCSV is also being added to the Bases of the TS.

The proposed changes on the RCSV paths in TVA's application dated December 9, 1985 duplicated the changes in its application dated January 25, 1984. This latter application also included proposed TS changes for the following TMI Action Plan monitors: high range noble gas effluent monitors, containment area high range radiation monitors, containment pressure monitor and the instrumentation for detection of inadequate core cooling. These are TMI Action Plan items ILF.1.1, ILF.1.3, ILF.1.4 and ILF.2, respectively. Also included were proposed changes to the requirements for diesel generator testing to meet the NRC Generic Letter 83-30 dated July 25, 1983.

For the high range noble gas effluent monitors and containment area radiation monitors, the staff approved changes to the TS in its letter dated April 28, 1989. For the containment pressure monitor and the instrumentation for detection of inadequate core cooling, the staff approved changes to the TS in its letter

dated September 16, 1988. For the diesel generator testing requirements, the staff approved changes to the TS in its letter dated October 28, 1986.

The amendments described above complete the staff's review of TVA application dated January 25, 1984.

Date of issuance: June 1, 1989

Effective date: June 1, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 116, 106

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38410). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated June 1, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

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: August 6, 1987

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deleted in its entirety the Appendix B "Environmental Technical Specifications" and those portions of License Conditions 2.C.(2) and 2.F.(1) which referred to the Environmental Technical Specifications.

Date of issuance: May 18, 1989

Effective date: May 18, 1989

Amendment No.: 133

Facility Operating License No. NPF-3: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15839). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 18, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

Date of application for amendment: September 18, 1985 as supplemented by letters dated March 23 and May 9, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Section 3/4.6.1.6, Containment Vessel Structural Integrity, of the Callaway Technical

Specifications. The amendment provided both clarification and relaxation of some of the existing Surveillance Requirements as well as adding provisions which the staff found vital for monitoring the integrity of prestressed concrete containments. In addition, modifications were made to some of the reporting requirements and action statements found within the Limiting Condition for Operation.

Date of issuance: May 24, 1989

Effective date: May 24, 1989

Amendment No.: 48

Facility Operating License No. NPF-30. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 4, 1985 (50 FR 49794). The March 23 and May 9, 1989 submittals provided additional clarifying information and did not change the proposed finding of the initial notice. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 24, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Callaway County Public Library, 710 Court Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251 and the John M. Olin Library, Washington University, Skinker and Lindell Boulevards, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia.

Date of application for amendments: March 30, 1988

Brief description of amendments: These amendments change TS Section 6.5.B.7, "Station Operating Records" by clarifying the requirement to retain photographs of scope traces of welds which are tested by ultrasonic examination and photographs of surface welds inspected by a visual or surface examination for the life of the plant.

Date of issuance: May 18, 1989

Effective date: May 18, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 127 and 127

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 18, 1988 (53 FR 17796). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 18, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia.

Date of application for amendments: February 14, 1979, as supplemented September 21, 1982, August 30, 1985, April 11, 1988 and May 12, 1989.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments remove obsolete inservice inspection and testing requirements and replaces them with more up-to-date NRC-approved requirements specified in 10 CFR 50.55a(g).

Date of issuance: May 24, 1989

Effective date: May 24, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 128 and 128

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 23, 1983 (48 FR 38428) and October 23, 1985 (50 FR 43036).

The April 11, 1988 and May 12, 1989 letters provided supplemental information which did not alter the staff's initial determination of no significant hazards considerations. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 24, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia.

Date of application for amendments: March 20, 1989

Brief description of amendments: These amendments change Technical Specification Sections 3.14 and 3.23 by imposing additional system operating restrictions on the Main Control Room and Emergency Switchgear Room Air Conditioning System.

Date of issuance: May 30, 1989

Effective date: May 30, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 129 and 129

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 5, 1989 (54 FR 13770). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 30, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

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

Date of application for amendment: May 23, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the expiration date of the license from August 6, 2008 to December 21, 2013.

Date of issuance: May 26, 1989

Effective date: May 26, 1989

Amendment No.: 82

Facility Operating License No. NPF-43. Amendment revised the License.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 25, 1989 (54 FR 17849). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 26, 1989 and the environmental assessment dated May 11, 1989 (54 FR 21510).

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas

Date of amendment request: December 6, 1985 and amended March 29 and May 10, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Section 3/4.6.1.6, Containment Vessel Structural Integrity, of the Wolf Creek Generating Station Technical Specifications. The amendment provided both clarification and relaxation of some of the existing Surveillance Requirements as well as added provisions which the staff found vital for monitoring the integrity of prestressed concrete containments. In addition, modifications were made to some of the reporting requirements and action statements found within the Limiting Condition for Operation.

Date of Issuance: May 24, 1989

Effective date: May 24, 1989

Amendment No.: 31

Facility Operating License No. NPF-42. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 15, 1988 (51 FR 1876). The March 29 and May 10, 1989 submittals provided additional clarifying information and did not change the finding of the initial notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 24, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621.

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

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

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual 30-day Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for a Hearing. For exigent circumstances, the Commission has either issued a Federal Register notice providing opportunity for public comment or has used local media to provide notice to the public in the area surrounding a licensee's facility of the licensee's application and of the Commission's proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration. The Commission has provided a reasonable opportunity for the public to comment, using its best efforts to make available to the public means of communication for the public to respond quickly, and in the case of telephone comments, the comments have been recorded or transcribed as appropriate and the licensee has been informed of the public comments.

In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant or in prevention of either resumption of operation or of increase in power output up to the plant's licensed power level, the Commission may not have had an

opportunity to provide for public comment on its no significant hazards determination. In such case, the license amendment has been issued without opportunity for comment. If there has been some time for public comment but less than 30 days, the Commission may provide an opportunity for public comment. If comments have been requested, it is so stated. In either event, the State has been consulted by telephone whenever possible.

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

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

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

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

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendments. By July 14, 1989, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose

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

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

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

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

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

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 325-6000 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (Project Director): petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: March 31, 1989 as supplemented May 25, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the one-time relaxation of the containment integrity Technical Specification granted in Amendment No. 112 to allow cleaning or

replacement of the containment air fan motor heat exchangers while at power.

Date of Issuance: June 1, 1989

Effective date: June 1, 1989

Amendment No.: 117

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

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes. Published in Federal Register May 12, 1989 (54 FR 20659). No comments were received.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluated dated

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

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz
Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of June, 1989.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Steven A. Varga,

Director, Division of Reactor Projects-I/II,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
(Doc. 89-14004 Filed 6-13-89; 8:45 am)

BILLING CODE 7530-01-D

