existing permit which expires by limitation of time on December 31, 1990, and therefore pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Act of October 9, 1965 (79 Stat. 969; 16 U.S.C. 20), is entitled to be given preference in the renewal of the permit and in the negotiation of a new contract as defined in 36 CFR, § 51.5.

The Secretary will consider and evaluate all proposals received as a result of this notice. Any proposal, including that of the existing concessioner, must be postmarked or hand delivered on or before the sixtieth (60th) day following publication of this notice to be considered and evaluated.

Date: February 23, 1989.

William J. Briggle,

Acting Regional Director, Pacific Northwest Region.

[FR Doc. 89-10556 Filed 5-2-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to CERCLA, NL Industries, Inc.

In accordance with Department policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on April 14, 1989, a proposed Partial Consent Decree in *United States v. NL Industries, Inc.*, Civil No CV89-408, was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Oregon.

The Partial Consent Decree was made and entered into by and between the United States and NL Industries, Inc. The complaint was brought pursuant to sections 106 and 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) to compel NL Industries, Inc., the past owner, operator and generator at the Gould Site (Site) in Portland, Oregon to carry out the remedial action contemplated by the Record of Decision (ROD) and to reimburse the United States for response costs associated with the Site. The Partial Consent Decree provides that NL Industries, Inc. will perform a predesign study and, if technologically feasible, remedial actions up to $2.25 million minus the cost of the pre-design study.

The proposed Partial Consent Decree may be be examined at the office of the United States Attorney for the District of Oregon, 312 U.S. Courthouse, 620 SW Main Street, Portland, Oregon 97205; at the Region IX Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101; and at the Environmental Enforcement Section, Land and Natural Resources Division of the Department of Justice, Room 1515, 10th and Pennsylvania Avenue Washington, DC. 20530.

The Department of Justice will receive written comments relating to the proposed partial consent decree for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this notice. Comments should be addressed to Assistant Attorney General, Land and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States v. NL Industries, Inc.*, Department of Justice Reference No. 90-11-3-397.

In requesting a copy of the Partial Consent Decree, please enclose a check in the amount of $4.30 (10 cents per page reproduction charge) payable to the Treasurer of the United States.

Donald A. Carr,

Acting Assistant Attorney General, Land and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 89-10572 Filed 5-2-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Arts in Education Advisory Panel; Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Arts in Education Advisory Panel (Arts in Schools Basic Education Grants Section) to the National Council on the Arts will be held on May 18, 1989, from 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. and May 19, 1989, from 9:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m. in Room M-09 at the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506.

A portion of this meeting will be open to the public on May 19, 1989 from 11:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m. The topics for discussion will be policy issues.

The remaining portion of this meeting on May 18, 1989 from 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. and May 19, 1989, from 9:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m. is for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendation on applications for financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including information given in confidence to the agency by grant applicants. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman published in the **Federal Register** of February 13, 1980, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsection (c)(4), (6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

If you need special accommodations due to a disability, please contact the Office for Special Constituencies, National Endowment for the Arts, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20506, 202/682-5532, TTY 202/682-5496 at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Yvonne M. Sabine, Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC 20506, or call 202/682-5433.

Yvonne M. Sabine,

Director, Council and Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 89-10536 Filed 5-2-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537-01-M

Arts in Education Advisory Panel; Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Arts in Education Advisory Panel (Special Projects Section) to the National Council on the Arts will be held on June 5, 1989, from 8:30 a.m.-8:00 p.m., June 6-7, 1989, from 8:30 a.m.-7:00 p.m., and June 8, 1989, from 8:30 a.m.-2:00 p.m. in Room M-09 at the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506.

A portion of this meeting will be open to the public on June 8, 1989 from 11:15 a.m.-2:00 p.m. The topics for discussion will be policy issues and guidelines.

The remaining portion of this meeting on June 5, 1989 from 8:30 a.m.-8:00 p.m., June 6-7, 1989, from 8:30 a.m.-7:00 p.m., and June 8, 1989, from 8:30 a.m.-11:15 a.m. is for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendation on applications for financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including information given in confidence to the agency by grant applicants. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman published in the **Federal Register** of February 13, 1980, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsection (c) (4), (6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

If you need special accommodations due to a disability, please contact the Office for Special Constituencies, National Endowment for the Arts, 1100

Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20506, 202/682–5532, TTY 202/682–5496 at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Yvonne M. Sabine, Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC 20506, or call 202/682–5433.

April 26, 1989.

Yvonne M. Sabine,

Director, Council and Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 89–10537 Filed 5–2–89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–M

Inter-Arts Advisory Panel; Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Inter-Arts Advisory Panel (Challenge III section) to the National Council on the Arts will be held on May 19, 1989, from 9:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m. in Room 714 of the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506.

The meeting is for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendation on applications for financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including discussion of information given in confidence to the Agency by grant applicants. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman published in the **Federal Register** of February 13, 1980, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsections (c) (4), (6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Yvonne M. Sabine, Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC 20506, or call (202) 682–5433.

April 26, 1989.

Yvonne M. Sabine,

Director, Council and Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 89–10538 Filed 5–2–89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–M

Museum Advisory Panel; Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Museum Advisory Panel (Overview Section) to the National Council on the Arts will be held on May 23, 1989, from 9:15 a.m.–5:30 p.m. in Room M–14 at the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506.

This meeting will be open to the public on a space available basis. The topics for discussion will be policy issues, budget, and guidelines.

If you need special accommodations due to a disability, please contact the Office of Special Constituencies, National Endowment for the Arts, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20506, 202/682–5532, TTY 202/682–5496, at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Yvonne M. Sabine, Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC 20506, or call 202/682–5433.

April 26, 1989.

Yvonne M. Sabine,

Director, Council and Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 89–10539 Filed 5–2–89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–M

Museum Advisory Panel; Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Museum Advisory Panel (Special Artistic Initiative Section) to the National Council on the Arts will be held on May 24, 1989, from 9:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m. in Room M–14 at the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20506.

A portion of this meeting will be open to the public on May 24, 1989 from 9:00 a.m.–9:15 a.m. and from 5:00 p.m.–5:30 p.m. The topics for discussion will be on policy issues.

The remaining portion of this meeting on May 24, 1989 from 9:15 a.m.–5:00 p.m. is for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendation on applications for financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including information given in confidence to the agency by grant applicants. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman published in the **Federal Register** of February 13, 1980, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsection (c)(4), (6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

If you need special accommodations due to a disability, please contact the Office for Special Constituencies, National Endowment for the Arts, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20506, 202/682–5532, TTY 202/682–5496 at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Yvonne M. Sabine, Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC 20506, or call 202/682–5433.

April 26, 1989.

Yvonne M. Sabine,

Director, Council and Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 89–10540 Filed 5–2–89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

I. Background

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from April 8, 1989 through April 21, 1989. The last biweekly notice was published on April 19, 1989 (54 FR 15820).

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 June 2, 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.

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

Date of amendment request: December 12, 1986 and April 14, 1988 as amended.

Description of amendment request: The licensee requested several administrative changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) for each unit. One change was to establish a range of membership of the Safety Review Committee (SRC) from eight to twelve members, instead of strictly eight as currently specified in the TS for each unit. Also, this change would provide an equivalent SRC meeting quorum requirement. Other TS changes requested in the licensee's submittal have been noticed separately.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (51 FR 7744). One of the examples (i) of these actions involving no significant hazards consideration relates to a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications. The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications for Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2, would allow the voting members on the safety review committee (SRC) to vary from a minimum of eight to a maximum of 12 persons plus the SRC chairman. This change would provide some flexibility that would enhance the functioning of the SRC and does not reduce the existing requirements regarding member qualifications and SRC duties and responsibilities, and provides an equivalent definition of what constitutes a quorum. These proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not change the functional requirements of the SRC presently in the Technical Specifications and, therefore, involve no significant hazards. These requests do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident or other adverse condition over previous evaluations; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident or condition over previous evaluations; or involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Based on this information, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not present a significant hazard.

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: Jose A. Calvo

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-454 and 50-455, Byron Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Ogle County, Illinois; and Docket Nos. 50-456 and 50-457 Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: January 25, 1989, supplemented February 3, 1989.

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendment would revise Techncial Specification 5.3.1 of Appendix A of those licenses to replace the values of the maximum enrichment of reload fuel with a reference to a report entitled "Criticality Analysis of Byron and Braidwood Station Fuel Storage Racks," which contains the values of those limits. In addition, reference to this report has been included in the Definitions Section of the Technical Specifications (TS) to note that it is the unit-specific document that provides these limits for the current operating reload cycle. Furthermore, the definition notes that the values of these cycle-specific parameter limits are to be determined in accordance with the Specification 6.9.1.10. This specification requires that these limits be determined for each reload cycle in accordance with the referenced NRC-approved methodology for these limits, and be consistent with the applicable limits of the safety analysis.

Finally, this report and any mid-cycle revisions shall be provided to the NRC upon issuance. Generic Letter 88-16, dated October 4, 1988, from the NRC provided guidance to the licensees on requests for removal of the values of cycle-specific parameters from TS. The licensee's proposed amendment is in response to this Generic Letter.

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 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 revision to the License Condition is in accordance with the guidance provided in Generic Letter 88-16 for licensees requesting removal of the values of cycle-specific parameters from TS. The establishment of these limits in accordance to an NRC-approved methodology and the incorporation of these limits into "Criticality Analysis of Byron and Braidwood Station Fuel Storage Racks" will ensure that proper steps have been taken to establish the values of these limits. Furthermore, the submittal of this report will allow the staff to continue to trend the values of these limits without the need for prior staff approval of these limits and without introduction on an unreviewed safety question. The revised specifications with the removal of the values of cycle-specific parameter limits and with addition of the referenced report for these limits does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated. They also don't involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety since the change does not alter the methods used to establish these limits.

Consequently, the proposed change on the removal of the values of cycle-specific limits does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Because the values of cycle-specific parameters will continue to be determined in accordance with an NRC-approved methodology and be consistent with the applicable limits of the safety analysis, these changes are administrative in nature and do not impact the operation of the facility in a manner that involves significant hazards considerations.

The proposed amendment does not alter either the requirement that the plant be operated within the limits for cycle-specific parameters or the required remedial actions that must be taken when these limits are not met. While it is recognized that such requirements are essential to plant safety, the values of limits can be determined in accordance with NRC-approved methods without affecting nuclear safety. With the removal of the values of these limits from the technical specifications, they have been incorporated into a report that is submitted to the Commission. Hence, appropriate measures exist to control the values of these limits. These changes are administrative in nature and do not impact the operation of the facility in a

manner that involves significant hazards considerations.

Based on the preceding assessment, the staff believes this proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: For Byron Station, the 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.

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. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: April 11, 1989

Description of amendments request: Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90, Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo, the licensee) proposed to amend Appendix A, Technical Specifications (TS), of Facility Operating Licenses DPR-29 and DPR-30 for the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station (QCNPS). The proposed amendment will change the current language of TS surveillance requirement 4.7.A.2.b to be consistent with the test frequency delineated in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J ("Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing for Water Cooled Power Reactors"). The existing TS requirement is more restrictive than 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J and could require a plant shutdown prior to a scheduled refueling outage, especially in light of 18-month fuel cycles. The provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J are structured such that this situation would be prevented. TS 4.7.A.2.b requires a Type A test be performed at least every 18 months in the event that two consecutive Type A tests fail to meet applicable acceptance criteria. The proposed change would require a Type A test be performed at each shutdown for refueling or approximately every 18 months, whichever occurs first, in the event that two consecutive tests failed.

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 an accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.92, CECo conducted an analysis of their proposed amendment and concluded that it does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

In a Federal Register notice publication dated March 6, 1986 (51 FR 7751) the Commission provided guidance on "Examples of Amendments That Are Considered Not Likely To Involve Significant Hazards Consideration." Example (vii) is defined as "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." Appendix J of 10 CFR Part 50 was made a regulatory rule after Quad Cities Station was licensed. CECo previously submitted a TS amendment request, dated April 13, 1981, to incorporate the provisions of Appendix J. The NRC approved this request as license amendments (No. 82 and 76 for Units 1 and 2, respectively) on November 2, 1982. Unfortunately this original TS amendment language for conducting Type A tests, following consecutive failures, was not an accurate reflection of the actual regulatory requirements. Consequently, CECo's subsequent request, dated April 11, 1989 to amend their facility license, is attempting to correct this discrepancy and make TS 4.7.A.2.b conform exactly with Appendix J as it should have been originally. The current difference between TS 4.7.A.2.b and Appendix J does not result from any technical design or licensing basis. The TS wording proposed for QCNPS is also consistent with current Dresden TS, a similar nuclear power station in vintage and design.

NRC staff reviewed the licensee's application and analysis of no significant hazards consideration. Based upon this review and the above discussion, and Commission guidance the NRC staff proposes to determine that this amendment request does not involve significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Daniel R. Muller

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

Date of amendment request: January 10, 1989

Description of amendment request: By an application dated January 10, 1989, Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCO) proposed to amend the existing Technical Specification sections that refer to the boron concentrations in the idled/isolated loops. The proposed amendment will: (a) split and revise existing Technical Specification (TS) section 3.3.1.5 "Isolated Loop," into sections 3.3.1.5 "Isolated Loop" (Modes 1 and 2) and 3.3.1.6 "Isolated Loop" (Modes 3, 4, 5 and 6), (b) renumber and revise existing TS section 3.3.1.6 "Isolated Loop Startup," to TS section 3.3.1.7 "Idled Loop," (Modes 3, 4, 5 and 6), and (c) split and revise existing TS section 3.3.1.8 "Idled Loop Startup," into sections 3.3.1.10 "Idled Loop Startup" (Modes 1 and 2) and 3.3.1.11 "Idled Loop Startup" (Modes 3, 4, 5 and 6). Currently, the TS requires that the boron concentration in the idled/isolated loops be maintained greater than or equal to the boron concentration in the operating loops. In Modes 1 and 2, the proposed amendment will not alter the current TS. In Modes 3, 4, 5 and 6, the TS will be revised to require a boron concentration in the idled/isolated loops that is greater than or equal to the shutdown margin requirements as specified in the current TS Sections 3.1.10.2, 3.10.1.3 and 3.13.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazard exists as stated in 10 CFR 50.92. CYAPCO has reviewed the proposed changes and concluded that the proposed amendment satisfies the three criteria in 10 CFR 50.92 and therefore involves no significant hazards consideration.

CYAPCO has provided the following discussion regarding these three criteria. The proposed changes do not:

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

Boron Concentration Change in Proposed Technical Specification Sections 3.3.1.6 through 3.3.1.11

The safety analysis assumes that the inactive loop is at the boron concentration which corresponds to the shutdown margin requirement. Inaccuracies in determining the concentration are accounted for in the analysis. The proposed change requires that

an idled or isolated loop be at a boron concentration greater than or equal to that required to meet the shutdown margin. Thus, the change does not impact the consequences of the idled or isolated analysis.

Other Changes in Proposed Technical Specification Sections 3.3.1.6 and 3.3.1.9

In addition to the boron concentration change addressed in the above discussion, the applicability requirements have been increased to include MODE 6.

The increased requirements will reduce the potential for reactivity transients during operation in MODE 6. The safety analysis assumes that the boron concentration and temperature surveillances are performed when a loop is isolated or idled during operation in MODE 6. Thus, the change is consistent with the safety analysis and does not impact the consequences of any event.

Other Changes in Proposed Technical Specification Section 3.3.1.7

In addition to the boron concentration change addressed in the above discussion, the applicability requirements have been increased to include MODE 6, the LCO requirement to keep the reactor subcritical by 1000 pcm has been deleted, and a footnote has been added which removes from the applicability section the instances when a hot leg loop isolation valve is opened to create an idled loop configuration.

The inclusion of MODE 6 is acceptable as discussed above for Technical Specification Section 3.3.1.6.

The definition of MODES 3, 4, and 5 require that the reactor be subcritical with K_{eff} less than .99 and MODE 6 requires K_{eff} less than .94. Thus the requirement on subcriticality in this section is redundant and can be deleted.

The note which removes from the applicability section the instances when a hot leg loop isolation valve is opened to create an idled loop, does not impact the design basis events. With the cold leg loop isolation valve closed there will be no flow through the loop. Thus there will be no flow induced reactivity insertion to the RCS due to temperature or boron concentration differences. If the RCS were depressurized after opening the loop isolation valve, less than 10 $ft.^3$ of fluid would be displaced into the remainder of the RCS. This volume of fluid is insignificant when compared to the volume of fluid in the remainder of the RCS. In addition, any cooldown of the RCS that would most probably occur as the plant is depressurized would negate this effect of the depressurization. For these reasons the proposed change has an insignificant impact on the design basis events.

Other Changes in Proposed Specification Section 3.3.1.11

In addition to the boron concentration change addressed in the above discussion, the discussion of Specification 3.3.1.7 regarding removal of the requirement to remain 1000 pcm subcritical applies here. For these reasons the change does not impact the consequences of the design basis events.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. The proposed change only modifies the required boron concentration for idled and isolated loops during operation in MODES 3 through 6. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis for idled loop startup and do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

3. Involve a significant reduction in margin of safety. The current Technical Specification bases provide margin against a dilution event in MODES 3, 4, and 6 by requiring an idled or isolated loop to be at the same concentration as the remainder of the RCS. The safety analysis assumes that the idled or isolated loop(s) is at a boron concentration greater than or equal to that required to meet shutdown or refueling requirements, whichever is appropriate. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis and, therefore, do not reduce the margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the analysis provided by the licensee in support of a no significant hazards consideration determination. The staff agrees with the licensee's analysis and believes that the licensee has met the criteria for such a determination. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

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

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: April 5, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment deletes the following sentence from Technical Specification 6.4.2.2; "The SRB shall be organized as one board for all GPC Nuclear power plants." This change will allow a separate Safety Review Board (SRB) for each Georgia Power Company (GPC) nuclear plant.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: GPC operates two nuclear power plants. One is the Hatch Nuclear Plant, a boiling water reactor of General Electric design, and the other is the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) which is a pressurized water reactor of Westinghouse design. Currently the VEGP Technical Specifications (TS) require that the same (SRB) be used for both of these plants. The proposed change to the TS will delete that requirement. The removal of that restriction will allow the formulation of a specific SRB for each plant. The qualifications for membership on the SRB and the responsibilities of the SRB will not change.

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.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's request and has determined that should this request be implemented, it would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed change does not affect any plant operating parameter.

Also, the licensee's proposed changes would not (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the physical plant design is not being changed. Finally, the licensee's proposed changes would not (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the qualification requirements and responsibilities of the SRB are not changed.

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, Chandler Building, Suite 1400, 127 Peachtree Street, N.E., Altanta, Georgia 30043.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Louisiana Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: March 21, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications on Control Room Air Conditioning System by separating the current composite requirements into four specifications covering control room emergency air filtration system (two mode sets), control room air temperature, and

control room isolation and pressurization. This amendment is related to a revision to the Technical Specification Bases approved by the NRC in a letter dated August 9, 1988.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The proposed change clarifies the operability criteria for the various heating, ventilating, air condition (HVAC) components servicing the control room. The composite requirements in the current Technical Specification are not altered except that they will be contained in four separate specifications to address specific requirements.

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 the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability of 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 proposed change represents a specialization of system and its operability criteria each into a specification. The sum of the new specifications is consistent with the current overall specifications but less confusing and easier understood. There is no change to the systems operation or design and no change to the responses to postulated accidents. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in probabilities or consequences of any accident previously evaluated. In addition, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. The systems will continue to be operated as before and will be available for service as required by the current Technical Specifications. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

Local Public Document Room Location: University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, Louisiana 70122

Attorney for licensee: Bruce W. Churchill, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N St., NW., Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Jose A. Calvo

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2, Scriba, New York

Date of amendment request: November 10, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification Section 4.0.5, Surveillance Requirements for Inservice Inspection and Testing, to incorporate the requirements of Generic Letter 88-01, "NRC Position on IGSCC In BWR Austenitic Stainless Steel Piping" dated January 25, 1988.

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 Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the criteria for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations and examples of actions involving significant hazards considerations (51 FR 7750). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is example (ii) "a change that constitutes an additional restriction, . . . , e.g., a more stringent surveillance requirement."

Because the application for amendment involves a change 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: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Attorney for licensee: Mark Wetterhahn, Esq., Conner & Wetterhahn, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20006.

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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: April 18, 1988 (Reference LAR 88-05)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to revise TS Sections 3.0 and 4.0 and associated Bases on the applicability of limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements. This amendment request also proposes to delete the exception to TS 3.0.4 in the applicable Technical Specifications. The proposed changes are in accordance with the recommendations of Generic Letter 87-09 to clarify the TS to provide greater operational flexibility and preclude unnecessary plant shutdowns and to clarify the TS to allow passage through or to operational modes as required to comply with Action Requirements.

Specific TS changes would include the following: TS 3/4 0, Table 3.3-1, Table 3.3-3, 3/4 3.3, Table 3.3-6, 3/4 3.3, 3/4 4.9, 3/4 4.10, 3/4 7.8, 3/4 7.9, 3/4 7.10, 3/4 7.13, 3/4 8.4, 3/4 9.7, 3/4 9.9, 3/4 9.11, 3/4 9.12, 3/4 11.1, 3/4 11.2, 3/4 11.3, 3/4 11.4, 3/4 12.1, 3/4 12.2, 3/4 12.3, and B3/4 0.

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 for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee, in its submittal of April 18, 1988, 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 proposed revision to Specification 3.0.4 does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The revision allows entry into an Operational Condition in accordance with Action requirements when conformance to the Action requirements permits continued operation of the facility for an unlimited period of time. This operational flexibility is consistent with that allowed by the existing individual LCOs and their associated Action requirements which provide an acceptable level of safety for continued operation.

The proposed revision to Specification 4.0.3 does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Providing a delay of up to 24 hours to permit the completion of a missed surveillance when the allowable outage time limit of the Action requirements is less than 24 hours reduces the probability of a transient occurring when the affected system or component is either out of service to allow performance of the surveillance test or there is a lower level of confidence in its operability because the normal surveillance interval was exceeded. As such, the probability and consequences of an accident previously evaluated are actually reduced as a result of the proposed revision.

The proposed revision to Specification 4.0.4 does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because it is a clarification to the specification and as such it is administrative in nature. The revision makes it clear that Specification 4.0.4 does not prevent passage through or to Operational Conditions as required to comply with Action requirements. This is consistent with the existing Specification 3.0.4.

The revisions to the Bases Section 3.0 and 4.0 and the elimination of specific exemptions to Specification 3.0.4 are administrative in nature and, therefore, do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed amendment does not [require]... physical alteration to any plant system, nor is there a change in the method in which any safety related system performs its function. The proposed revisions result in improved Technical Specifications by (1) removing unnecessary restrictions on mode changes and facility operation, (2) preventing unnecessary shutdowns caused by inadvertent exceedance of surveillance intervals, and (3) avoiding conflicts within the Technical Specifications.

The revisions to the Bases Sections 3.0 and 4.0 and the elimination of specific exemptions to TS 3.0.4 are administrative in nature and, therefore, do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The revision to Specification 3.0.4 allows operations flexibility consistent with that allowed by the existing individual LCOs and their associated Action requirements. An acceptable level of safety for continued operation is provided.

The proposed revision to Specification 4.0.3 reduces risk by providing a delay of up to 24 hours to permit the completion of a missed surveillance when the allowable outage time limit of the Action requirements is less than 24 hours. This reduces the probability of a transient occurring when the affected system or component is either out of service to allow performance of the surveillance test or when there is a lower level of confidence in its operability because the normal surveillance interval was exceeded. The revision to Specification 4.0.4 is a clarification to the specification and as such is administrative in nature. The revision makes it clear that Specification 4.0.4 does not prevent passage through or to Operational Conditions as required to comply with Action requirements. This is consistent with the existing Specification 3.0.4.

The revisions to the Bases Sections 3.0 and 4.0 and the elimination of specific exemptions to Specification 3.0.4 are administrative in nature and, therefore, do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed changes 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

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: December 19, 1988 (Reference LAR 88-09)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to allow the fully withdrawn position for the shutdown and control rod banks to be redefined as 225 steps or greater, rather than 228 steps, with insertion limits remaining the same. This revision would provide the flexibility to reposition the rod banks as part of a control rodlet wear management program and involves changes to TS 3.1.3.5 and 4.1.3.5 and Figures 3.1-1a and 3.1-1b.

Also, this amendment request adds x and y axis intercepts to Figure 3.1-1a. This would provide clarity to operations personnel as to the value of rod bank positions for these power conditions. Values for the x and y intercepts were provided from the Diablo Canyon "Precautions, Limitations and Setpoints Document."

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 December 19, 1988, 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?

Repositioning rod banks will reduce the possibility of wear-through of the rodlet cladding. Thus, the consequences and probability of a malfunction of the rods will be decreased while maintaining compliance with functional requirements. ...[S]ufficient margin exists between calculated safety parameters and safety limits, such that redefining the fully withdrawn position for the rod banks to 225 steps or greater, will not significantly increase the probability or the consequences of any previously analyzed accident.

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

Repositioning the rods does not involve the addition of a new plant system or significantly alter operation of the current system. Therefore, this change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

A Westinghouse evaluation has determined that the impact of redefining the fully withdrawn position for the rod banks to 225 steps or greater has a negligible effect on peaking factors and rod worths under accident conditions. The slight change in these parameters does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC Staff has reviewed the proposed changes and the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination and find 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.

Attorney for Licensee: Richard F. 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

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: February 28, 1989 (Reference LAR 89-01)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to:

(1) Change the description of Plant Staff Review Committee (PSRC) membership by using functional and organizational description of the PSRC responsibilities rather than by formal job title,

(2) Specify that the qualifications of each PSRC member shall meet or exceed the requirements and recommendations of ANSI/ANS 3.1-1978,

(3) Increase the PSRC quorum requirements to a majority (more than one-half) of the members of the PSRC, and

(4) Revise the review and approval methodology for procedures to allow independent technically qualified individuals to conduct procedure reviews instead of the PSRC.

Specific TS changes include the following: TS Section 6.5.1 would be revised regarding description of PSRC membership, quorum requirements, qualifications and review responsibilities and would be renumbered to TS Section 6.5.2.; TS Section 6.5.1 would be added regarding the review methodology for procedures; TS Section 6.8 would be revised regarding methodology for procedures.

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 for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee, in its submittal of February 28, 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 change regarding the procedures review methodology will not result in a decrease in the effectiveness of the review methodology and will result in an equivalent or more effective level of review.

The other proposed changes are administrative in nature, do not affect plant operations, constitute more restrictive requirements, and provide greater assurance of effective performance. These changes are expected to result in improved administrative practices. Therefore, these proposed changes will not increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

...[T]here is no physical alteration to any plant system, nor is there a change in the method by which any safety related system performs its function. The proposed changes are administrative in nature, are more restrictive and, therefore, do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature or are more restrictive and, therefore, do not reduce any margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed changes 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

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: March 20, 1989 (Reference LAR 89-02)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to:

(1) Implement a nominal 40-hour work week for operating personnel and limit an individual to work no more than 28 hours in any 48-hour period;

(2) Change the requirement for plant staff qualification to reference ANSI/ANS 3.1-1978 and 10 CFR Part 55;

(3) Change the requirement for the plant staff retraining and replacement training program to reference 10 CFR Part 55;

(4) Add the Plant Manager, Diablo Canyon Power Plant, to the General Office Nuclear Plant Review and Audit Committee (GONPRAC) membership and to reflect the current title of the Manager, Station and Hydro Construction; and

(5) Require the submission of reports in accordance with 10 CFR 50.4.

Specific TS changes would include revisions to TS Sections 6.2.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5.2, 6.9.1, and 6.9.2.

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 for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3)

involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee, in its submittal of March 20, 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?

Use of a 12-hour shift for plant staff personnel will not result in an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident because: studies of 12-hour shift operations have not indicated any deleterious effects; PG&E's 12-hour shift scheduling is similar to shift rotations now being used successfully at several other nuclear power plants; and PG&E's 12-hour shift scheduling is consistent with the draft revised NRC Policy Statement on control of working hours, indicating the NRC intent to move away from prescriptive requirements in the Technical Specifications governing work hours.

The other proposed changes will result in improved administrative practices, constitute more restrictive requirements, are consistent with NRC regulations, and do not affect plant operations.

Based on these considerations, these changes will not increase 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?

...[T]here is no physical alteration to any plant system, nor is there a change in the method in which any safety related system performs its function. The proposed changes are administrative in nature and, therefore, do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature and, therefore, will not reduce any margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed changes 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

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: March 22, 1989 (Reference LAR 89-03)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to

(1) Change TS 4.3.1.1, Table 4.3-1, Item 23, Seismic Trip, to increase the surveillance test interval (STI) for the seismic trip system actuating device operational test from 6 to 18 months to eliminate the need to perform seismic trip system surveillance testing at power, and

(2) Change TS 3.3.1, Table 3.3-1, Item 23, Seismic Trip, to add a Table Notation allowing the seismic trip system to be removed from service for up to 72 hours for maintenance or component replacement should failures be detected while operating at power.

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 for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee, in its submittal of March 29, 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?

Operation of the seismic trip system is not required or assumed to mitigate the consequences of any accident in the FSAR Update safety analyses. The seismic trip system component history demonstrates that component failures would not have prevented a reactor trip had a seismic event of the prescribed magnitude occurred. Because the system design does not permit reliable testing at power, two challenges to the reactor protection system have occurred during testing. Such challenges cause an increase in core damage frequency. Increasing the STI to allow testing to be performed during shutdown periods will eliminate the risk of inadvertent reactor trips and establishing an out of service time will allow for maintenance or component replacement at power.

Therefore, the proposed changes to increase the STI of the trip actuating device operational test to 18 months and establishing an out of service time at 72 hours do not increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

There is no physical alteration to any plant system, nor is there a change in the method by which any safety related system performs its function. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes would potentially reduce the number of inadvertent reactor trips due to on-line surveillance testing and, therefore, would result in an increase in plant safety. Since the seismic reactor trip is not assumed to function for any of the Chapter 15 FSAR Update accident analyses, there is no affect on the margin of safety as defined in those analyses. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed changes 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

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: March 29, 1989 (Reference LAR 89-04)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to require the licensee to maintain at least 23 feet of water above the top of irradiated fuel assemblies within the vessel during movement of rod cluster control assemblies. The present TS requires that at least 23 feet of water must be maintained above the top of the reactor vessel flange. The proposed amendment would revise TS 3/4.9.10, "Water Level-Reactor Vessel," and the associated Bases.

Specifically, TS 3.9.10 would be subdivided into TS 3.9.10.1 and TS 3.9.10.2 to address different operational situations. TS 3.9.10.1 would require at least 23 feet of water above the reactor pressure vessel flange for movement of fuel assemblies within containment. TS 3.9.10.2 would allow rod cluster control assembly (RCCA) movement within the reactor pressure vessel with at least 23 feet of water over the top of the irradiated fuel assemblies. Also, a statement would be added to the TS 3.9.10.1 action statement to specify that the provisions of TS 3.0.3 are not applicable. TS 3.9.10.2 would allow RCCA movement with 23 feet of water over the top of irradiated fuel assemblies. TS 4.9.10 would be subdivided into TS 4.9.10.1 and TS 4.9.10.2 to require surveillance of the refueling water level for movement of fuel assemblies and for movement of control rods, respectively.

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 for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee, in its submittal of March 29, 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 basis for requiring 23 feet of water above the reactor vessel flange is to ensure that sufficient water depth is available to remove 99 percent of the assumed 10 percent iodine gap activity if released by an irradiated fuel assembly. During uncoupling of the control rod drive shafts, the upper internals are still in place and the fuel assemblies will remain seated in the reactor pressure vessel. With the fuel assemblies seated in the pressure vessel, 23 feet of water above the top of the fuel will ensure sufficient water depth is available to remove 99 percent of the assumed 10 percent iodine gap activity released from any conceivable accident in accordance with NRC Safety Guide 25.

This change, which involves uncoupling the control rod drive shafts sooner in the refueling evolution and at a lower reactor vessel water level, does not alter the conditions or assumptions of the accident analysis, increase the probability or consequences of the accidents analyzed, or the bases of the current Technical Specification. Fuel handling operations during refueling are unchanged and the refueling water level requirement remains consistent with the accident analysis assumptions in the DCPP FSAR Update concerning the minimum required water level.

Therefore, this 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?

Requiring 23 feet of water above the irradiated fuel assemblies during movement of RCCAs is in accordance with the assumptions made in the DCPP FSAR Update and the Bases of the Technical Specifications (B 3/4.9.10 and B 3/4.9.11) that require 23 feet of water be available over any fuel damaged in a fuel handling accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Requiring 23 feet of water above the irradiated fuel assemblies during movement is in accordance with the Bases of the Technical Specifications (B 3/4.9.10 and 3/4.9.11) that require 23 feet of water be available over any fuel damaged in a fuel handling accident. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed changes 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

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

Date of amendment request: February 22, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) related to the Standby Liquid Control System (SLCS) to ensure compliance with paragraph (c)(4) of the Anticipated Transient Without Scram (ATWS) Rule, 10 CFR 50.62, and to simplify and improve the TS requirements for the backup shutdown system. The ATWS Rule requires that the SLCS for BWRs have an equivalent control capacity of 86 gpm of 13 weight percent sodium pentaborate solution. One of the proposed changes to the surveillance requirements (SR) on the SLCS would be inclusion of a formula that includes the concentration of sodium pentaborate and the two pump flowrate to comply with the ATWS Rule. The SRs would also be revised to specify that the available volume of sodium pentaborate solution must be at least 4537 gallons, instead of having the operators determine the minimum required volume from a figure, and to require that the available weight of sodium pentaborate must be at least 5389 pounds. The Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) definition for operability would require that all three injection loops shall be tested in three operating cycles.

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 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 an analysis of no significant hazards considerations with the request for the license amendment. The licensee's analysis of the proposed amendment against the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 is reproduced below:

A. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The requested changes do not involve any physical changes to the SLCS or its operation. The proposed changes reflect SRs necessary to ensure compliance with ATWS Rule, relocation of certain SRs in order to simplify the Technical Specifications (TS), and a SR change to reflect actual system design. This latter change extends the SLCS loop testing requirement to three cycles to reflect the LGS three pump design. All testing criteria will continue to be met to ensure the same high degree of reliability for the SLCS. Therefore, the same or better reliability of the SLCS system will result.

The latest General Electric design data is incorporated into the proposed specifications to reflect more refined instrument accuracies. Design margins and requirements continue to be satisfied.

The proposed change to add minimum operability requirements in the LCO, provides specifics on what these requirements are since none are currently stated. This change is administrative, since the minimum operability requirements are the same as those in the TS bases and the design bases.

The proposed changes described above maintain system design criteria and surveillance requirements. In addition, no changes to the system or its operation result and therefore, these changes do not modify or add any initiating parameters that would significantly increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

FSAR Sections 9.3.5 and 15.8 were reviewed in making this determination.

B. The proposed changes 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 design or physical changes to the SLCS and do not change system operation. The design bases of LGS will remain the same. Therefore, the current FSAR will remain complete and accurate in its discussion of the licensing basis events and in analyzing plant response and consequences. Further, as discussed above, the proposed changes maintain the design basis and testing criteria so that the same level of reliability and performance are maintained. Therefore, no equipment is adversely affected, nor could the proposed changes involve any potential initiating events which would create any new or different kind of accident. As such, the plant initial conditions utilized for the design basis accident analyses are still valid.

C. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

As discussed above, the proposed changes do not change the design bases and continue to ensure a high degree of system reliability. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's submittal and significant hazards analysis and concurs with the licensee's determination as to whether the proposed amendment involves a significant hazards consideration. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

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

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

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

Date of amendment request: April 10, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would amend the Technical Specifications (TSs) on the Residual Heat Removal Service Water (RHRSW) and the Emergency Service Water (ESW) systems to reflect operation of Limerick, Unit 2. The RHRSW and ESW systems are common to both Limerick, Units 1 and 2. These systems were previously evaluated and approved for two unit operation in the NRC's Safety Evaluation Report (SER) NUREG-0991. The current TSs contain special provisions for one unit operation while the second unit is under construction. The purpose of amending the TSs is to reflect the original design for two unit operation of the Limerick Generating Station.

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 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 an analysis of no significant hazards considerations with the request for the license amendment, addressing the proposed revisions to the TSs for the RHRSW and ESW systems separately. The licensee's analysis of the proposed amendment against the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 is reproduced below:

The proposed TS changes [for the RHRSW] system do not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated

Since the proposed Technical Specification[s] changes reflect no functional change to the Unit 1 and Common RHRSW system, the system will operate exactly as before. The system's capability to perform its safety-related functions will be improved due to the additional reliability present from the Unit 2 operable diesel generators. These Technical Specification[s] changes are necessary to be consistent with the final two-unit design configuration of the RHRSW system. All accidents previously analyzed that require operation of this system were evaluated in the [Final Safety Analysis Report] FSAR Chapter 15 with the system in its two-unit configuration.

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

These proposed Technical Specification[s] changes reflect the final two-unit configuration of the RHRSW system upon which the FSAR Chapter 15 analyses are based.

The proposed changes to the Limiting Condition for Operation Action statements will result in operational parameters for the RHRSW system which have been previously evaluated in the original NRC SER for the two-unit operation of Limerick Generating Station. Therefore, these changes do not create a new or different kind of accident that has not been considered in the previously approved two-unit operating system configuration as described in the FSAR.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety

The proposed Technical Specification[s] changes provide for two-unit operation and eliminate unique requirements which were in place due to single-unit operation. These changes will result in this Technical Specification[s] allowable out-of-service times being consistent with NUREG-0123 "Standard Technical Specification". The capacity of the RHRSW system and its ability to perform its safety-related function will remain unchanged. Therefore, the applicable margin of safety will not be changed. The RHRSW system operation during two-unit operation was previously evaluated and found acceptable by the NRC in SER Section 9.2.2. Therefore, the proposed changes do not reduce this approved margin of safety.

The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications [to permit tie-in of the ESW system to Unit 2] do not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated

The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications do not reflect a functional change to the Unit 1 and Common ESW System operation. The Unit 2 portions of the ESW system were designed, installed, and will be tested to the same requirements as the Unit 1 and Common portions of the system. The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications are required to reflect the final two-unit configuration of the ESW System as originally designed and described in FSAR Section 9.2.2. The revised Action statements will make no change in the system's capability to operate as designed.

The present Technical Specification restriction exists to provide adequate separation from Unit 2 equipment outside the [Protected Area Boundary] PAB. Since Unit 2 equipment will be placed within the PAB, the restriction is no longer needed. Therefore, the changes do not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications also assure the availability of emergency power to the remaining ESW pumps by reminding operators of the plant interdependency on emergency diesel generators.

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

The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications provide for two-unit operation as described and evaluated in the SER and the FSAR. The changes provide relief from the restriction on inter-connection with Unit 2 following its inclusion within the PAB. In the final two-unit system configuration, there will be no functional change in the system operation and its ability to perform its intended safety function as described in the FSAR. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety

The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications are consistent with two-unit operation of Limerick Generating Station. The two-unit operation of Limerick Generating Station has been previously evaluated in the FSAR Section 9.2.2 and previously evaluated and approved in SER Section 9.2.1. There is no change in the system's capability and its ability to perform its safety-related function, and consequently in the applicable margin of safety, as a result of these proposed changes to the Technical Specifications. Therefore, the proposed changes will not reduce the margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's submittal and significant hazards analysis and concurs with the licensee's determination as to whether the proposed amendment involves a significant hazards consideration. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

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

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

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

Date of amendment request: April 10, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would make six changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) as follows:

1. To delete the requirement that the Average Power Range Monitors (APRM) be operable when the plant is in the cold shutdown condition.

2. Revise the reactor coolant leakage requirements to be similar to the leakage rates in generic letter 88-01.

3. Modify the table on minimum shift crew composition to permit the SRO for Unit 1 to serve the same position for Unit 2 when Unit 2 is in cold shutdown, being refueled or is defueled. This corrects an error in the TSs since the table now permits the Unit 1 SRO to fill the same position in the common control room for Units 1 and 2 when both units are in startup, hot shutdown or power operation.

4. Clarify the location of the temperature sensors used to delete leakage from the main steam lines.

5. Permit snubber surveillance to be performed when a unit is operating.

6. Correct an error in the test value listed for the hydrogen recombiner phase resistance to ground for the heater elements.

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 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 an analysis of the no significant hazards consideration in its request for a license amendment for each of the proposed changes discussed previously. The licensee's analysis of the proposed amendment against the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 is reproduced below.

A. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes which correct technical inconsistencies will correct errors currently existing in the TS or achieve consistency throughout the TS. The proposed change to allow the surveillance testing of snubbers during operation would eliminate the restriction that the 18 month inspections be performed while the unit is shutdown.

None of these changes will affect any plant hardware, plant design, safety limit settings, or plant system operation, and therefore do not modify or add any initiating parameters that would significantly increase the probability or consequences of any previously analyzed accident. Therefore, the proposed changes will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

B. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

As discussed in Item (1) above, the proposed TS changes correct errors, provide consistency throughout the TS, or are the result of the tie-in and operation of Unit 2. The proposed changes do not affect any equipment nor do they involve any potential initiating events that would create any new or different kind of accident. As such, the plant initial conditions utilized for the design basis accident analyses remain valid. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

C. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

As discussed in (1) above, the proposed changes which correct technical inconsistencies, do not affect any equipment involved in potential initiating events or safety limit settings and therefore, do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The change to remove the requirement to perform snubber surveillances during shutdown does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, since snubber operability will continue to be demonstrated in accordance with the existing surveillance test intervals which have not been changed. The bases establish snubber-functional reliability by specifying testing methods which prescribe sample size and sample acceptance but not the operation status of the associated reactor. All snubbers are demonstrated to be operable under existing criteria and the guidelines of the current Technical Specifications. Removing the requirement to perform snubber testing during shutdown does not change the operability or testing requirements for snubbers. Therefore, the proposed change to remove the requirement to perform snubber surveillances during shutdown does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's submittal and significant hazards analysis and concurs with the licensee's determination as to whether the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

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

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

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

Date of amendment request: April 10, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TSs) to reflect the modifications necessary to change from the current single-unit power supply configuration to a two-unit power supply configuration when Limerick, Unit 2 is issued an operating license. These modifications merely implement the final configuration of the original two-unit design that was reviewed and approved by the NRC in the Safety Evaluation Report (SER), NUREG-0991, dated August, 1983. The final design configuration for Unit 2 power supplies feeding common system components is reflected in the proposed TS to ensure the interdependence between Unit 1 and Unit 2 is properly considered by Unit 1 plant operators. When Unit 2 is issued an operating license, some of the Unit 2 power distribution systems are needed to support common equipment for the operation of Unit 1. This philosophy is currently reflected in the Unit 2 TS which are in the final stages of development. The proposed changes, therefore, would provide a consistent application of this philosophy to both Unit 1 and Unit 2 TS.

The proposed TS changes reflect transfers of several Class 1E 480 volt AC power supplies and several 125 volt DC power supplies for the motor operated valves associated with Unit 2 for the common Residual Heat Removal Service Water (RHRSW) system, the Emergency Service Water (ESW) system and the Spray Pond system. The proposed TS changes reflect segregating (approximately in half) the redundant loads for the ESW and RHRSW systems between the Unit 1 and Unit 2 power supplies.

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 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 an analysis of the no significant hazards consideration with the request for a license amendment. The licensee's analysis of the proposed amendment against the three standards in 10 CFR 50.92 is reproduced below.

A. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed TS changes reflect transfers of several Class 1E 480V AC power supplies and several 125V DC power supplies for the motor operated valves associated with Unit 2 for the common RHRSW, ESW, and Spray Pond systems. The proposed TS changes reflect segregating (approximately in half) the redundant loads for the ESW and RHRSW systems between the Unit 1 and Unit 2 power supplies and has no adverse effect on the ability of Unit 1 to achieve safe shutdown. Once licensed, the Unit 2 power sources will operate with the same high degree of dependability as the Unit 1 power sources. Hence, supplying common equipment from Unit 2 sources has no effect on the operability of this equipment or on Unit 1 safety. The Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) Sections 8.3.1.1.2, 8.3.2, 9.2.2, 9.2.3, and Figures 8.3-2 and 8.3-3 were reviewed in making this determination. The proposed TS changes are consistent with all the design requirements applicable to the original design. These requirements include, but are not limited to, seismic and environmental qualifications, quality assurance, separation, and testability.

B. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The transfer of power supplies is in accordance with the original design intent of segregating (approximately in half) the redundant loads for the ESW and RHRSW systems between the Unit 1 and Unit 2 power supplies, and does not reduce the equipment protection provided by the existing design.

The ability of the RHRSW and ESW systems to support safe shutdown of Unit 1 is not adversely affected.

The function or performance of any safety-related or nonsafety-related equipment or system is not affected. The Unit 2 power supply system was designed to carry the additional loading being transferred to it. Hence, there is no degradation in the dependability or operability of the power sources supplying these common loads. FSAR Sections 8.3 and 9.3 were reviewed in making this determination.

The proposed TS changes are consistent with all the design requirements applicable to the original design.

These requirements include, but are not limited to, seismic and environmental qualifications, quality assurance, separation, and testability. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

C. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed TS changes are necessary to reflect the original two-unit power supply configurations which are being implemented due to the completion and licensing of Unit 2. The power supplies will meet all their original design requirements, and the capacity for performing their safety-related functions will not be reduced. Since the Unit 2 power sources will operate with the same high degree of reliability as Unit 1 power sources, supplying the identified common loads from Unit 2 power sources has no effect on their ability to perform their safety related function for Unit 1. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's submittal and significant hazards analysis and concurs with the licensee's determination as to whether the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

Attorney for licensee: Conner and Wetterhahn, 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: March 22, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would clarify the surveillance requirements for maintaining the discharge piping of the Emergency Core Cooling Systems (ECCS) and of the Reactor Core Isolation Cooling (RCIC) System filled

with water. Minor editorial changes would also be incorporated.

Specifically, the proposed changes affect page 123 as follows: (1) Specification 3.5.G.a would be changed by adding "of" between "purposes" and "satisfying" for clarity; (2) Specification 4.5.G.2 would be changed to read, "Following any period when the LPCI subsystems or core spray subsystems have not been maintained in a filled condition, the discharge piping of the affected subsystem shall be vented from the high point of the system and water flow observed," to more closely control the filled status; and (3) Specification 4.5.G.3 would be changed by deleting "Core Spray" since lineup of a Core Spray System to the condensate storage tank is not considered to be an operable condition for the system.

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:

The basis for concluding that a significant hazards consideration does not exist for each of the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications is as follows:

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The change to Specification 3.5.G.a is purely administrative. The clarification of Specification 4.5.G.2 retains the existing functional requirements to maintain the discharge piping of the ECCS and RCIC Systems filled with water. The revision to Specification 4.5.G.3 eliminates a reference to an alignment of the Core Spray System which would render it inoperable. The proposed changes do not involve modification of any existing equipment, systems, or components; nor do they change any administrative controls or limitations imposed on existing plant equipment. The changes do not 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. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. They merely correct editorial and grammatical errors, clarify the intent of the surveillance requirements, and improve the consistency of Technical Specifications. They do not involve modification to any of the plant's systems, equipment, or components; nor do they place the plant in an unanalyzed configuration. These changes are of an administrative nature.

3. The change to Specification 3.5.G.a is purely administrative, and as such, does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The other proposed changes affect the Core Spray and LPCI Systems. These systems are the primary source of emergency core cooling after the reactor is depressurized and for flooding of the core after a postulated accident. Revised Specification 4.5.G.2 still requires that the discharge piping of the ECCS and RCIC Systems be maintained water solid; thus, the system response times for providing emergency cooling water are not impacted and the potential for a water hammer transient is still precluded. Revised Specification 4.5.G.3 eliminates a reference to an inoperable alignment of the Core Spray System; thus, providing additional assurance that the Core Spray System's suction supply is from the torus as assumed in the plant's accident analyses. The proposed changes do not involve modification to any 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 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: February 6, 1989

Description of amendment request: Increase the Surveillance Test Intervals (STIs) and allowable out-of-service times (AOTs) for the Reactor Protection System.

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:

Significant Hazards Consideration Evaluation

The proposed changes to the HCGS Technical Specifications:

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

The generic analysis contained in Licensing Topical Report NEDC-30851P assessed the impact of changing RPS STIs and AOTs on the RPS failure frequency, the scram frequency and equipment cycling. Specifically, Section 5.7.4 of NEDC-30851P states that:

Fewer challenges to the safeguards system, due to less frequent testing of the RPS, conservatively results in a decrease of approximately one percent in core damage frequency. This decrease is based upon the following:

- Based on the plant specific experience presented in Appendix J, the estimated reduction in scram frequency (0.3 scrams/yr) represents a 1 to 2 percent decrease in core damage frequency based on the BWR plant specific Probabilistic Risk Assessments (PRAs) listed in Table 5-8.
- The increase in core damage frequency due to less frequent testing is less than one percent. This increase is even lower (less than 0.01 percent) when the changes resulting from the implementation of the Anticipated Transients Without Scram (ATWS) rule are considered.
- The effect of reducing unnecessary cycles on RPS equipment, although not easily quantifiable also results in a decrease in core damage frequency.
- The overall impact on core damage frequency of the changes in allowable out-of-service time is negligible.

From this generic analysis, the BWR owners Group concluded that the proposed changes do not significantly increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated, namely the probability of a scram due to RPS unavailability, and the consequences of an accident are actually decreased in that the core damage frequency is decreased by about one percent.

Furthermore, the proprietary plant-specific analysis [contained in Attachment 3] demonstrates that although HCGS differs from the generic model analyzed in Licensing Topical Report NEDC-30851P, the net affect of the plant specific differences do not alter the generic conclusions.

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

The increase in the RPS AOTs and STIs does not alter the function of the Reactor

Protection System nor involve any type of plant modification. Additionally, no new modes of plant operation are involved with these changes.

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 and has concurred with the BWR Owners Group that the proposed changes do not significantly affect the reliability of the RPS. The overall availability of the RPS is increased due to reduced component wearout and actuation. Hence it can be concluded that the proposed changes do not adversely affect plant safety margins. In fact, not all proposed changes involve an increase in the AOT or STI, for example, the Manual Scram functional test of the RPS is being decreased from monthly to weekly. Therefore, it can be concluded that the proposed changes do not significantly reduce 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: December 27, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would delete the existing Non-radiological Environmental Technical Specifications from Appendix B for both Salem Units 1 and 2 and replace them with an Environmental Protection Plan. Adoption of the Environmental Protection Plan will provide an up-to-date definition of PSE&G's environmental review and protection responsibilities and standardize environmental requirements for the two Salem units.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The majority of the sections of the radiological portion of the Environmental Technical Specifications (ETS) have, by previous amendments, either been deleted or moved into Appendix A. The only remaining Radiological ETS in Appendix B is Section 3.1.1.6, Meteorological Monitoring. Section 3.3.3.4 of Appendix A to the Unit 1 license is a duplicate of Section 3.1.1.6 of Appendix B. The fact that only Unit 1 Technical Specifications has the Meteorological Monitoring requirements is not of any safety significance. There is only one meteorological monitoring tower for both the Salem Units. The Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) requires the instruments to be operable at all times. However, if the LCO is not met, the Action Statements do not prohibit mode changes nor require a plant shutdown.

Implementation of the EPP will terminate the terrestrial monitoring requirements. A summary assessment report titled, "An Environmental Monitoring Program 1974-1984 on Diamondback Terrapin Nesting and Osprey Nesting/Bald Eagle Occurrence in the Vicinity of Artificial Island," concluded that Salem has had no adverse environmental impact on either the diamondback terrapin or the osprey/bald eagle. The monitoring program has continued to be conducted and the data collected in subsequent years support the conclusion. This program was required to be continued for five years after Unit 2 became operational. Unit 2 became operational in 1981.

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 analyzed the proposed amendment to determine if a significant hazards consideration exists:

The following evaluation is provided for the significant hazards consideration standards.

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

The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. This change merely replaces the present Environmental Technical Specifications with the Environmental Protection Plan and is administrative in nature.

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

The proposed changes do not make any physical changes to the plant or changes in parameters governing normal plant operation. Therefore, the changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

As discussed above, the proposed changes are administrative and do not degrade the existing margin of safety. Therefore, changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The staff has reviewed the licensees 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: November 24, 1986, September 21, 1987, and December 14, 1987

Description of amendment request: In accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55, the licensee submitted an amendment to the Physical Security Plan for the Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station to reflect changes to that regulation. The proposed amendment would modify paragraph 2.C.(3) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-54 to require compliance with the revised plan.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: On August 4, 1986 (51 FR 27817 and 27822), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission amended Part 73 of its regulations, "Physical Protection of Plants and Materials," to clarify plant security requirements to afford an increased assurance of plant safety. The amended regulations required that each nuclear power reactor licensee submit proposed amendments to its security plan to implement the revised provisions of 10 CFR 73.55. The licensee submitted its revised plan on November 24, 1986, September 21, 1987, and December 14,

1987, to satisfy the requirements of the amended regulations. The Commission proposes to amend the license to reference the revised plan.

In the Supplementary Materials accompanying the amended regulations, the Commission indicated that it was amending its regulations "to provide a more safety conscious safeguards system while maintaining the current levels of protection" and that the "Commission believes that the clarification and refinement of requirements as reflected in these amendments is appropriate because they afford an increased assurance of plant safety."

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the criteria for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations and examples of actions involving significant hazards considerations (51 FR 7750). One of these examples of actions involving no significant considerations is 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 changes in this case fall within the scope of the example. For the foregoing reasons, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Martin Luther King Regional Library, 7340 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

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of amendment request: June 21, 1988, as revised February 28, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications to address operation of the 12-inch reactor building pressure equalization valves when the plant is in the "Power Operation" mode (greater than 2% of rated power as defined by Technical Specification 1.2.5). Also, the Technical Specifications would be changed to appropriately define the purge system operation requirements and add reference to reactor building equalization isolation in Technical Specification Table 3.5.1-1, "Process Instrumentation," Item 9.

The proposed amendment would remove the "at cold shutdown or refueling" operator action statement in Table 3.5.1-1, "Process Instrumentation," Item 9, column (c); modify the action statement to ensure the equalization valves and the purge valves are properly addressed in relation to high-range reactor building area radiation monitor operability and provide consistency and proper cross-referencing within the Technical Specifications; and change the Minimum Channels Operable requirement in column (B) of Table 3.5.1-1 for the high-range reactor building area radiation monitors from 1 to 2.

The proposed amendment would also add reference to reactor building pressure equalization valves to Technical Specification 3.6.8, modify Technical Specification Section 3.8, "Fuel Loading and Refueling," to provide appropriate refueling restriction on the operability of the reactor building purge system and the reactor building stack radiation monitor, and add a new refueling Technical Specification.

Additionally, the proposed amendment would shorten the Technical Specification required surveillance interval for the reactor building equalization valves from 6 months to 3 months.

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 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.

The NRC staff finds that the proposed amendment does not (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the licensee states that containment integrity would be maintained at all times when it is required by the Technical Specifications. Moreover, the proposed changes are within the bounds of the accident analysis of reactor building pressure equalization during power operation contained in the Safety Analysis Report; (2) The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated because, currently, the purge valves are required to be closed during cold shutdown when the high-range reactor building area radiation monitors are inoperable and containment integrity is not required, thus allowing for the possibility of an unmonitored, unfiltered release through the equipment or personnel hatches. The licensee stated that deleting this requirement will remove the possibility of an unmonitored, unfiltered release of radiation under the above described conditions. Additionally, the licensee stated that there are no hardware modifications and providing limitations on the reactor building pressure equalization operations will assure that the Safety Analysis Report accident analysis that considers equalization during power operation will remain bounding for pressure equalization operations; (3) The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the licensee plans to maintain containment integrity at all appropriate times, such as during power operation, when the reactor is above cold shutdown, and during refueling. The licensee states that the changes proposed would not compromise any of the bases for the affected Technical Specifications.

Therefore, 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: Martin Luther King Regional Library, 7340 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

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of amendment request: October 25, 1988

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment modifies Technical Specification 3.14 to remove technical specification requirements for fire suppression systems in fire zones 75 through 80 located in the Nuclear Service Electrical Building (NSEB). Fire zones 75 through 80 do not require automatic suppression systems. This proposed change provides an operational enhancement by removing the CO_2 fire suppression systems that are currently required to be operable by

Technical Specification 3.14.4 in zones 75 through 80.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provide 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 previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has determined that the proposed change will not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the fire hazards analysis demonstrates that the construction features, low combustible loadings and equipment layout within the NSEB serve to contain the postulated fire within the given fire area and limit potential fire damage to one train of systems important to safety without reliance on automatic fire suppression; (2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the NSEB Train A and Train B equipment credited for post-fire safe shutdown is protected in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R; (3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the existing fire detection system will remain operational. Adequate fire suppression capability is available to confine and extinguish fires occurring where safety-related equipment or redundant systems required for safe shutdown are located.

Accordingly, the licensee has determined that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed amendment and the licensee's determination and find them acceptable. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment request does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Martin Luther King Regional Library, 7340 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

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

Date of amendment request: August 24, 1988

Description of amendment request: The August 24, 1988 submittal proposes to revise Technical Specifications (TS) Sections 3/4.8.2, "D. C. Sources." This revision proposed to modify the value for the average electrolyte temperature referenced in TS 4.8.2.1.b.3 and the value for the battery capacity as referenced in TS 4.8.2.1.e. The submittal proposed modifying the average electrolyte temperature in TS 4.8.2.1.b.3 from 60° F to 65° F and battery capacity in TS 4.8.2.1.e from 80% to 90%.

The licensee identified during an emergency power review, that the calculation for sizing ESF Batteries 1A & 1B used derating factors for aging and temperature more conservative than those identified in the TS. The calculations used an aging derating factor of 90% and a temperature derating factor of 94% (65° F) as opposed to 80% aging derating factor and 90% (60° F) temperature derating factor, as presently stated in the TS. In respect to the "Aging Factor," it has been identified that 90% for the capacity of the battery at the end of its useful life was used in the original calculation, dated December 26, 1980, based on a letter from the manufacturer. In respect to the "Temperature Derating Factor," a factor of 94% for battery capacity has been used to account for the effect of minimum temperature. As identified in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) Table 3.11-3, the minimum design temperature for the battery room is 65° F. During normal plant operation, the battery room temperature is controlled by a thermostat, which is set to maintain the room temperature at 75° F. If the control system malfunctions, a bistable controller connected to a temperature element in the room will close the supply damper if the temperature falls below 70° F (the dampers will reopen if the temperature increases).

The standard temperature for stating cell capacity is 77° F. Temperature correction factors are used to determine the additional battery capacity required at lower temperatures to achieve the same battery performance, as if it were 77° F. Electrolyte temperature is assured to be at a temperature equal to or greater than ambient because of the heating effects of the float charge. Thus, the minimum room design temperature of 65° F has been used in conjunction with vendor supplied curves, for the specific battery in use, to establish the derating factor of 94%.

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 has determined with respect to the August 24, 1988 submittal that:

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the revised derating factors will provide added assurance that the batteries will maintain capacity to perform their design function.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated because the proposed changes do not change any hardware. They provide more conservative derating factors to use in establishing the condition of the batteries. As such, the revision does not create a new or different kind of accident.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Since the revised derating factors are more conservative, the margin in capacity of the batteries is increased, not decreased.

The staff has reviewed these determinations and is in agreement with them.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam

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

Date of amendment request: January 20, 1989, as supplemented March 20, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would implement the recommendations of Generic Letter 85-09, "Technical Specifications for Generic Letter 83-28, Item 4.3," regarding reactor trip breaker testing. Specifically, the licensee proposed to modify Technical Specifications (TS) Table 3.3-1, "Reactor Trip System Instrumentation," to add Action 11 to the reactor trip breakers for the case when one of the diverse trip features is inoperable. Table 4.3-1, "Reactor Trip System Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements," of the TS was proposed to be revised to modify Table Notation 11 and to add Table Notations 12-14. This Table was also proposed to be modified to have Table Notations 11 and 12 apply to the Trip Actuating Device Operational Test for the Manual Reactor Trip functional unit and the Reactor Trip Breaker functional unit, respectively. In addition, the Reactor Trip Bypass Breaker was added as a functional unit to Table 4.3-1 with Table Notations 13 and 14 applying to this unit.

On May 25, 1985, the Commission issued Generic Letter 85-09, "Technical Specifications for Generic Letter 83-28, Item 4.3." Generic Letter 83-28, Item 4.3 established the requirement for automatic actuation of the shunt trip attachment for Westinghouse plants. Later the staff concluded that Technical Specification changes should be proposed to explicitly require independent testing of the undervoltage and shunt trip attachments during power operation and independent testing of the control room manual switch contacts during each refueling outage. The proposed changes to Tables 3.3-1 and 4.3-1 add additional limitations and restrictions required to implement the staff's objectives in Generic Letter 85-09.

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 has determined that a no significant hazards evaluation is justified and that should this request be implemented it will not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated because no plant equipment has been changed. This proposed change adds additional testing requirements to the reactor trip breakers.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the additional testing is necessary to ensure the continued reliable reactor trip breaker operation.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because only additional testing of the reactor trip is proposed.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards considerations determination and finds it acceptable. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the change does not involve any significant hazards considerations.

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

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam

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

Date of amendment request: April 5, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment revises the action statement of Technical Specification 3.7.1.6, "Feedwater Isolation Valves," to allow one or more feedwater isolation valves to be inoperable in Modes 2 and 3 provided that the affected isolation valves are maintained closed. Currently, the licensee can have only one isolation valve inoperable in Modes 2 and 3.

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 operability of open feedwater isolation valves in Modes 2 or 3 is necessary to ensure the feedwater isolation function in the event of a secondary side high-energy line break. However, a closed feedwater isolation valve in Modes 2 or 3 is in its required position for plant safety. An inoperable status for a feedwater isolation valve is only a concern if the affected valve is open and cannot be closed. For this case, a planned shutdown must be executed. This requirement is reflected in the current Technical Specification and remains valid.

The number of closed but inoperable feedwater isolation valves would not have an impact on plant safety. Thus, the Technical Specification requirement regarding an inoperable feedwater isolation valve in Mode 2 or 3 being maintained in the closed position supports the licensing-basis safety analysis assumptions of closed feedwater isolation valves upon receipt of a signal to do so.

The licensee has determined that a no significant hazards consideration determination is justified and that should this request be implemented it will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated because the feedwater isolation valves will be maintained in a safe although inoperable status. The feedwater isolation valves are required to close to mitigate the consequences of a postulated main steam line break, feedwater line break, or steam generator blowdown line break. This modified Technical Specification requires that any feedwater isolation valves [sic] must be maintained closed if inoperable.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because this proposed revised Technical Specification continues to maintain the feedwater isolation valves in a safe position.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the feedwater isolation valves will be maintained in their safe position. The margin of safety is not reduced as long as the inoperable feedwater isolation valves remain closed.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards considerations determination and finds it acceptable. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the change does not involve any significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library,

Garden and Washington Streets, Winnsboro, South Carolina 29180

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, P.O. Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218

NRC Project Director: Elinor G. Adensam

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

Date of amendment request: April 11, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would re-issue the Technical Specifications in their entirety to eliminate all differences between the NRC and licensee's copy of this document which have evolved over the years. The amendment is editorial and administrative in content and does not involve substantive changes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis about the issue of no significant hazards consideration which is quoted below:

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

Response: No

As stated above, the proposed revisions are administrative in nature and do not affect accident probabilities or consequences. Therefore, it is concluded that operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No

As stated above, the proposed revisions are administrative in nature and do not affect previously analyzed or create any new accidents. Therefore, it is concluded that operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No

As stated above, the proposed revisions are administrative in nature and do not impact any margin of safety. Therefore, it is concluded that operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the analysis and, based on that review, it appears that the three criteria are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of amendment request: March 28, 1989 (Reference PCN-283)

Description of amendment request: Technical specification 3/4.7.8.1 requires operability of the fire suppression water system at all times. This ensures that adequate fire suppression capability is available to confine and extinguish fires occurring in any plant area where safety related equipment is located. The fire suppression system consists of the water system, spray and/or sprinklers, and fire hose stations. The collective capability of the fire suppression system is adequate to minimize potential damage to safety related equipment and is a major element in the site fire protection program.

Surveillance Requirement 4.7.8.1.1.e.2 specifies an 18 month surveillance frequency to demonstrate operability of the fire suppression water system by performing a system functional test. This includes cycling each valve in the flow path that is not testable during plant operation through at least one complete cycle of full travel. The proposed change would revise the frequency of this surveillance to a refueling interval for those plant areas that are inaccessible during non-refueling plant operations.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided the following no significant hazards consideration determination:

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

Response: No

The proposed change from "18 months" to "refueling interval" is required to prevent plant shutdowns that would otherwise be required to provide for Technical Specification surveillances in areas which are normally inaccessible during power operation (i.e., inside containment and other high radiation areas). Results of the surveillances previously performed to meet this Technical Specification have indicated that no unsatisfactory conditions were identified. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No

The proposed change only affects the frequency of performing the 18 month system functional test of the fire suppression water system. The proposed change does not modify operation of the facility. Therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No

The proposed change only revises the frequency of the 18 month system functional test of the fire suppression water system. Facility operation will be unchanged by this change to this surveillance. Results from the surveillance to date have demonstrated that no unsatisfactory conditions have been discovered. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed this analysis and, based on that review, it appears that the three criteria are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of amendment request: February 23, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the North Anna Unit 2 (NA-2) Technical Specifications (TS) by deleting components from Table 3.8-1 which had previously been removed, and by correcting a typographical error. TS Section 3.8.25, Table 3.8-1, specifies the trip point for the containment penetration conductor overcurrent

protective devices. Included in this list are the steam generator support heaters, which were removed from the NA-2 TS by Amendment No. 40, dated July 7, 1984. The proposed change will remove the support heaters from the list.

In addition, the "System Powered (Mark No.)" for "Device Number and Location (Breaker No.)," 2C1-1A2L, currently shown in Table 3.8-1 as "2-DA-P-01B," should be "2-DG-P-01B." This typographical error would also be corrected.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of criteria for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (51 FR 7750). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is example (i), "a purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature." The first change to Table 3.8-1 is administrative in nature as it involves deleting the steam generator support heaters which were previously removed by Amendment No. 40. The second change is also administrative as it involves the correction of a typographical error. Therefore, the proposed changes are in accordance with the above example.

Based on the above discussion, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes involve no significant hazards considerations.

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

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, P.O. Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23212.

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

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

Date of amendment request: March 28, 1989

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would change Table 3.3-6 of the North Anna Units 1 and 2 (NA-1&2) Technical Specifications (TS) which provides the operability requirements for radiation monitoring instrumentation. Associated with each radiation monitor is an action statement should the radiation monitor be determined inoperable. Currently, Action Statement 35 for the containment high range area radiation monitors and the noble gas high range effluent monitors requires that when the number of channels operable is less than the minimum channels operable requirement, either restore the inoperable channel(s) to operable status within 72 hours or initiate the preplanned alternative method for monitoring the appropriate paramenter(s). The preplanned alternate monitoring method for containment high range area radiation is to utilize one of the two backup monitors located inside each containment. The TS require two radiation monitoring instruments to remain operable during Modes 1, 2, 3 and 4. The preplanned alternate monitoring method for noble gas high range effluents is to utilize a specified alternate noble gas high range effluent monitoring instrument or to sample the effluents every 12 hours for noble gas. Action Statement 35 also requires the submittal of a Special Report be made within the next 14 days outlining the action taken, the cause of inoperability, and the plans and schedule for restoring the monitor to operable status.

In an effort to enhance operating flexibility and allow the proper calibration and troubleshooting on an inoperable radiation monitor, the licensee proposed a change to Action Statement 35. The proposed change would initiate the preplanned alternate method for monitoring the appropriate parameter(s) of the radiation monitor within 72 hours and either restore the inoperable radiation monitor to operable status within 7 days or submit a Special Report within 14 days.

The proposed change is in conformance with the NRC guidance provided in Generic Letter No. 83-37, dated November 1, 1983.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards 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 change in accordance with the criteria above and has made the following determination:

The proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10 CFR 50.92 because the change would not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The preplanned alternate method of radiation monitoring will continue to be implemented when a radiation monitor is declared inoperable. This will ensure that abnormal radiation levels can be detected.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The preplanned alternated method of radiation monitoring will continue to be implemented when a radiation monitor is declared inoperable. This will ensure that abnormal radiation levels can be detected.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The preplanned alternate method of radiation monitoring will continue to be implemented when a radiation monitor is declared inoperable. This will ensure that abnormal radiation levels can be detected. In addition, the proposed change is consistent with the guidance provided in NRC Generic Letter No. 83-37, dated November 1, 1983.

Therefore, it has been concluded that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's no significant hazards consideration determination analysis and agrees with the above conclusion. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not involve significant hazards considerations.

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

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, P.O. Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23212.

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

Washington Public Power Supply System, Docket No. 50-397, Nuclear Project No. 2, Benton County, Washington

Date of amendment request: March 8, 1989.

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification Table 4.3.2.1-1, Isolation Actuation Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements, would be modified to reduce requirements for testing temperature switches in the leak detection system. Presently the technical specification requires channel checks and channel functional tests on a 12-hour and monthly frequency respectively. The licensee proposes to amend the Technical Specifications to (1) eliminate the 12-hour channel check requirement and (2) change the channel functional test frequency from monthly to semi-annually.

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 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.

The reduction in surveillance is based on enhanced operating capabilities of the leak detection system due to replacement of the present equipment (based on Riley Model 86 temperature switches) with General Electric Nuclear Measurement Analysis and Control (NUMAC) micro-computer based instrumentation. During the upcoming spring refueling outage the licensee intends to replace the Riley temperature switches in the leak detection system with General Electric Nuclear Measurement and Control instrumentation. The NUMAC equipment will receive signals from the presently installed thermocouples and provide alarm and trip signals to existing circuitry. All functions of the leak detection system will remain, the replacement is being done to enhance overall system reliability.

The licensee contends that the enhanced capabilities of the NUMAC instrumentation justify the reduction in surveillance and thus the proposed amendment to the Technical Specifications. The NUMAC equipment has significantly better total channel drift characteristics and the design incorporates diagnostic and self-test features. These design features provide a more comprehensive assessment of system operability every 30 minutes than that presently provided by the Riley instrument channel check on a 12-hour basis.

The Supply System has evaluated this amendment request per 10 CFR 50.59 and 50.92 and determined that it does not represent an unreviewed safety question or a significant hazard because it does not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the NUMAC design providing better channel drift characteristics and incorporating diagnostic and self-test features should ensure a level of operability and functionality of the leak detection system comparable to that achieved with the present equipment and testing schedule. Hence, the probability or consequences of previously evaluated accidents are not increased by this change.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the function of the leak detection system would not change. The licensee believes that a new or different kind of accident due to functional testing on a semi-annual versus monthly frequency or due to substitution of the self-test for the manual check is not credible.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the diagnostic and self-test functions in lieu of a manual channel check, and semi-annual functional testing would ensure the NUMAC equipment functions as intended. Due to the diagnostic, self-test, and channel drift features, system operability would be assessed more frequently and accurately, failure would be identified more readily, operator efficiency would be increased and presently recognized margins would be conservatively preserved. Hence, the licensee believes the margin of safety would be increased through the use of the NUMAC equipment.

Based on the above considerations the Commission proposes to determine that the requested changes to the WNP-2 Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Richland City Library, Swift and Northgate Streets, Richland, Washington 99352.

Attorneys for licensees: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., Bishop, Cook, Purcell and Reynolds, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502 and G.E. Doupe, Esq., Washington Public Power Supply System, P.O. Box 968, 3000 George Washington Way, Richland, Washington 99352.

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

Washington Public Power Supply System, Docket No. 50-397, Nuclear Project No. 2, Benton County, Washington

Date of amendment request: March 31, 1989

Description of amendment request: Technical Specification 3/4.2.6 Power/Flow Instability, and the associated Figure 3.2.6-1, Operating Region Limits of Specification 3.2.6, would be revised to change the limits defining the prohibited region of operation and to modify the action statement to require a manual scram when the required surveillance shows operation to be within the prohibited region.

Technical Specification 3/4.2.7, Neutron Flux Noise Monitoring, would be eliminated. This specification places limits on APRM and LPRM neutron flux noise levels.

Two new specifications would be added to require stability monitoring for two loop and single loop operation. The new specifications would add limiting conditions of operation for the decay ratio of the neutron signals. The stability monitoring is based on the LPRMs and the APRMs and thus effectively addresses the objective of the neutron flux noise monitoring specification (3/4.2.7) proposed for deletion.

Technical Specification 3/4.4.1, Recirculation System would be revised to specify actions to be taken to ensure stability with less than two recirculation pumps operating.

Corresponding sections of the Bases of the Technical Specifications would be revised to reflect the new bases for the revised specifications.

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 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.

On December 30, 1988 NRC issued IE Bulletin 88-07, Supplement 1, "Power Oscillations in Boiling Water Reactors." This supplement required licensees to take certain actions to protect against power instabilities in the reactor core. In response to Supplement 1 the Washington Public Power Supply System proposed replacing the existing detect-and-suppress technical specifications with specifications based on the Advanced Nuclear Fuels (ANF) ANNA Stability Monitoring System. The current specifications require evaluation of neutron signal noise against a baseline noise level. The licensee contends that the ANNA system provides a much stronger, faster means of monitoring the stability of the reactor core.

The ANNA system performs a sophisticated noise analysis technique to calculate the decay ratio of neutron

signals (LPRM and APRM). These calculations are performed automatically, such that peak-to-peak and decay ratio data is presented in near real-time. As a result, the ANNA system provides information more rapidly than existing methods, and without the distractions to control room staff imposed by current methods. In addition, the decay ratio information available through the ANNA system is a primary indicator of the state of the core stability, whereas the current indicator, neutron signal noise level, is an indirect, less reliable means. The licensee believes that through use of the ANNA system, a much more quantitative measure of the margin of instability exists. This significant improvement in detecting the approach to a region of instability is the licensee's justification for the proposed enlargement of the allowable region of operation.

The Supply System has reviewed this amendment request per 10 CFR 50.92 and has determined that it does not represent an unreviewed safety question or a significant hazard because it does not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because, as discussed above, the ANNA system represents a substantial improvement in the capability to detect-and-suppress, such that the present safety margin is preserved for operation in an expanded region. The use of the ANNA system provides greatly improved ability to detect the approach to a region of instability. It is the Supply System's judgement that this improved detection capability more than compensates for the enlargement of the power/flow operating region such that the present safety margin is preserved and in fact increased. Hence, the probability or consequences of previously evaluated accidents are not increased by this change.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the design basis function, to detect-and-suppress core instability events, remains the same and is enhanced by the ANNA system.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because as discussed above, the implementation of ANNA would provide improved detection capability which would more than compensate for the enlargement of the allowable range of operation. Hence, there is no reduction in the margin of safety due to this proposal.

Based on the above considerations the Commission proposes to determine that the requested changes to the WNP-2 Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Richland City Library, Swift and Northgate Streets, Richland, Washington 99352.

Attorneys for licensees: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq., Bishop, Cook, Purcell and Reynolds, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502 and G.E. Doupe, Esq., Washington Public Power Supply System, P.O. Box 968, 3000 George Washington Way, Richland, Washington 99352.

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of amendments request: September 9, 1988.

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendment would revise portions of Technical Specification Section 15.3.8, "Refueling," in order to provide more specific and precise requirements regarding the Containment Purge and Vent System. Additionally, minor editorial changes to Technical Specification Table 15.7.3-2, 15.7.4-2, and 15.7.6-2 are requested.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists in 10 CFR 50.92. 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, (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 an analysis of no significant hazards consideration in its request for a license amendment. The licensee proposes to:

(A) Revise Technical Specification item 15.3.8.7 to reflect more specific requirements regarding the Containment Purge and Vent System as found in the Standard Technical Specifications for the Westinghouse Pressurized Water Reactors, NUREG-0452, revision 4. The modified specification will require demonstration of the operability of the Containment Purge and Vent System "within four days prior to the start of and at least once per seven days during refueling operations."

(B) Add a new Technical Specification item 15.3.8.8 which will introduce an exception to the operability requirement of Technical Specification item 15.3.8.7. It allows refueling operations to continue with the Containment Purge and Vent System inoperable, provided the purge and vent containment penetrations are closed.

(C) Modify the wording of the existing Technical Specification item 15.3.8.8, which becomes a new Technical Specification item 15.3.8.9. This item will identify more concisely the conditions under which refueling operations will cease. This is necessary due to the revision of Technical Specification items 15.3.8.7 and 15.3.8.8.

(D) Make minor editorial changes to Technical Specification Tables 15.7.3-2, 15.7.4-2, and 15.7.6-2. The changes to these tables are identical in nature, establishing a system name which is consistent throughout the Technical Specification, i.e. "Containment Purge and Vent System."

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the criteria by providing examples (51 FR 7751) of actions that are considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration. This guidance has been applied to the aforementioned items and is outlined below.

In regards to items (A), (B), and (C) above, these items are indicative of example (ii) "A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specification..." The proposed change constitutes a more restrictive operability requirement for an isolation system during refueling operations. Additionally, the proposed amendment cannot affect the probability or consequences of a refueling accident nor create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. Moreover, this proposal increases, rather than decreases, the margin of safety.

In regards to item (D) above, this item is indicative of example (i) "A purely administrative change to Technical Specifications..." These editorial changes are administrative in nature which would bring nomenclature consistency to the Technical Specification.

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: John N. Hannon.

Yankee Atomic Electric Company Docket No. 50-029 Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Franklin County, Massachusetts

Date of application for amendment: March 21 and April 14, 1989.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment provides for the addition of a snubber to the pressurizer drain piping.

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 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 March 21 and April 14, 1989 letters states the following:

The change is requested in order to add Snubber DRH-SNB-1 to Table 3.7-4 of the Yankee Nuclear Power Station Technical Specifications.

As such, this proposed change would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The addition of the snubber will enhance the seismic capability of the Pressurizer Drain piping. The snubber will not reduce the capability of the Pressurizer Drain piping to perform its operating or emergency functions. The design criteria provides assurance that the piping and snubber will perform their intended normal and emergency functions. No accident analysis assumptions are affected by the addition of the snubber.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. The design criteria and installation requirements used are at least equal to the original plant design basis. The Pressurizer Drain piping with snubber installed is in a stress analyzed condition meeting the requirements of the design criteria.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The addition of the snubber does not affect the basis of any Technical Specification. Also, there are no accident analysis assumptions affected. The analysis of the Pressurizer Drain piping together with the in-service inspection requirements for snubbers in the Technical Specification ensures that this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the discussion above, it is concluded that there is reasonable assurance that operation of the Yankee plant, consistent with the proposed Technical Specifications, will not endanger the health and safety of the public. The proposed change has been reviewed by the Nuclear Safety Audit and Review Committee.

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: Greenfield Community College, 1 College Drive, Greenfield, Massachusetts 01301.

Attorney for licensee: Thomas Dignan, Esquire, Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Project Director: Richard H. Wessman

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

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

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

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

Date of application for amendment: October 13, 1988

Brief description of amendment request: The amendment would revise the Duane Arnold Energy Center Technical Specifications to conform to the Inservice Testing (IST) Program for Pumps and Valves and to correct typographical errors.

Date of individual notice in Federal Register: April 6, 1989 (54 FR 13967)

Expiration date of individual notice: May 8, 1989

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

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

Date of application for amendment: April 24, 1987

Brief description of amendment request: The amendment would modify the Specifications issued as part of the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications (RETS). The proposed modifications are administrative in nature and incorporate clarifications as well as typographical corrections to improve format consistency with the rest of the DAEC TS.

Date of individual notice in Federal Register: March 23, 1989 (54 FR 12034)

Expiration date of individual notice: April 24, 1989

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

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.

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

Date of applications for amendment: January 28, 1985 as revised August 30, 1985

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modified Technical Specification (TS) 4.6.2.2.e, which requires periodic surveillance testing of the sodium hydroxide addition system. The change clarified the intent of the flow testing of the system and reduces the flow rate of the test in accordance with the design specifications of the sodium hydroxide system pumps.

Date of issuance: April 11, 1989

Effective date: April 11, 1989

Amendment No.: 90

Facility Operating License No. NPF-6. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 20, 1985 (50 FR 47857). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 11, 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: November 17, 1986, January 13 and April 5, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revised the ANO-2 Technical Specifications to reflect changes in reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 in accordance with NRC Generic Letter 83-43.

Date of issuance: April 18, 1989

Effective date: April 18, 1989

Amendment No.: 91

Facility Operating License No. NPF-6. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** May 20, 1987 (52 FR 18972). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 18, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: January 12, 1987, as supplemented October 3, 1988 and April 4, 1989.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the TS by adding operability and surveillance testing requirements for the reactor trip and bypass breakers, diverse trip features and trip logic. The amendment complies with the guidance provided in the NRC Generic Letters 85-09 and 83-28, Item 4.3.

Date of issuance: April 20, 1989

Effective date: April 20, 1989

Amendment No. 122

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 12, 1987 (52 FR 5851). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 20, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendments: November 26, 1986, January 14, 1988 and June 1, 1988.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments modified paragraph 2.C.(27) of License No. NPF-11 and paragraph 2.C.(16) of License No. NPF-18 to require compliance with the revised Physical Security Plan. This plan was updated to conform to the latest requirements of 10 CFR 73.55. Consistent with the provisions of 10 CFR 73.55, search requirements must be implemented within 60 days and miscellaneous amendments within 180 days from the effective date of this amendment.

Date of issuance: April 10, 1989

Effective date: April 10, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 65, 46

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-11 and NPF-18. These amendments revised the license.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 30, 1988 (53 FR 53089). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 10, 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.

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

Date of application for amendments: January 19, 1989

Brief description of amendments: These amendments relieve the licensee from the requirement that CO_2 fire hose stations be subject to the same surveillance testing used for water hose stations.

Date of issuance: April 13, 1989

Effective date: April 13, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 116, 112

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 22, 1989 (54 FR 7629). The Commission's related evaluation of these amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 13, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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: August 18, 1986, as modified January 25, 1989

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises and adds new requirements to Technical Specification Tables 3.5-2 and 4.1-1 requiring the operability and surveillance testing of the reactor trip breakers shunt trip attachment.

Date of issuance: April 10, 1989

Effective date: April 10, 1989
Amendment No.: 137
Facility Operating License No. DPR-26: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** October 8, 1986 (51 FR 36087) and renoticed March 8, 1989 (54 FR 9915). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 10, 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

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 23, 1988
Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the operability requirements for the radioactivity monitors used for reactor coolant system leakage detection. The amendment also corrects several minor editorial errors.
Date of issuance: April 14, 1989
Effective date: April 14, 1989
Amendment No.: 138
Facility Operating License No. DPR-26: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 1, 1989 (54 FR 5162). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 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. 50-155, Big Rock Point Plant, Charlevoix County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: December 30, 1986
Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises section 5.2.2(h) of the Technical Specifications to reflect the inclusion of a second vent and a second drain valve to the scram dump tank.
Date of issuance: April 14, 1989
Effective date: April 14, 1989
Amendment No.: 95
Facility Operating License No. DPR-6. The amendment revises the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 28, 1987 (52 FR 2879). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 1989.
No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.
Local Public Document Room location: North Central Michigan College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

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

Date of application for amendments: January 17, 1989
Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised Technical Specification Table 3.3-5, item 15, and surveillance requirement (4.7.1.2 1b.4) to increase the auxiliary feedwater system suction swapover time from less than or equal to 15 seconds to less than or equal to 16 seconds.
Date of issuance: April 11, 1989
Effective date: April 11, 1989
Amendment Nos.: 60 and 54
Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 8, 1989 (54 FR 6193). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 11, 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: September 19, 1988, as supplemented December 28, 1988, and March 6, 1989.
Brief description of amendments: The amendments modify the Technical Specifications to revise the setpoints for Unit 2 steam generator level trips due to the planned relocation of level taps.
Date of issuance: April 14, 1989
Effective date: April 14, 1989
Amendment Nos.: 61 and 55
Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 8, 1989 (54 FR 6191). Because the March 6, 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 April 14, 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: October 5, 1988, as supplemented December 30, 1988, and January 27, 1989.
Brief description of amendments: The amendments modified the Technical Specifications to: (1) allow a one-time waiver to the requirements for a complete diesel generator (DG) overhaul and for the testing as stated in the first footnote to Table 4.8-1, (2) change the counting of failures on DGs from a "per nuclear unit basis" to a "per diesel generator basis," and (3) correct the numbers of surveillances referenced in the first footnote to Table 4.8-1.
Date of issuance: April 21, 1989
Effective date: April 21, 1989
Amendment Nos.: 62 and 56
Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 22, 1989 (54 FR 7630). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 21, 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. 50-269, 50-270 and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendments: October 13, 1986, as supplemented December 22, 1988
Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications to require Type C local leak test for penetration no. 22, low pressure service water from the reactor coolant pump motors and lube oil coolers outlet.
Date of issuance: April 21, 1989
Effective date: April 21, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 173, 173, and 170
Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-38, DPR-47 and DPR-55. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** May 6, 1987 (52 FR 16943). Because the December 22, 1988, 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 amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 21, 1989.
No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.
Local Public Document Room location: Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina 29691

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 amendment revises the Technical Specifications in the following way: (1) updates the index, (2) corrects Section 4.4.5.2, steam generator inspection requirements to be consistent with Section 4.0.5, (3) corrects reporting requirement of Section 6.9.1 to be consistent with 10 CFR 50.4(b)(1), and (4) modifies Basis Section 3/4.2.2 and 3/4.2.3 to reflect updated approved requirements.
Date of issuance: April 11, 1989
Effective date: April 11, 1989
Amendment Nos.: 139 for Unit 1; 14 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 7633). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 7, 1989
No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.
Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

Duquesne Light Company, Docket No. 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: June 30, 1988
Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Section 4.8.1.1.2.b.4, "Emergency Diesel Generator Surveillance Requirement," to include backup phase fault protection as one of the diesel generator trips not bypassed on a loss-of-power event to the emergency bus. This hardware change that resulted in this amendment was originally approved in our Safety Evaluation Report Supplement 1 (NUREG-1057, Supp. 1).
Date of issuance: April 19, 1989
Effective date: April 19, 1989
Amendment No.: 15
Facility Operating License No. NPF-73. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 7, 1988 (53 FR 34603). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 19, 1989.
No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.
Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, Docket No. 50-320, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 2, (TMI-2), Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: April 4, 1988
Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies Appendix B Technical Specification by revising certain surveillance terms and definitions consistent with the meaning and usage in the Appendix A Technical Specifications.
Date of Issuance: April 12, 1989
Effective date: April 12, 1989
Amendment No.: 33
Facility Operating License No. DPR-73. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 30, 1988 (53 FR 53093). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 12, 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.

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

Date of application for amendment: December 21, 1988
Description of amendment request: The proposed change will revise the acceptance criteria for the secondary containment drawdown test.
Date of issuance: April 10, 1989
Effective date: April 10, 1989
Amendment No.: 21
Facility Operating License No. NPF-62. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 8, 1989 (54 FR 9918). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 10, 1989
No significant hazards consideration comments received: No
Local Public Document Room location: The Vespasian Warner Public Library, 120 West Johnson Street, Clinton, Illinois 61727.

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 April 29, 1988
Brief description of amendments: These amendments change the Technical Specifications to allow the use of either actual or simulated loads for all of the station batteries and associated inverters. The Technical Specification (TS) changes reflect more closely the Standard Westinghouse TS's (STS) (NUREG-0452, Rev. 4), which allow the use of simulated loads.
Date of issuance: April 11, 1989
Effective date: April 11, 1989
Amendments Nos.: 123 and 110
Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.
Dates 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 April 11, 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 14, 1986, as revised March 25, 1987.
Brief description of amendment: The amendment consisted of changes to Section 6.0, "Administrative Controls," of the Duane Arnold Energy Center Technical Specifications. The amendment clarified the responsibilities of the plant Safety Committee and made other minor editorial changes.

Date of issuance: April 18, 1989
Effective date: April 18, 1989
Amendment No.: 157
Facility Operating License No. DPR-49. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 26, 1987 (52 FR 5857). The licensee's March 25, 1987 submittal reduced the scope of the original requested changes. Therefore, the staff's no significant hazards consideration analysis contained in the initial notice remains valid. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 18, 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.

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: August 21, 1986
Brief description of amendment: This amendment adds Technical Specification 3.1.7.h to permit end-of-cycle coastdown operation to as low as 40 percent of rated power and to prohibit increasing core power level, once operation in the coastdown mode has begun, by reduced feedwater heating. The inclusion of Technical Specification 3.1.7.h transfers to the Technical Specifications the limiting conditions of license condition 2.C.(3), thereby permitting deletion of that license condition.
Date of issuance: April 10, 1989
Effective date: April 10, 1989
Amendment No.: 104
Facility Operating License No. DPR-63: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 9, 1987 (52 FR 34016). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 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

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

Date of application for amendment: January 20, 1989
Brief description of amendment: This amendment to the Technical Specifications removes cycle-specific parameter limits, decreases the Minimum Critical Power Ratio from 1.07 to 1.04 and removes previous approval to initiate reactor startup with flow indication from 1 of the 20 jet pumps unavailable.
Date of issuance: April 14, 1989
Effective date: April 14, 1989
Amendment No.: 29
Facility Operating License No. DPR-21. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 22, 1989 (54 FR 7636). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 29, 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. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

Date of application for amendment: December 5, 1986.
Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the plant Technical Specification to: (1) reflect logic changes to made implement the requirements of NUREG-0737, Item II.K.3.18, which added a bypass timer to the reactor low pressure permissive start switch contracts for each Core Spray and Lower Pressure Coolant Injection System electrical division, and removed the high drywell initiation signal from the Auto Pressure Relief System; and (2) lower the Safety/Relief Valve Discharge Pipe Pressure Switch setpoint for Technical Specification consistency.
Date of issuance: March 31, 1989
Effective date: March 31, 1989
Amendment No.: 62
Facility Operating License No. DPR-22. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 9, 1987 (52 FR 34016). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 31, 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.

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

Date of application for amendment: May 5, 1986
Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TSs) to include changes resulting from a detailed review of the TSs that occurred following the 1985 plant refueling and recirculation piping replacement outage.
Date of issuance: April 18, 1989
Effective date: April 18, 1989
Amendment No.: 63
Facility Operating License No. DPR-22. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 9, 1986 (51 FR 36100). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 18, 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.

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

Date of amendment request: December 31, 1988 as supplemented March 15, 1989.
Brief description of amendment: This amendment modifies the Technical Specifications to change the minimum operating requirements for the Raw Water Pumps to allow operation with one inoperable raw water pump when river water temperature is below 60° F.
Date of issuance: April 14, 1989
Effective date: Full implementation within 30 days from the date of issuance.
Amendment No.: 120
Facility Operating License No. DPR-40. This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.
Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 1, 1989 (54 FR 5171). The March 15, 1989 submittal 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 April 14, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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: March 13, 1987 (Reference LAR 87-03)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised Technical Specification (TS) 4.7.5.1, "Control Room Ventilation System," Table 3.3-1, "Reactor Trip System," of TS 3.3.1, and Table 4.3-1, "Reactor Trip System Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements," of TS 4.3.1 to clarify surveillance test requirements for the control room ventilation system and the reactor trip system instrumentation.

Date of issuance: April 7, 1989

Effective date: April 7, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 35 and 34

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82: Amendments changed the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** August 12, 1987 (52 FR 29926). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 7, 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.

NRC Project Director: George W. Knighton

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

Date of application for amendment: March 23, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the Technical Specifications Table 3.3.3-2 to reflect compliance with the Final Safety Analysis Report design bases of the degraded grid undervoltage relay setpoints which provide a second level of undervoltage protection to the Class 1E equipment.

Date of issuance: April 14, 1989

Effective date: April 14, 1989

Amendment No. 18

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

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes (54 FR 12978, dated March 29, 1989). That notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. No comments have been received. The notice also provided for an opportunity to request a hearing by April 28, 1989, but indicated that if the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination, any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendments. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 1989.

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: January 26, 1989 as supplemented with confirmation information on March 6, 1989. The supplementary information did not alter or modify the application. The application of January 26, 1989 supersedes and replaces in its entirety an earlier application dated September 7, 1988.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments modified the Technical Specifications to correct deficiencies in the degraded voltage protection features.

Date of issuance: April 13, 1989

Effective date: April 13, 1989

Amendments Nos.: 143 and 145

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** October 19, 1988 (53 FR 40996). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 13, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Ave., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Power Authority of The State of New York, Docket No. 50-286, Indian Point Unit No. 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of application for amendment: February 5, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to reflect the management reorganization of the Power Authority of the State of New York. The changes affect Figures 6.2-1 and 6.2-2 and Section 6.5.2.2.

Date of issuance: April 11, 1989

Effective date: April 11, 1989

Amendment No.: 85

Facility Operating License No. DPR-64: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 9, 1988 (53 FR 7599). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 11, 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

Public Service Company of Colorado, Docket no. 50-267, Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Generating Station, Platteville, Colorado

Date of amendment request: January 13, 1989

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the amount of radioactive materials the licensee may possess and updates the format of the license.

Date of issuance: April 18, 1989

Effective date: April 18, 1989

Amendment No.: 70

Facility Operating License No. DPR-34. Amendment revised the license.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 22, 1989 (54 FR 7644). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 18, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: September 29, 1988 (TS 257)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments modify Tables 3.2.J and

4.2.J to reflect new testing frequencies for seismic monitoring equipment.

Date of issuance: April 13, 1989

Effective date: April 13, 1989, and shall be implemented within 60 days

Amendments Nos.: 165, 163, 136

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 8, 1989 (54 FR 6211). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 13, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: October 25, 1988

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TS) to support a core reload for Cycle 4. The revised TS include increased peaking factors, a positive moderator temperature coefficient, increased refueling water storage tank and accumulator boron concentrations, and increased spray additive tank sodium hydroxide concentration.

Date of issuance: April 19, 1989

Effective date: April 19, 1989

Amendment No.: 44

Facility Operating License No. NPF-30. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 30, 1988 (53 FR 53103). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 19, 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.

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

Date of application for amendments: March 23, 1989

Brief description of amendments: The amendment revised the permissible enrichments for storage of fuel assemblies in the new fuel storage vault and spent fuel pool by increasing the permitted U-235 content for OFA fuel assemblies to 40.0 g/cm (axial). In addition, the word "assemblies" is changed to "assembly" in two places to clarify the intent of the Technical Specification 15.5.4.2.

Date of issuance: April 14, 1989

Effective date: April 14, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 117 and 120

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes (54 FR 13261 dated March 31, 1989). This notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. No comments have been received. The notice also provided an opportunity to request a hearing by May 1, 1989, but indicated that if the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination, any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: April 19, 1983 and modified April 13, 1984, September 7, 1984, July 14, 1988, and March 22, 1989.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments changed the technical specifications by modifying certain fire protection sections to include recently-installed systems or to be consistent with Standard Technical Specification, NUREG-0452.

Date of issuance: April 17, 1989

Effective date: April 17, 1989

Amendment Nos.: 118 and 121

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 23, 1983 (43 FR 38382), July 24, 1984 (49 FR 29902), November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45941). The July 14, 1988 submittal is an administrative change to return to the original technical specifications and/or a previous submittal. This does not change the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as previously noticed. The March 22, 1989 submittal is an administrative change to correct typographical errors. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 17, 1989.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of April, 1989.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Steven A. Varga,

Director, Division of Reactor Projects-I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

[Doc. 89-10479 Filed 5-2-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-D

[Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324]

Carolina Power & Light Co.; Withdrawal of Application for Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses; Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2

The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) to withdraw their application dated April 29, 1985, for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, (Brunswick) located in Brunswick County, North Carolina.

The proposed amendments were to provide for license changes to require an Integrated Plant Modification Plan. The proposed amendment did not involve changes to plant systems, components, or Technical Specifications. The Commission issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments in the Federal Register on June 19, 1985 (50 FR 25484). By letter dated April 3, 1987, the licensee withdrew their application for the proposed amendment. The basis for withdrawal of the application was the licensee's determination that a license change is not necessary to achieve the benefits of integrated scheduling. The licensee advises that such an integrated scheduling concept has been adopted at the Brunswick site. Their plan has been found to be a useful means of enhancing safe, reliable and economic operation. The Commission has considered the licensee's April 3, 1987 request and has determined that permission to withdraw the April 29, 1985 application should be granted.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 29, 1985, and the licensee's letter dated April 3, 1987, withdrawing the application for amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC and at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 17th day of March 1989.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Edward A. Reeves,

Acting Director, Project Directorate II–1, Division of Reactor Projects I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 89–10573 Filed 5–2–89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

National Advisory Committee on Semiconductors (NACS); Meeting

The purpose of the National Advisory Committee on Semiconductors is to devise and promulgate a national semiconductor strategy, including research and development. The implementation of this strategy will assure the continued leadership of the United States in semiconductor technology. The Committee will meet on May 16, 1989 at Science Applications International Corporation, 1555 Wilson Blvd., 7th Floor, Rosslyn, Virginia, 9:00 a.m. The proposed agenda is:

(1) Briefing of the Committee on its organization and administration.

(2) Briefing of the Committee by OSTP personnel and personnel of other agencies on proposed, ongoing, and completed studies regarding semiconductors.

(3) Discussion of composition of panels to conduct studies.

A portion of the May 16 session will be closed to the public.

The briefing on some of the current activities of OSTP necessarily will involve discussion of material that is formally classified in the interest of national defense or for foreign policy reasons. This is also true for a portion of the briefing on panel studies. As well, a portion of both of these briefings will require discussion of internal personnel procedures of the Executive Office of the President and information which, if prematurely disclosed, would significantly frustrate the implementation of decisions made requiring agency action. These portions of the meeting will be closed to the public pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b. (c) (1), (2), and (9)(B).

A portion of the discussion of panel composition will necessitate the disclosure of information of a personal nature the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. Accordingly, this portion of the meeting will also be closed to the public, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b. (c)(6).

Because of the security in the New Executive Office Building, persons wishing to attend the open portion of the meeting should contact Hazel Houston, at (703) 556–7130, prior to 3:00 p.m. on May 15, 1989. Mrs. Houston is also available to provide specific information regarding time, place and agenda for the open session.

Barbara J. Diering,

Special Assistant, Office of Science and Technology Policy.

May 1, 1989.

[FR Doc. 89–10750 Filed 5–1–89; 4:08 pm]

BILLING CODE 3170–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. IC–16939; File No. 811–5154]

Variable Life Investment Fund; Notice of Application.

April 25, 1989

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC").

ACTION: Notice of Application for an Order under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "1940 Act").

Applicant: Variable Life Investment Fund ("Applicant").

Relevant 1940 Act Sections: Order requested under Section 8(f).

Summary of Application: Applicant seeks an order under section 8(f) of the 1940 Act declaring that it has ceased to be an investment company.

Filing Date: The application was filed on January 23, 1989.

Hearing or Notification of Hearing: If no hearing is ordered, the application will be granted. Any interested person may request a hearing on this application, or ask to be notified if a hearing is ordered. Any requests must be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m., on May 19, 1989. Request a hearing in writing, giving the nature of your interest, the reason for the request, and the issues you contest. Serve Applicant with the request, either personally or by mail, and also send it to the Secretary of the SEC, along with proof of service by affidavit, or, for lawyers, by certificate. Request notification of the date of a hearing by writing to the Secretary of the SEC.

ADDRESS: Secretary, SEC, 450 5th Street, NW., Washington DC 20549. Variable Life Investment Fund, 245 Park Avanue, New York, New York 10167.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeffrey M. Ulness, Attorney, (202) 272–3027 or Clifford E. Kirsch, Special Counsel (202) 272–2061 (Division of Investment Management).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Following is a summary of the application; the complete application is available for a fee from either the SEC's Public Reference Branch in person or the SEC's commercial copier (800) 231–3282 (in Maryland (301) 258–4300).

Applicant's Representations

1. On May 11, 1987, Applicant, an open-end, diversified, management company, filed a Notification of Registration on Form N–8A and a registration statement on Form N–1A. The registration statement never became effective and no public offering of the securities of the Applicant was ever made.

2. Applicant represents that it has never had any assets, has no debts or other liabilities outstanding, is not a party to any litigation or administrative proceeding, has no security holders and is not now engaged, nor does it propose to engage, in any business activities other than those necessary for the winding-up of its affairs.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, pursuant to delegated authority.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 89–10530 Filed 5–2–89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Region III—Advisory Council Meeting

The U.S. Small Business Administration Region III Advisory Council, located in the geographical area of Richmond, Virginia, will hold a public meeting from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 8, 1989, and from 8:30 a.m. on June 9 until 12:00 Noon, at the Holiday Inn Conference Center, 1021 Koger Center Blvd., Richmond, Virginia 23235, to discuss such business as may be presented by members, and staff of the U.S. Small Business Administration, or others present.

For further information, write or call Catherine S. Marschall, District Director, U.S. Small Business Administration, P.O.