

RECORD GROUPS CLOSING AND REOPENING—Continued

Cluster title	Rg. No.	Record group short title	Close date	Reopen date
Old Navy	072	Bureau of Aeronautics	02/06/96	04/12/96
Old Navy	074	Bureau of Ordnance	02/16/96	04/16/96
Old Navy	125	Judge Advocate General (Navy)	02/28/96	04/30/96
Old Navy	127	U.S. Marine Corps	03/21/96	04/30/96
Old Navy	143	Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	03/13/96	05/10/96
Old Navy	181	Naval Districts and Shore Establishments	03/25/96	05/10/96
Old Navy	313	Naval Operating Forces	03/13/96	05/31/96
State/Foreign Relations	469	U.S. Foreign Assistance Agencies, 1948-61	10/24/95	01/08/96
State/Foreign Relations	490	Peace Corps	12/04/95	01/10/96
World War I Period Agencies	002	National War Labor Board (World War One)	04/15/96	08/27/96
World War I Period Agencies	004	U.S. Food Corporation	04/17/96	09/04/96
World War I Period Agencies	005	U.S. Grain Corporation	04/24/96	09/06/96
World War I Period Agencies	006	U.S. Sugar Equalization Board, Inc.	04/24/96	09/06/96
World War I Period Agencies	014	U.S. Railroad Administration	04/29/96	09/11/96
World War I Period Agencies	061	War Industries Board	04/30/96	09/17/96
World War I Period Agencies	062	Council on National Defense	05/06/96	09/19/96
World War I Period Agencies	067	U.S. Fuel Administration	05/08/96	09/25/96
World War I Period Agencies	158	Capital Issues Committee	05/13/96	09/27/96
World War I Period Agencies	182	War Trade Board	05/17/96	10/03/96
World War I Period Agencies	194	War Minerals Relief Commission	05/24/96	10/07/96

[FR Doc. 95-24962 Filed 10-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION****Biweekly Notice****Applications and Amendments to
Facility Operating Licenses Involving
No Significant Hazards Considerations****I. Background**

Pursuant to Public Law 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 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 September 16, through September 28, 1995. The last biweekly notice was published on September 27, 1995 (60 FR 49929).

**Notice Of Consideration Of Issuance Of
Amendments To Facility Operating
Licenses, Proposed No Significant
Hazards Consideration Determination,
And Opportunity For A 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 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 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.

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 in the **Federal Register** 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.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, 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 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. 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 a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By November 10, 1995, 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 request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition 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. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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. 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 a 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 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 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. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. 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 request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

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 Services 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 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) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 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 a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of 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.

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

Date of amendment request: August 10, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment will add a footnote to Technical Specification (TS) Section 3/4.4.3, "Pressurizer," to allow the pressurizer level to be controlled, outside of the programmed level, between 25 to 50 percent, plus or minus 5 percent in Mode 3 when the reactor coolant system is borated to the required Mode 5 concentrations.

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

...The proposed change does not involve an SHC because the change would not:

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

The design basis accidents analyzed in Mode 3 are steam line break, control rod withdrawal from subcritical, boron dilution and control rod ejection. Of these four analyzed accidents, the relaxing of the pressurizer level requirement can only impact the steam line break accident analyses. The initial pressurizer level can impact the timing of the safety injection signal and the subsequent boron addition from the HPSI [high pressure safety injection] system. The proposed change requires that the boron concentration be equal to the Mode 5 required concentration in order for the pressurizer level to be higher than the current requirement. The Mode 5 boron concentration ensures that there is sufficient negative reactivity in the core due to boron that a steam line break from this condition would not need the boron addition from the HPSI system and would be bounded by the design basis analyses. Thus the proposed change cannot increase the probability or consequences of the design basis accidents.

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

The proposed change only modifies the Mode 3 pressurizer level requirement. This change does not impact the lower bound but provides flexibility to the plant operators in the maximum pressurizer level. The upper limit still provides margin to pressurizer overflow. This cannot cause an accident nor introduce a new type of malfunction. The

modified level would allow for a higher initial pressurizer level in Mode 3. This higher level is already used in the accident analyses which result in an increase in pressurizer level. Therefore, the change does not modify the plant's response to accidents.

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

The proposed change is consistent with or bounded by the design basis analyses. The higher shutdown margin required in order to relax the upper bound of the pressurizer level assures that a steam line break from these conditions is bounded by the design basis analyses. Therefore, the proposed change cannot impact the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq., Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141-0270.

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

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

Date of amendment request: September 1, 1995

Description of amendment request: Generic Letter 88-16 provided guidance on removing cycle-specific parameters which are calculated using NRC-approved methodologies from the Technical Specifications (TS). The parameters are replaced in the TS with a reference to a named report which contains the parameters, and a requirement that the parameters remain within the limits specified in the report. The proposed changes incorporate NRC-approved methodologies, approved revisions to previously approved methodologies, or republished versions of previously approved methodologies into Section 6.9.2 of the Oconee TS. The limits to which these methodologies are applied are 1) Axial Power Imbalance Protective Limits and Variable Low RCS Pressure Protective Limits, 2) Reactor Protective System Trip Setting Limits for the Flux/Flow/Imbalance and Variable Low Reactor Coolant System Pressure Trip functions, and 3) Power Imbalance Limits. Since the proposed changes only incorporate NRC-approved methodologies into the TS, the licensee proposed that the changes are administrative in nature and can be

assumed to have no impact, or potential impact, on the health and safety of the public.

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

The proposed changes will not create a significant hazards consideration, as defined by 10 CFR 50.92, because:

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature, and do not affect any system, procedure, or manipulation of any equipment which could affect the probability or consequences of any accident.

2) The proposed changes will not create the possibility of any new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are administrative in nature, and cannot introduce any new failure mode or transient which could create any accident.

3) The proposed changes will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes are administrative in nature, and will not affect any operating parameters or limits which could result in a reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina 29691

Attorney for licensee: J. Michael McGarry, III, Winston and Strawn, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

Entergy Operations, Inc., et al., Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of amendment request: November 9, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated August 4, 1995

Description of amendment request: This supplement revises the licensee's November 9, 1994, application by updating the request to reflect implementation of the Improved Standard Technical Specifications on March 20, 1995, and by deleting the request for a definition of the term RECENTLY IRRADIATED FUEL. The proposed amendment revises those

specifications associated with various engineered safety feature systems following a design basis fuel handling accident. The proposed changes affect conditions where irradiated fuel is handled in the primary or secondary containment and when fuel is handled over the reactor vessel with fuel in the vessel. These changes are based on a recent re-analysis of the fuel handling accident for Grand Gulf Nuclear Station (GGNS).

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

1. The proposed changes do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

A new term to describe irradiated fuel is used to establish operational conditions where specific activities represent situations where significant radioactive releases can be postulated. These operational conditions are consistent with the design basis analysis. Because the equipment affected by the revised operational conditions is not considered an initiator to any previously analyzed accident, inoperability of the equipment cannot increase the probability of any previously evaluated accident. The proposed requirements in conjunction with existing administrative controls on light loads, bounds the conditions of the current design basis fuel handling accident analysis which concludes that the radiological consequences are within the acceptance criteria of NUREG 0800, Section 15.7.4 and General Design Criteria 19. Therefore, the proposed changes do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of any previously evaluated accident.

Based on the above, the proposed changes do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previous analyzed.

The new term to describe irradiated fuel is used to establish operational conditions where specific activities represent situations where significant radioactive releases can be postulated. These operational conditions are consistent with the design basis analysis. The proposed changes do not introduce any new modes of plant operation and do not involve physical modification of the plant. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previous analyzed.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

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

The new term to describe irradiated fuel is used to establish operational conditions where specific activities represent situations

where significant radioactive releases can be postulated. These operational conditions are consistent with the design basis analysis and are established such that the radiological consequences are at or below the current GGNS licensing limit. Safety margins and analytical conservatisms have been evaluated and are well understood. Substantial margins are retained to ensure that the analysis adequately bounds all postulated event scenarios. The proposed change only eliminates the excess margin from the analysis. The current margin of safety is retained.

Specifically, the margin of safety for the fuel handling accident is the difference between the 10 CFR 100 limits and the licensing limit defined by NUREG 0800, Section 15.7.4. With respect to the control room personnel doses, the margin of safety is the difference between the 10 CFR 100 limits and the licensing limit defined by 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, Criterion 19 (GDC 19). Excess margin is the difference between the postulated doses and the corresponding licensing limit.

The proposed applicability continues to ensure that the

whole-body and thyroid dose at the exclusion area and low population zone boundaries as well as control room, doses are at or below the corresponding licensing limit. The margin of safety is unchanged; therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above evaluation, operation in accordance with the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce Street, Natchez, MS 39120

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., 12th Floor, Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: July 19, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment reduces requirements associated with the exercise frequency of control element assemblies from once per 31 days to once per 92 days.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated.

Changing the frequency of the control element assemblies (CEA) exercise test surveillance introduces no new failure mechanism for the system, so the consequences of a postulated stuck CEA are no different than those previously evaluated.

As explained in NUREG-1366, "Improvements to Technical Specifications Surveillance Requirements," the purpose of this test is to identify immovable CEAs. NUREG-1366 goes on to explain that the majority of CEA problems are identified during the performance of startup physics testing and during CEA withdrawal for startup, not during the exercise test. The incidence of electrical malfunctions which will still allow CEA insertion is much greater than the incidence of mechanically bound CEAs. As stated in NUREG-1366, there has only been one incidence of multiple CEAs failing to fully insert upon a reactor trip (Point Beach Nuclear Plant, May 1985) and in this case the two affected CEAs partially inserted. Based on this history, simply reducing the test frequency will not increase the probability of a stuck CEA.

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

2. Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Previously Evaluated.

Because the proposed change does not alter the design, configuration, or method of operation of the plant, it does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety.

The proposed change does not alter the acceptance criteria of any surveillance requirements, alter any assumptions used in accident analysis, change any actuation setpoints, nor allow operations in any configuration not previously evaluated. This change in surveillance frequency is based on a satisfactory operating history of CEAs. Additionally, the number of problems created by this test when compared with the number of problems identified by this test indicate that reducing the test frequency will have no adverse impact on the continued safe operation of the unit.

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

Therefore, based upon the reasoning presented above and the previous discussion of the amendment request, Entergy Operations had determined that the requested change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff

proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801
Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S.

Reynolds, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

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

Date of amendment request: September 11, 1995

Description of amendment request: The licensee proposes to change Turkey Point Units 3 and 4 Technical Specifications (TS) to incorporate line-item improvements to Specifications 3/4.8.1, "Electrical Power Systems-A.C. Sources," and the associated BASES. The licensee stated that the proposed changes are consistent with the guidance provided by the NRC in GL 93-05, "Line-Item Technical Specifications Improvements to Reduce Surveillance Requirements for Testing During Power Operation," and the corresponding recommendations contained in NUREG-1366, "Improvements to Technical Specifications Surveillance Requirements."

In addition, line-item improvements are proposed following the guidance in GL 94-01, "Removal of Accelerated Testing and Special Reporting Requirements for Emergency Diesel Generators." The implementation of a maintenance program for monitoring and maintaining Emergency Diesel Generator (EDG) performance for Turkey Point Units 3 and 4, consistent with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.65 "Requirements for Monitoring the Effectiveness of Maintenance at Nuclear Power Plants" and the associated guidance of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.160 will be met by FPL within 90 days following issuance of the proposed amendments.

The licensee also requested to revise the current wording used in the Turkey Point Units 3 and 4 TS to require testing of remaining required diesel generators "[i]f the diesel generator became inoperable due to any cause other than planned preventative maintenance...". The licensee requested that TS 3.8.1.1, ACTION statements b. and c. be amended such that the word 'preventative' is deleted. Deleting this wording will reduce unnecessary testing of diesel generators as a result of planned corrective maintenance.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The licensee amendments proposed for Turkey Point Units 3 and 4 will incorporate line-item Technical Specification (TS) improvements for Emergency Diesel Generators (EDG) pursuant to guidance provided in Generic Letters (GL) 93-05 and 94-01. The EDGs are not accident initiators, the proposed TS changes do not involve any assumptions relative to accident initiators in the plant safety analyses, and therefore the proposed amendments will not impact the probability of occurrence for accidents previously analyzed.

The EDG line-item TS improvements associated with GL 93-05 are based on recommendations designed to remove unwarranted requirements for testing during power operation and other factors that are counter-productive to safety in terms of equipment degradation and availability. These recommendations resulted from a comprehensive study of industry-wide EDG surveillance requirements and subsequent findings reported by the NRC in NUREG-1366. The proposed amendments are consistent with the guidance of GL 93-05 for implementing such recommendations as well as contemporary licensing actions by the NRC on other light water reactors.

Similarly, GL 94-01 provides guidance for a line-item TS improvement that will remove accelerated testing requirements from the TS provided that the licensee commits to a maintenance program for monitoring and maintaining EDG performance that includes the applicable provisions of the maintenance rule (10 CFR 50.65). Such a program will further assure EDG availability. Since the availability of EDGs is assumed in certain success paths for mitigating analyzed accidents, an improvement in EDG availability will enhance accident mitigation capabilities.

Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed amendments incorporate line-item TS and other improvements to EDG surveillance testing requirements, and will not change the physical plant or the modes of plant operation defined in the Facility License. The changes do not involve the addition or modification of equipment, nor do they alter the design or methods of operation of plant systems. Plant configurations that are prohibited by TS will

not be created by the amendments. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed amendments are designed to improve EDG availability by eliminating unwarranted surveillance testing. The currently specified surveillance intervals are not changed, except to delete the requirement for accelerated testing under certain circumstances. The proposed changes do not otherwise alter the basis for any Technical Specification that is related to the establishment of, or the maintenance of a nuclear safety margin. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Florida International University, University Park, Miami, Florida 33199

Attorney for licensee: J. R. Newman, Esquire, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036
NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

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

Date of amendment request: July 24, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specification 3.6.C to allow up to 7 days to restore low pressure safety injection (LPSI) pump subsystem operability, and up to 24 hours to restore safety injection tank (SIT) operability.

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

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The LPSI system is designed primarily to mitigate the consequences of a large loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). Inoperable LPSI

components are not accident initiators in any accident previously evaluated, and the proposed change does not affect any of the assumptions relative to accident initiators in the plant's safety analysis. Probabilistic safety analysis (PSA) methods were used to fully evaluate the extension of the LPSI system allowed outage time (AOT). The licensee asserts that the results of these analyses show no significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The SITs were designed to mitigate the consequences of a LOCA. The proposed amendment does not affect any of the assumptions used in the deterministic LOCA analysis. Probabilistic safety analysis methods were used to fully evaluate the effect of the SIT allowable outage time (AOT). The licensee asserts that the results of these analyses show no significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Thus, there is no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed amendment does not change the design, physical configuration, or modes of operation of the plant. Plant configurations that are prohibited by TS will not be created by this proposed amendment. Thus, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed amendment does not affect the limiting conditions for operation or the bases used in the deterministic analyses to establish the margin of safety. The licensee asserts that PSA methods were used to evaluate these changes and demonstrate that the changes are either risk neutral or risk beneficial. Thus, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that this amendment request involves no significant hazards determination.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mary Ann Lynch, Esquire, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, 329 Bath Road, Brunswick, ME 04011

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

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

Date of amendment request: August 8, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would

modify the definition of Transthermal (Condition 4), Hot Shutdown (Condition 5), and Hot Standby (Condition 6) reactor operating conditions. The Transthermal and Hot Shutdown conditions are modified to establish an applicable range of subcriticality and be consistent with other Definitions. The wording of Hot Standby is modified to remove reference to control rod position, consistent with NUREG-1432, Standard Technical Specifications for Combustion Engineering Plants, Revision 1 dated April 1995.

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

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The changes to these Definitions are administrative in nature. The Transthermal and Hot Shutdown conditions are changed by adding "at least" to establish a range of subcriticality. The current Definitions for the Transthermal and Hot Shutdown conditions set one minimum value for subcriticality; the change to these two Definitions would allow a range of values for subcriticality. All values of subcriticality that may be established by this change are below the current Definitions (more subcritical). The change to the wording of Hot Standby removes confusion about the Conditions during which control rods may be withdrawn and is consistent with current NRC guidance. All current plant analyses, requirements and acceptance criteria on subcriticality conditions remain in effect. The changes to these Definitions have no impact on event probability. Thus, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed amendment clarifies the subject Definitions. Limits on subcriticality requirements are unaffected, as are reactivity transients previously evaluated. Plant procedures currently require that minimum values for subcriticality be established. All values of subcriticality that may be established by this change are below the current Definitions (more subcritical). Further, the change to the wording of Hot Standby is consistent with current NRC guidance. Thus, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Adding the words "at least" to the Transthermal and Hot Shutdown conditions establishes a range of subcriticality to the

Definitions for these terms. All values of subcriticality are below (more subcritical) than the current value, thus the margin of safety is increased. All current plant analyses, requirements and acceptance criteria on subcriticality conditions remain in effect. The change to the wording of Hot Standby removes confusion about the Conditions during which control rods may be withdrawn and is consistent with current NRC guidance. Thus, there is no significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Mary Ann Lynch, Esquire, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, 329 Bath Road, Brunswick, ME 04011

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

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

Date of amendment request: August 30, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change Technical Specification (TS) 1.3.A, Reactor Core, to allow the use of fuel rods clad with zirconium alloy, rather than restrict fuel rod cladding to Zircaloy-4. In addition, the fuel enrichment limit described in this specification would be changed to more closely agree with the wording found in NUREG-1432, "Standard Technical Specifications for Combustion Engineering Plants," dated April 1995.

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

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Maine Yankee (MY) reload cores containing fuel rods clad with zirconium alloy and having higher fuel enrichments will be analyzed using NRC-approved methods and applicable acceptance criteria. In addition, the impact of fuel assembly design changes on fuel storage will be analyzed using NRC-approved methods and acceptance criteria. Compliance with the acceptance criteria for the applicable analysis for a given core design must be determined

for each core prior to reloading. The material used to clad the fuel and the fuel enrichment are only two of the factors considered in this determination. The application of approved methods ensures that all appropriate variables are addressed and their acceptance criteria satisfied. Thus, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The determination of compliance with the acceptance criteria of the approved safety evaluation for any given core reload design is performed for each MY reload core prior to loading. In addition, determination of compliance with the acceptance criteria of the approved safety evaluation for fuel storage is performed for each core prior to receipt of the fuel. The use of approved methods and their acceptance criteria ensures that new or different accidents will not be encountered by the use of fuel rods clad with zirconium alloy and having higher fuel enrichments. Further, the proposed change does not involve any alterations to plant equipment that would affect any operational modes or accident precursors. Finally, the proposed change does not involve, or require secondary involvement of, any equipment important to safety. Thus the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Maine Yankee reload cores containing fuel rods clad with zirconium alloy and having higher fuel enrichments will be analyzed using NRC-approved methods and applicable acceptance criteria. Safety evaluations performed for each core reload ensure that the core design meets appropriate safety assessment acceptance criteria. In addition, the impact of fuel assembly design changes on fuel storage also will be analyzed using NRC-approved methods and acceptance criteria. Application of the approved methods ensures that the requirements of MY TS 1.1, Fuel Storage, are achieved. Because these requirements are not changed, the margin of safety remains the same. Thus there is no significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Mary Ann Lynch, Esquire, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, 329 Bath Road, Brunswick, ME 04011

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

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

Date of amendment request: August 31, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would relocate fire protection requirements from the Maine Yankee (MY) Atomic Power Station Technical Specifications (TS) to other, licensee-controlled documents. The proposed amendment is consistent with the guidance of U.S. NRC Generic Letters 86-10, Implementation of Fire Protection Requirements, and 88-12, Removal of Fire Protection Requirements from the Technical Specifications.

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

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change is administrative and consistent with the guidance provided by the U.S. NRC. Removing fire protection requirements from the TS does not affect any fire protection equipment, or involve any physical modifications to plant structures, systems or components. The proposed change is not associated with accident initiation or mitigation and cannot affect the probability of occurrence of an accident, or increase the consequences of an accident. The licensee's fire protection plan contains the relocated requirements.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change introduces no new mode of plant operation, does not involve physical modification of any structure, system or component, and does not affect the function, operation or surveillance requirements of any equipment necessary for safe operation or shutdown. Further, the proposed change does not involve any change to equipment setpoints or operating parameters. The proposed change is administrative in nature. Existing plant fire protection equipment requirements are retained. Thus, the proposed change does not create the possibility for a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. No margins of safety established by system or component design, or verified by testing to ensure operability of fire protection systems or components, are affected. Fire protection requirements currently found in the TS will be relocated in their entirety to the Maine Yankee Fire Protection Plan. Any future

changes to the Plan will be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59. Changes, tests and experiments. Thus the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Mary Ann Lynch, Esquire, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, 329 Bath Road, Brunswick, ME 04011

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

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

Date of amendment request: September 11, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes affect Technical Specification Sections 3.4.8 and 3.9.9, Tables 2.2-1, 3.3-3, 3.3-5 and 3.3-8, and Bases Sections 3/4.2.1, 3/4.4.8 and 3/4.11.2.1. These changes combine several different administrative changes which will correct typographical errors, provide clarifications, or make editorial changes.

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

Pursuant to 10CFR50.92, NNECO has reviewed the proposed changes. NNECO concludes that these changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration since the proposed change satisfies the criteria in 10CFR50.92(c). That is, the proposed changes do not:

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not result in changes to plant configuration, operation, accident mitigation, or analysis assumptions. Thus, it cannot increase the probability or consequence of an accident.

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not result in changes to plant configuration, operation, accident mitigation, or analysis assumptions. The intent and application of the proposed specification will not change. Therefore, the proposal does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

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

Since the proposed change[s] are administrative in nature and do not result in changes to plant configuration, operation, accident mitigation, or analysis assumptions, there is no reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360.

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq., Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141-0270.

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

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

Date of amendment requests: July 17, 1995

Description of amendment requests: The proposed amendments would revise the Prairie Island Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications and other sections relating to radiological controls to conform to NUREG-1431, Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants, Revision 1, and Generic Letter 89-01, "Implementation of Programmatic Controls for Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications in the Administrative Controls Section of the Technical Specifications and the Relocation of Procedural Details of RETS to the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual or to the Process Control Program.

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

1. The proposed amendment will not 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. The proposed changes are administrative in nature and alter only the format and location of programmatic controls and procedural details relative to radioactive effluents, radiological environmental monitoring, radioactive source leakage

testing, solid radioactive wastes, and associated reporting requirements. Existing Technical Specifications containing procedural details on radioactive effluents, radiological environmental monitoring, radioactive source leakage testing, explosive gas monitoring, storage tank radioactive content limits, solid radioactive wastes and associated reporting requirements are being relocated to the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual, Process Control Program or other new programs as appropriate. Compliance with applicable regulatory requirements will continue to be maintained. In addition, the proposed changes do not alter the conditions or the assumptions in any of the previous accident analyses. Since the previous accident analyses remain bonding, the radiological consequences previously evaluated are not adversely affected by the proposed changes.

Therefore, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not affected by any of the proposed amendments.

2. The proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

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 change to the configuration or method of operation of any plant equipment. Accordingly, no new failure modes have been defined for any plant system or component important to safety nor has any new limiting single failure been identified as a result of the proposed changes. Also, there will be no change in types or increase in the amounts of any effluents released offsite.

Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated would not be created.

3. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed changes do not involve any actual change in the methodology used in the control of radioactive effluents, radioactive sources, solid radioactive wastes, or radiological environmental monitoring. These changes are considered administrative in nature and provide for the relocation of procedural details outside of the technical specifications but add appropriate administrative controls to provide continued assurance of compliance to applicable regulatory requirements. These proposed changes also comply with the guidance contained in Generic Letter 89-01 and the Standard Technical Specifications.

Therefore, it can be concluded a significant reduction in the margin of safety would not be involved.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Minneapolis Public Library,
 Technology and Science Department,
 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis,
 Minnesota 55401

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

NRC Project Director: John N. Hannon

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

Date of amendment request: June 19,
 1995

Description of amendment request:
 The proposed amendment would revise
 Technical Specification Section 2.1,
 "Safety Limits," to change the
 Minimum Critical Power Ratio Safety
 Limit due to the use of General Electric
 13 fuel product line.

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

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

The derivation of the revised GE13
 [General Electric] Minimum Critical Power
 Ratio (MCPR) Safety Limit for incorporation
 into the Technical Specifications, and its use
 to determine cycle-specific thermal limits
 have been performed using NRC-approved
 methods within the existing design and
 licensing basis, and cannot increase the
 probability or severity of an accident.

The basis of the MCPR Safety Limit
 calculation is to ensure that greater than
 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core avoid
 boiling transition if the limit is not violated.
 The new MCPR Safety Limit preserves the
 existing margin to transition boiling and fuel
 damage in the event of a postulated accident.

All design bases of the MCPR Safety Limit
 calculation apply to GE13 fuel in the same
 manner that they have applied to previous
 fuel designs. The probability of fuel damage
 is not increased.

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

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

The MCPR Safety Limit for the GE13 fuel
 design is a Technical Specification numerical
 value, designed to ensure that fuel damage
 from transition boiling does not occur as a
 result of the limiting postulated accident. It
 cannot create the possibility of any new type
 of accident. The new Minimum Critical
 Power Ratio (MCPR) Safety Limit is
 calculated using NRC-approved methods and

has the same calculational basis as the MCPR
 Safety Limit for other GE fuel designs
 currently used at LGS [Limerick Generating
 Station] Unit 1.

Therefore, the proposed TS change does
 not create the possibility of a new or different
 kind of accident, from any accident
 previously evaluated.

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

The following TS Bases were reviewed for
 potential reduction in the margin of safety:

- 2.1 "Safety Limits"
- 3/4.2.1 "Average Planar Linear Heat
 Generation Rate"
- 3/4.2.3 "Minimum Critical Power Ratio"
- 3/4.2.4 "Linear Heat Generation Rate"
- 3/4.4.1 "Recirculation System"
- 3/4.9 "Refueling Operations"

The margin of safety as defined in the TS
 Bases will remain the same. The new
 Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR)
 Safety Limit is calculated using NRC
 approved methods which are in accordance
 with the current fuel design and licensing
 criteria. The MCPR Safety Limit for GE13 fuel
 remains high enough to ensure that greater
 than 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core will
 avoid boiling transition if the limit is not
 violated, thereby preserving the fuel cladding
 integrity.

Therefore, the proposed TS change does
 not involve a reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the
 licensee's analysis and, based on this
 review, it appears that the three
 standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are
 satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff
 proposes to determine that the
 amendment request involves no
 significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: J. W. Durham,
 Sr., Esquire, Sr. V. P. and General
 Counsel, Philadelphia Electric
 Company, 2301 Market Street,
 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

**Philadelphia Electric Company, Docket
 Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick
 Generating Station, Units 1 and 2,
 Montgomery County, Pennsylvania**

Date of amendment request:
 September 14, 1995

Description of amendment request:
 The amendments change the Technical
 Specifications (TS) by removing the
 Reactor Enclosure and Refueling Area
 Secondary Containment Isolation Valve
 Tables 3.6.5.2.1-1 and 3.6.5.2.2-1 from
 TS in accordance with NRC Generic
 Letter (GL) 91-08, "Removal of
 Component Lists from Technical
 Specifications."

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

licensee has provided its analysis of the
 issue of no significant hazards
 consideration, which is presented
 below:

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

The proposed changes will remove
 component tables from TS. The component
 lists will be retained in licensee controlled
 documents (UFSAR [Updated Final Safety
 Analysis Report] and a plant procedure)
 which will be maintained under the
 requirements of TS Administrative Controls
 Section 6.0 and the provisions of 10 CFR
 50.59. Since any changes to licensee
 controlled documents are required to be
 evaluated per 10 CFR 50.59, no increase
 (significant or insignificant) in the
 probability or consequences of an accident
 previously evaluated will be allowed.

In addition, these proposed changes will
 not affect any equipment important to safety,
 in structure or operation. These changes will
 not alter operation of process variables,
 structures, systems, or components as
 described in the safety analysis and licensing
 basis. The changes will not increase the
 probability or consequences of occurrence of
 a malfunction of equipment important to
 safety previously evaluated in the SAR
 [Safety Analysis Report].

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

The proposed changes will not alter the
 plant configuration or change the methods
 governing normal plant operation. The
 changes will not impose different operating
 requirements and adequate control of
 information will be retained. The changes
 will not alter assumptions made in the safety
 analysis and licensing basis. Since the
 proposed changes cannot cause an accident,
 and the plant response to the design basis
 events is unchanged, the changes do not
 create the possibility of a new or different
 kind of accident from any accident
 previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes to remove the
 component tables from TS have been
 performed under the guidance of NRC GL 91-
 08. The component lists will be retained in
 licensee controlled documents (UFSAR and a
 plant procedure) which will be maintained
 under the requirements of TS Administrative
 Controls Section 6.0 and the provisions of 10
 CFR 50.59. These changes will not reduce the
 margin of safety since they have no impact
 on any safety analysis assumptions. Since
 any future changes to the removed tables will
 be evaluated under the requirements of 10
 CFR 50.59, no reduction (significant or
 insignificant) in a margin of safety will be
 allowed. Therefore, the proposed TS changes
 do not involve a significant reduction in a
 margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the
 licensee's analysis and, based on this
 review, it appears that the three
 standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are

satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire, Sr. V. P. and General Counsel, Philadelphia Electric Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

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

Date of amendment request: May 26, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would represent a full conversion from the current Technical Specifications (TSs) to a set of TS based on NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants," Revision 0, dated September 1993, together with approved travellers used in the issuance of Revision 1, dated April 1995. NUREG-1431 was developed through working groups composed of NRC staff members and industry representatives and has been endorsed by the staff as part of an industry-wide initiative to standardize and improve the TSs. As part of this submittal, the licensee has applied the criteria contained in the Commission's Final Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors of July 22, 1993, to the current Ginna TSs, and using NUREG-1431 as a basis, developed a proposed set of improved TSs for Ginna. Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** September 26, 1995 (60 FR 49636)

Expiration date of individual notice: October 26, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610

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

Date of amendment request: September 13, 1995 (TS 368)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment deletes requirements for daily checks for certain instruments that do not have indications, and provides editorial changes.

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

licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature and correct errors that were introduced by previous changes to the TSs. These changes do not affect any of the design basis accidents nor do they involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature. These changes do not change the operation or function of the affected instrumentation. The deletion of the RCIC and HPCI instrument checks reflects the actual installed configuration of this instrumentation (no indication) and the change to Table 4.2.C corrects the referenced note for the SRM Upscale function. Therefore, the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously is not created by this change.

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature. The proposed changes to TS Tables 4.2.B and 4.2.C do not affect any acceptable limit of operation, instrument setpoint, or analysis assumption in the TS or Bases. Therefore, this change does not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any TS.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET 11H, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

TU Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446, Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Somervell County, Texas

Date of amendment request: August 15, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The proposed amendment would relocate the Shutdown Margin limits from the Technical Specifications (TSs) to the Core Operating Limits Report. The proposed changes are consistent with

the intent of Generic Letter (GL) 88-16 which provides guidelines for the removal of cycle-specific parameter limits from the TSs.

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

1. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The proposed changes remove cycle-specific parameter limits from the Technical Specifications, add them to the list of limits contained in the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR), and revise the Administrative Controls section of the Technical Specifications. The changes do not, by themselves, alter any of the parameter limits. The changes are administrative in nature and have no adverse effect on the probability of an accident or on the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The removal of parameter limits from the Technical Specifications does not eliminate the requirement to comply with the parameter limits.

The parameter limits in the COLR may be revised without prior NRC approval. However, Specification 6.9.1.6c continues to ensure that the parameter limits are developed using NRC-approved methodologies and that applicable limits of the safety analyses are met. While future changes to the COLR parameter limits could result in event consequences which are either slightly less or slightly more severe than the consequences for the same event using the present parameter limits, the differences would not be significant and would be bounded by the requirement of specification 6.9.1.6c to meet the applicable limits in the safety analysis.

Based on the above, removal of the parameter limits from the Technical Specifications and the addition of these limits to the list of limits in the COLR, thus allowing revision of the parameter limits without prior NRC approval, has no significant effect on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

The proposed changes remove certain parameter limits from the Technical Specifications and add these limits to the list of limits in the COLR, removing the requirement for prior NRC approval of revisions to those parameters. The changes do not add new hardware or change plant operations and therefore cannot initiate an event nor cause an analyzed event to progress differently. Thus, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident is not created.

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

The margin of safety, as it relates to a parameter limit, is the difference between the

acceptance criterion for that parameter and its failure value. The proposed changes do not affect the failure values for any system. Through the accident analyses, all relevant event acceptance criteria (as described in the NRC-approved analysis methodologies) are shown to be satisfied; therefore, there is no impact on an event acceptance criteria. Because neither the failure values nor the acceptance criteria are affected, the proposed change has no effect on the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019

Attorney for licensee: George L. Edgar, Esq., Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036
NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

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

Date of amendment request: September 19, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would make administrative changes to the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) Technical Specifications (TS) to improve their clarity and consistency. The proposed amendment includes changes to reflect revisions to 10 CFR Part 20, and changes to correct minor typographical and format inconsistencies as part of an ongoing effort to convert the TS to the WordPerfect format.

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

The proposed changes were reviewed in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.92 to show no significant hazards exist. The proposed changes will not:

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

The likelihood that an accident will occur is neither increased or decreased by these TS changes. These TS changes will not impact the function or method of operation of plant equipment. Thus, there is not a significant increase in the probability of a previously analyzed accident due to these changes. No systems, equipment, or components are affected by the proposed changes. Thus, the

consequences of the malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) are not increased by these changes.

The proposed changes are administrative in nature and, therefore, have no impact on accident initiators or plant equipment, and thus, do not affect the probabilities or consequences of an accident.

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

Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed TS changes would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not involve changes to the physical plant or operations. Since these administrative changes do not contribute to accident initiation, they do not produce a new accident scenario or produce a new type of equipment malfunction. Also, these changes do not alter any existing accident scenarios; they do not affect equipment or its operation, and thus, do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed TS would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed changes do not affect plant equipment or operation. Safety limits and limiting safety system settings are not affected by these proposed changes.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Wisconsin, Cofrin Library, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-7001.

Attorney for licensee: Bradley D. Jackson, Esq., Foley and Lardner, P. O. Box 1497, Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1497.

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas

Date of amendment request: September 14, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification 3/4.5.5 to increase the outage time allowed for adjusting the boron concentration of the refueling water storage tank (RWST) from 1 hour to 8 hours.

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

issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

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

The increase in the RWST allowed outage time does not alter the plant configuration or operation. The potential for the RWST boron concentration to be outside the technical specification limits is small because the RWST and its contents are not involved with normal plant operation and are not subject to process variations associated with plant operation.

The potential causes of boron concentration deviation have been evaluated with the conclusion that any deviation in RWST boron concentration would not be expected to increase significantly during the proposed 7 hour allowed outage time increase.

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

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

Increasing the RWST allowed outage time from 1 hour to 8 hours for reasons directly related to boron concentration does not require physical alteration to any plant system and does not change the method by which any safety related system performs its functions. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Increasing the RWST allowed outage time for reasons directly related to boron concentration does not affect any accident analysis assumptions, initial conditions, or results. The margins of safety reflected in the Wolf Creek Generating Station Technical Specifications are not compromised by the 7 hour allowed outage time increase. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room locations: Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Previously Published Notices Of Consideration Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, And Opportunity For A Hearing

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

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

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

Date of amendment request:
September 1, 1995

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendments would revise the present voltage-based repair criteria in the Byron 1 and Braidwood 1 Technical Specifications (TSs). These proposed revisions would raise the lower voltage limit from its present value of 1.0 volt to 3.0 volts; there would no longer be an upper voltage limit.

The Braidwood 1 TSs were revised by License Amendment No. 54, issued on August 18, 1994, to add voltage-based repair criteria to the existing steam generator (SG) tube repair criteria. The Byron 1 TSs were revised in a similar manner by License Amendment No. 66, issued on October 24, 1994.

The voltage-based repair criteria in the subject TSs are applicable only to a specific type of SG tube degradation which is predominantly axially-oriented outer diameter stress corrosion cracking (ODSCC). This particular form of SG tube degradation occurs entirely within the intersections of the SG tubes with the tube support plates (TSPs).

The present voltage values for the ODSCC repair criteria are based on the assumption of a "free span" exposure of the SG tube flaw; i.e., no credit is given for any constraint against burst or leakage, which may be provided by the presence of the TSPs. This approach is, in turn, based on the assumption that

under postulated accident conditions, the TSPs may be displaced sufficiently by blowdown hydrodynamic loads such that a SG tube flaw which was fully confined within the thickness of the TSP prior to the accident would then be fully exposed. This approach was first advanced by the NRC staff in a draft generic letter issued on August 12, 1994, which was subsequently modified slightly and issued as Generic letter (GL) 95-05, "Voltage-Based Repair Criteria For Westinghouse Steam Generator Tubes Affected by Outside Diameter Stress Corrosion Cracking," dated August 3, 1995. The previous license amendments related to the issue of ODSCC were based to a large extent on the draft generic letter cited above.

The fundamental difference between the pending proposal to raise the lower voltage repair limit to 3.0 volts and the methodology contained in GL 95-05, is that the licensee proposes to install certain modifications to the SG internal structures, thereby limiting to a small value, the maximum displacement of the TSPs under accident conditions. The proposed structural modifications consist of expanding a limited number of SG tubes only on the hot leg side of the TSP, at each of the intersections of the tubes with the TSPs. The purpose of this approach would be to greatly reduce the probability of SG tube burst under postulated accident conditions by several orders of magnitude. There would be a negligible impact on the primary-to-secondary SG tube leakage under accident conditions.

While the voltage-based repair criteria for ODSCC flaws are applicable only to Byron 1 and Braidwood 1, the pending request for license amendments involves all four units in that both stations have a common set of TSs. Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: September 27, 1995 (60 FR 49963)

Expiration date of individual notice:
October 27, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: For Byron, the Byron Public Library District, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron, Illinois 61010; for Braidwood, the Wilmington Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Grundy County, Illinois

Date of amendment request:
September 1, 1995

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would upgrade the Dresden TS to the standard Technical Specifications (STS)

contained in NUREG-0123. The Technical Specification Upgrade Program (TSUP) is not a complete adaptation of the STS. The TS upgrade focuses on (1) integrating additional information such as equipment operability requirements during shutdown conditions, (2) clarifying requirements such as limiting conditions for operation and action statements utilizing STS terminology, (3) deleting superseded requirements and modifications to the TS based on the licensee's responses to Generic Letters (GL), and (4) relocating specific items to more appropriate TS locations. The September 1, 1995, application proposed to upgrade only Section 6.0 (Administrative Controls) of the Dresden TS. Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: September 20, 1995 (60 FR 48728)

Expiration date of individual notice:
October 20, 1995

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

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

Date of amendment request:
September 13, 1995

Brief description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise the Administrative Controls section and the Bases section of the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (BVPS-1 and BVPS-2), technical specifications to be consistent with the requirements of the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (ODCM). The ODCM was recently updated to reflect the radioactive liquid and gaseous effluent release limits and the liquid holdup tank activity limit of BVPS-1 License Amendment No. 188 and BVPS-2 License Amendment No. 70 which were issued June 12, 1995. Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register**: September 22, 1995 (60 FR 49292)

Expiration date of individual notice:
October 23, 1995

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

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

Date of amendment request: September 1, 1995

Brief description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would delete License Condition 2.C.(5) from Facility Operating License DPR-56 which restricts power levels to no less than seventy percent in the coastdown condition.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: September 19, 1995 (60 FR 48530)

Expiration date of individual notice: October 18, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Notice Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses

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, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved.

Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket Nos. STN 50-528, STN 50-529, and STN 50-530, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of application for amendments: December 7, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated August 1, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change Note 5 to Table 4.3-1 of Technical Specification 3/4.3.1 to allow verification of the shape-annealing matrix elements used in the core protection calculators. This provides the option of using generic shape-annealing matrix elements in the core protection calculators. Presently, cycle-specific shape-annealing elements are determined during startup testing after each core reload. Use of a generic shape-annealing matrix eliminates several hours of critical path work during startup after a refueling outage.

Date of issuance: September 20, 1995

Effective date: September 20, 1995

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - Amendment No. 100; Unit 2 - Amendment No. 88; Unit 3 - Amendment No. 71

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-41, NPF-51, and NPF-74: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 4, 1995 (60 FR 495). The August 1, 1995, supplemental letter provided clarifying information and did not change the original no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 20, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Phoenix Public Library, 1221 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois 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: March 26, 1993, as supplemented May 15, 1995

Brief description of amendments: These amendments upgrade the current custom Technical Specifications (TS) for Dresden and Quad Cities to the Standard Technical Specifications contained in NUREG-0123, "Standard Technical Specification General Electric Plants BWR/4." These amendments upgrade only Section 3/4.9 (Electrical Power Systems). These amendments include the relocation of some TS requirements to licensee-controlled documents.

Date of issuance: September 18, 1995

Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented no later than December 31, 1995, for Dresden Nuclear Power Station and June 30, 1996, for Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station.

Amendment Nos.: 138, 132, 160, 156

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-19, DPR-25, DPR-29 and DPR-30. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 19, 1994 (59 FR 2864) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 18, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: for Dresden, Morris Area Public Library District, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450; for Quad Cities, Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021

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

Date of application for amendments: December 8, 1992, as supplemented September 10, 1993, and May 17, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: This application upgrades the current custom Technical Specifications (TS) for Dresden and Quad Cities to the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) contained in NUREG-0123, "Standard Technical Specification General Electric Plants BWR/4." This application upgrades only Section 3/4.1 (Reactor Protection System). Date of issuance:

September 20, 1995 Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented no later than December 31, 1995, for Dresden Station and June 30, 1996, for Quad Cities Station.

Amendment Nos.: 139, 133, 161, and 157

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-19, DPR-25, DPR-29 and DPR-30. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 6, 1995 (60 FR 29872) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 20, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: for Dresden, Morris Area Public Library District, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450; for Quad Cities, Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois 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: September 17, 1993, as supplemented June 30, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: This application upgrades the current custom Technical Specifications (TS) for Dresden and Quad Cities to the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) contained in NUREG-0123, "Standard Technical Specification General Electric Plants BWR/4." This application upgrades only Section 3/4.6.

Date of issuance: September 21, 1995
Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented no later than December 31, 1995, for Dresden Station and June 30, 1996, for Quad Cities Station.

Amendment Nos.: 140, 134, 162, and 158

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-19, DPR-25, DPR-29 and DPR-30. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37087) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 21, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: for Dresden, Morris Area Public Library District, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450; for Quad Cities, Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021

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

Date of application for amendments: April 11, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The amendments allow a one-time extension of specific LaSalle, Units 1 and 2, 18-month Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements to allow surveillance testing to coincide with the LaSalle, Unit 1, seventh refueling outage (L1R07). The shutdown for L1R07 has been rescheduled from September 1995 until early 1996. The proposed extensions apply to calibrations and functional testing of isolation actuation instrumentation, emergency core cooling system actuation instrumentation, and recirculation pump trip actuation instrumentation; leakage testing of reactor coolant system isolation valves; inspection of fire-rated seals; functional testing of mechanical snubbers; inspections of emergency diesel generators; and testing of batteries, battery chargers, and other electrical components.

Date of issuance: September 27, 1995
Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment Nos.: 106 and 92
Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-11 and NPF-18: The amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 5, 1995 (60 FR 35066) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 27, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Jacobs Memorial Library, Illinois Valley Community College, Oglesby, Illinois 61348.

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: June 17, 1993, as supplemented July 5, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Technical Specification Section 5.3.1 "Fuel Assemblies" in accordance with Generic Letter 90-02, Supplement 1, "Alternative Requirements For Fuel Assemblies in The Design Features Section of Technical Specifications."

Date of issuance: September 18, 1995
Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days from the date of issuance

Amendment Nos.: 135 and 129

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 21, 1993 (58 FR 39048) and ReNoticed August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42601) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 18, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: July 11, 1995

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revised the required area of the reactor coolant system overpressure protection system vent from 3.14 square inches to 2.07 square inches which is equal to the relief area of a single power-operated relief valve.

Date of issuance: September 26, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 193
Facility Operating License No. DPR-66. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42603) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 26, 1995. 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, et al., Docket No. 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: July 24, 1995

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises TS 3/4.4.11, "Relief Valves," and associated Bases to make Unit 2 TS 3/4.4.11 consistent with Unit 1 TS 3/4.4.11 which was revised by Unit 1 License Amendment No. 187 issued on May 15, 1995. The amendment generally reflects the guidance provided in NRC Generic Letter 90-06 and in the NRC's Improved Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1431).

Date of issuance: September 18, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 76

Facility Operating License No. NPF-73: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42604) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 18, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendment: March 17, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises requirements associated with the frequency of containment post-entry visual inspections.

Date of issuance: September 15, 1995

Effective date: September 15, 1995

Amendment No.: 162

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

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37089) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 15, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendment: October 27, 1993

Brief description of amendment: The amendment relocated reactor incore detector requirements from the TSs to the safety analysis report.

Date of issuance: September 15, 1995

Effective date: September 15, 1995

Amendment No.: 163

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

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: December 8, 1993 (58 FR 64606) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 15, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendment: March 17, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment transfers requirements for cycle specific core operating limits from the Technical Specifications to the Core Operating Limits Report. Additionally, a reference to a statistical methodology for determining uncertainties is being changed to reference a methodology that was recently approved by the NRC.

Date of issuance: September 19, 1995

Effective date: September 19, 1995

Amendment No.: 164

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

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37088) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 19, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendment: April 4, 1995, as supplemented August 25, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment provides a one-time extension of the reactor coolant pump flywheel inservice inspection.

Date of issuance: September 22, 1995

Effective date: September 22, 1995

Amendment No.: 165

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

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: July 5, 1995 (60 FR 35069) The August 25, 1995, submittal did not change the original no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 22, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendment: May 19, 1995 as supplemented July 21, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the specifications to permit the containment personnel airlock doors to remain open during fuel handling.

Date of issuance: September 28, 1995

Effective date: September 28, 1995

Amendment No.: 166

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

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: August 2, 1995 (60 FR 39437) The July 22, 1995, supplement provided clarifying information and did not change the original no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 28, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of application for amendment: April 4, 1995, as supplemented September 28, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment removes the requirement to maintain water level 23 feet above irradiated fuel assemblies in the reactor while latching and unlatching control element assemblies.

Date of issuance: September 28, 1995

Effective date: September 28, 1995

Amendment No.: 167

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

Date of initial notice in Federal

Register: August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42604) The September 28, 1995, submittal provided clarifying information and did not change the original no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 28, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, AR 72801

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: June 22, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated June 28, 1995 and August 22, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Appendix A TSs by increasing the control room radiation monitor setpoint (CRRMS) to a fixed value of 5.45E-6 micro curies per cubic centimeters instead of being set at two times the background.

Date of issuance: September 27, 1995

Effective date: September 27, 1995

Amendment No.: 114

Facility Operating License No. NPF-38. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 3, 1994 (59 FR 39586) The June 28, 1995 and August 22, 1995, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 27, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: August 11, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment removes the Technical Specifications for the Makeup, Purification, and Chemical Addition Systems from the Technical Specifications (Section 3.2) and relocates the pertinent design information, including tank volume and boron concentrations, to the TMI-1 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

Date of issuance: September 19, 1995

Effective date: September 19, 1995

Amendment No.: 196

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 18, 1995 (60 FR 43172) The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 19, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Law/Government Publications

Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105

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

Date of application for amendment: June 9, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies Technical Specification 4.1, "Site Location," to incorporate a description of the exclusion area boundary. The change is necessary to ensure the content of the technical specifications conform to Section 182 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Date of issuance: September 14, 1995

Effective date: September 14, 1995

Amendment No.: 101

Facility Operating License No. NPF-62: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37093) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 14, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: July 21, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specifications Section 6.0 (Administrative Controls) to replace the title-specific list of members on the Plant Operating Review Committee (PORC) with a more general statement of membership requirements. The scope of disciplines represented on the PORC was also expanded to include nuclear licensing and quality assurance. The amendment also changed the title "Resident Manager" to "Site Executive Officer." This title change was an administrative change that did not affect the reporting relationship, authority, or responsibility of the position.

Date of issuance: September 20, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 163

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42606) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 20, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: April 25, 1994

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises TS Section 3.8.1.1, "A.C. Sources - Operating," TS Section 3.8.1.2, "A.C. Sources - Shutdown," and associated Bases, to increase the required quantity of fuel in the Emergency Diesel Generator Fuel Oil Day Tanks from 200 to 360 gallons.

Date of issuance: September 15, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 79

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 8, 1994 (59 FR 29632) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 15, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: January 20, 1995

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changes Technical Specification (TS) 4.1.3.1.2.b, "Control Rods - Surveillance Requirement" to change the required action to be taken when a control rod becomes immovable due to excessive friction from "at least once per" 24 hours to "within" 24 hours.

Date of issuance: September 20, 1995

Effective date: As of its date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 80

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 2, 1995 (60 FR 39452). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 20, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: January 11, 1995

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changes Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.3.8, "Turbine Overspeed Protection System," removing these requirements from the TS and relocating the Bases to the Hope Creek Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) and the Surveillance Requirements to the applicable surveillance procedures. The Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs) are eliminated.

Date of issuance: September 25, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 81

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 2, 1995 (60 FR 39451). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 25, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: September 29, 1994

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changes Technical Specification (TS) Sections 3/4.3.7.2, "Seismic Monitoring Instrumentation," and 3/4.3.7.3, "Meteorological Instrumentation," to remove the requirements from the TS and relocate the appropriate descriptive information and testing requirements to the Hope Creek Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

Date of issuance: September 25, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 82

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 2, 1995 (60 FR 39449). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 25, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendments: September 20, 1994

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Channel Functional Test surveillance frequency for the Manual Reactor Trip Switches and Reactor Trip Breakers (RTB) and relocate the RTB maintenance requirements from the Technical Specifications to the Salem Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

Date of issuance: September 18, 1995

Effective date: Both units, as of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment Nos.: 176 and 157

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 9, 1994 (59 FR 55890). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 18, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendments: January 21, 1994, as supplemented June 28 and September 13, 1994, and April 4, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: Revised Technical Specifications 3.8.2.3, "125-Volt D.C. DISTRIBUTION - OPERATING."

Date of issuance: September 19, 1995

Effective date: Both units, as of the day of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment Nos.: 177 and 158

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 28, 1994 (58 FR 22012). The June 28 and September 13, 1994, and April 4, 1995 letters provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the January 21, 1994 application and initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, nor go beyond the scope of the **Federal Register notice**. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 19, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: June 19, 1995, as supplemented on August 21, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to change the required test frequency for the reactor building spray nozzle flow test from once per five years to once per ten years.

Date of issuance: September 18, 1995

Effective date: September 18, 1995

Amendment No.: 127

Facility Operating License No. NPF-12: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37100). The August 21, 1995 letter provided supplemental information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 18, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, 300 Washington Street, Winnsboro, SC 29180

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

Date of application for amendment: July 28, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to exclude the requirement to perform the slave relay test of the 36-inch containment purge supply and exhaust valves on a quarterly basis while the plant is in Modes 1, 2, 3, or 4.

Date of issuance: September 18, 1995

Effective date: September 18, 1995

Amendment No.: 128

Facility Operating License No. NPF-12. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42608) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 18, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, 300 Washington Street, Winnsboro, SC 29180

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

Date of application for amendment: June 19, 1995, as supplemented on August 21, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to change the required test frequency for the reactor building spray nozzle flow test from once per five years to once per ten years.

Date of issuance: September 18, 1995

Effective date: September 18, 1995

Amendment No.: 129

Facility Operating License No. NPF-12. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37100). The August 21, 1995 letter provided supplemental information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 18, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Fairfield County Library, 300 Washington Street, Winnsboro, SC 29180

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

Date of application for amendment: April 3, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TS) to relocate radiological effluent and radiological environmental monitoring TS to the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual or to the Process Control Program.

Programmatic controls for radioactive effluent and radiological environmental monitoring were included in TS 6.8.4.

Date of issuance: September 15, 1995

Effective date: September 15, 1995

Amendment No.: 72

Facility Operating License No. NPF-58: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 10, 1995 (60 FR 24921) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 15, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: June 1, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications to make them more restrictive regarding control rod drive scram time testing. CRD scram time testing would be required following maintenance prior to considering the CRD operable, and could be performed at any reactor pressure. Additional testing would be required when reactor coolant pressure is greater than or equal to 950 psig and prior to 40 percent rated thermal power.

Date of issuance: September 26, 1995

Effective date: September 26, 1995

Amendment No.: 73

Facility Operating License No. NPF-58: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 2, 1995 (60 FR 39452)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 26, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: January 14, 1992, as supplemented by letters dated February 10, 1995, and August 16, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises technical specification surveillance requirements regarding demonstration of jet pump operability and corrects several administrative discrepancies.

Date of issuance: September 18, 1995

Effective date: September 18, 1995, to be implemented within 30 days of issuance

Amendment No.: 141

Facility Operating License No. NPF-21: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 27, 1992 (57 FR 22272) and March 29, 1995 (60 FR 16204). The August 16, 1995, supplemental letter provided additional clarifying information and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 18, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of October 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Elinor G. Adensam,
Deputy Director, Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
[Doc. 95-25006 Filed 10-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

[Docket No. 50-251]

Florida Power and Light Company (Turkey Point Unit 4); Exemption

I

Florida Power and Light Company (the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. DPR-41, which authorizes operation of Turkey Point Unit 4 (the facility), at a steady-state