

Testing of Safety-Related Logic Circuits; Issued

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Issuance.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued Generic Letter 96-01 to notify licensees of nuclear power reactors about problems with testing of safety-related logic circuits, request that licensees implement certain actions, and require that all licensees submit a written response. This generic letter is available in the Public Document Rooms under accession number 9601050193.

DATES: The generic letter was issued on January 10, 1996.

ADDRESSEES: Not applicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hukam C. Garg at (301) 415-2929.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: None.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of January, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Dennis M. Crutchfield,
Director, Division of Reactor Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96-1871 Filed 1-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

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 January 5, 1996, through January 19, 1996. The last biweekly notice was published on January 22, 1996.

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 March 1, 1996, 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.

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

Date of amendment request: January 12, 1996

Description of amendment request: Compliance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, provides assurance that the primary containment, including those systems and components that penetrate the primary containment, do not exceed the allowable leakage rate values specified in the Technical Specifications and Bases. The allowable leakage rate is determined so that the leakage assumed in the safety analyses is not exceeded.

On February 4, 1992, the NRC published a notice in the Federal Register (57 FR 4166) discussing a planned initiative to begin eliminating requirements marginal to safety that impose a significant regulatory burden. Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, "Primary Containment Leakage Testing for Water-

Cooled Power Reactors," was considered for this initiative and the staff undertook a study of possible changes to this regulation. The study examined the previous performance history of domestic containments and examined the effect on risk of a revision to the requirements of Appendix J. The results of this study are reported in NUREG-1493, "Performance-Based Leak-Test Program."

Based on the results of this study, the staff developed a performance based approach to containment leakage rate testing. On September 12, 1995, the NRC approved issuance of this revision to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, which was subsequently published in the Federal Register on September 26, 1995, and became effective on October 26, 1995. The revision added Option B "Performance-Based Requirements" to Appendix J to allow licensees to voluntarily replace the prescriptive testing requirements of Appendix J with testing requirements based on both overall and individual component leakage rate performance.

Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance-Based Containment Leak Test Program," was developed as a method acceptable to the staff for implementing Option B. Accordingly, the licensee has submitted, in its application dated January 12, 1996, proposed changes to the TS to implement 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B, by referring to Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance-Based Containment Leakage-Test 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 change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Containment leak rate testing is not an initiator of any accident; the proposed change does not affect reactor operations or accident analysis, and has no significant radiological consequences. Therefore, this proposed change will not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of any previously-evaluated accident.

2. The proposed change will not create the possibility of any new accident not previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not affect normal plant operations or configuration, nor does it affect leak rate test methods. The test history at Catawba (no ILRT [integrated leak rate test] failures) provides continued assurance of the leak tightness of the containment structure.

3. There is no significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes are based on NRC-accepted provisions, and maintain necessary levels of reliability of containment integrity. The performance-based approach to leakage rate testing recognizes that historically good results of containment testing provide appropriate assurance of future containment integrity; this supports the conclusion that the impact on the health and safety of the public as a result of extended test intervals is negligible.

Based on the above, no significant hazards consideration is created by the proposed change.

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: York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

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: December 27, 1995

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendments would modify Tables 3.3-11 and 4.3-7 of Beaver Valley Power Station Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (BVPS-1 and BVPS-2) Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.3.8 such that only one valve position indication system for the power operated relief valves and safety valves is required to be operable. The licensee stated that the proposed amendments would then be consistent with the NRC's Improved Standard Technical Specifications, NUREG-1431, Revision 1, and with the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.97, NUREG-0578, and NUREG-0737.

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

The proposed change involves instrumentation which is redundant in monitoring the position of valves and, as such, does not influence the potential for an initiating event involving the power operated

relief valves (PORVs) or the safety valves (SVs). Implementation of these changes will reduce the potential for challenges to the plant due to a potential shutdown which should not be necessary due to the restrictive nature of having unnecessary redundant position indication in the technical specification. By deleting the Unit No. 1 technical specification operability requirements for the PORV acoustic detectors, and by deleting, on both units, the technical specification operability requirements for the SV temperature detector position indicators, the potential for unnecessary shutdowns is reduced. When inoperable, the PORV acoustic detectors and the SV temperature detectors presently invoke an unnecessary action statement as another fully qualified safety-related position indication system exists to provide indication. The proposed change modifies Specification 3.3.3.8 actions and surveillance requirements, but does not affect the BASES.

The remaining instrumentation on these tables [3.3-11 and 4.3-7] will be unaffected. The remaining position indication systems for the PORVs and SVs are fully qualified and satisfy regulatory criteria for post accident monitoring of valve position. These changes do not affect the ability to satisfy analysis assumptions regarding operation of the PORVs and SVs. They do not affect the ability to continue to meet the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.97, the post Three Mile Island criteria contained in NUREG 0578 and NUREG 0737, and reflect the guidance provided in NUREG 1431, "Improved Standard Technical Specifications" (ISTS). Therefore, we have concluded that these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR).

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

The proposed change will reduce the potential to challenge safety systems due to eliminating the potential for unnecessary plant shutdowns. The proposed changes are limited to PORV and SV position indication and do not involve any physical changes to the PORVs or SVs or their setpoints. These changes do not delete any design basis accident functions previously provided by the PORVs or SVs nor has the probability of inadvertent opening been increased. Accordingly, no new single failure has been identified as a result of these changes. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

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

The proposed changes have been incorporated to eliminate a degree of equipment redundancy and is consistent with the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (ISTS). The Unit No. 1 specification presently requires operability of both redundant PORV position indication systems and the primary and backup SV position indication systems. The Unit No. 2 specification also requires operability of the primary and backup SV position indication

systems. These changes will potentially eliminate some challenges and potential unnecessary shutdowns by eliminating equipment determined to be no longer necessary. Only one safety-related position indication system is necessary to satisfy regulatory criteria; therefore, operation of the plant 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 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: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

Attorney for licensee: Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

IES Utilities Inc., Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of amendment request: December 22, 1995

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendment would revise the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) Technical Specifications (TS) Sections 3.7.A and 4.7.A, "Primary Containment," by deleting information also contained in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option A and incorporating references to the Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program. These changes will allow the use of the performance based option of containment leak testing. The request also adds Operability and Surveillance Requirements (SRs) for the drywell air lock. Minor administrative changes are also made. These changes are consistent with comparable specifications in the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (ITS), NUREG-1433. In addition to the licensee's proposed revision to the DAEC TS, the staff will be executing administrative changes and corrections to the TS Bases, as submitted in letters(2) dated February 13, 1995. Sections that will be changed or corrected are Section 1.2, Bases; Section 2.2, Bases Reactor Coolant System Integrity; Section 3.2, Bases; Section 3.7.H/4.7.H, Bases Containment Atmosphere Dilution; and Section 3.7.I/4.7.I, Bases Oxygen Concentration.

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

Information contained in 10 CFR 50, Appendix J was deleted and references to the Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program were added. These are administrative changes to allow the use of performance-based containment leakage testing methods. The containment testing program will conform with the requirements of Option B of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J and approved exemptions. The performance of the leakage tests themselves is not an input or consideration in any accident previously evaluated, thus the proposed change will not increase the probability of any such accident occurring. The same operability requirements remain for the primary containment, therefore the consequences of an accident are not significantly increased.

Drywell air lock operability and surveillance requirements were added. Actions for one air lock door inoperable have been added consistent with the ITS. In addition, notes have been added to allow entry and exit to perform repairs of the air lock components and to explain that the previous overall leak test is not invalidated by an inoperable door. This change represents an additional restriction on plant operation, since the previous condition of one air lock door inoperable did not require any actions to be taken. A requirement to verify proper operation of interlock mechanism was also added. This will ensure that one door is always closed which maintains primary containment integrity.

The addition of these new drywell air lock requirements provides more stringent provisions than previously existed in the [current Technical Specifications]. The more stringent requirements will not result in operation that will increase the probability of initiating an analyzed event. If anything, the new requirements may decrease the probability or consequences of an analyzed event by incorporating the more restrictive changes discussed above. These changes will not alter assumptions relative to mitigation of an accident or transient event. The more restrictive requirements will not alter the operation of process variables, structures, systems, or components as described in the safety analyses.

The TS revision includes the relocation of certain requirements from the current technical specification (CTS) to licensee controlled documents. CTS 4.7.A.1.e contains a requirement to replace the T-ring inflatable seals for the 18 inch purge valves every four years. This provision is not in the ITS as it is a maintenance issue and not a surveillance for operability. CTS 4.7.A.1.e also contains a requirement to verify (during Type C testing) that the mechanical modification which limits the maximum opening angle for the 18 inch purge valves is intact. The ITS only requires this surveillance if the mechanical modification is not permanent. At DAEC, the 18 inch purge valves are permanently blocked to restrict opening to 30°. These CTS provisions

will be relocated to plant procedures. Any changes to these relocated requirements will require an evaluation in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59. CTS 4.7.A.1.a and 4.7.A.1.d contain some procedural details that are not contained in Appendix J. These details will also be relocated to plant procedures, consistent with the ITS. Since any changes to these licensee controlled documents will be evaluated in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59, no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated will be allowed.

The proposed revision does not involve any change to the configuration or method of operation of any plant equipment that is used to mitigate the consequences of an accident, nor does it affect any assumptions or conditions in the accident analysis. The proposed revision does not degrade any existing plant programs, nor modify any functions of safety related systems or accident mitigation functions previously credited at the DAEC. The proposed changes do not impact initiators of analyzed events. They also do not impact the assumed mitigation of accidents or transient events. These TS changes will not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis and licensing basis.

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

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

Deleting information from the TS which is contained in 10 CFR 50, Appendix J and adding references to the Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program are purely administrative changes to allow the use of performance-based containment leakage testing methods. The containment testing program will conform with the requirements of Option B of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J and approved exemptions. The use of Option B will maintain the containment safety functions as a barrier to the release of radioactivity to the environment.

The proposed revision does not make any physical or operational changes to existing plant systems or components, nor does it alter any plant parameters, revise any safety limit setpoint, or provide any new release pathways. The proposed revision does not change any transient responses assumed in the Design Bases of the plant.

The proposed changes which relocate requirements to licensee controlled documents will not alter the plant configuration (no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or change the methods governing normal plant operation. These changes will not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis or licensing basis.

The proposed changes which add more restrictive requirements to the CTS will not alter the plant configuration (no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or change the methods governing normal plant operation. These changes do impose different requirements. However, they are consistent with assumptions made in the safety analyses.

Therefore, the revision does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed revision will not significantly reduce any margin of safety.

Deleting information from the TS which is contained in 10 CFR 50, Appendix J and adding references to the Primary Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. These changes are administrative in nature and either eliminate a redundant requirement or clarify the applicability and acceptability of an alternative. NRC approved, leak rate testing provision within the TS. The containment testing program will conform to the requirements of Option B of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J and approved exemptions. The use of Option B will maintain the containment safety functions as a barrier to the release of radioactivity to the environment.

The proposed revision does not require any modifications to existing plant systems or equipment, safety limit settings, or parameters utilized in the licensing bases for the safety analysis. The proposed revision does not change any safety analysis or any accident mitigation action for which DAEC has previously taken credit. The proposed changes do not involve any technical changes; they have no impact on any safety analysis assumptions. The addition of new requirements either increases or does not affect the margin of safety.

The proposed changes that relocate requirements from the CTS to licensee controlled documents will not reduce a margin of safety since they have no impact on any safety analysis assumptions. In addition, the requirements to be relocated from the CTS to the licensee controlled document are unchanged. Since any future changes to this licensee controlled document will be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59, no significant reduction in a margin of safety will be allowed.

The proposed changes are consistent with NUREG-1433, which was approved by the NRC Staff. The changes are also consistent with NRC guidance provided for the implementation of Option B. The change controls for proposed relocated details and requirements are acceptable. Therefore, revising the TS to reflect the NRC accepted level of detail and requirements ensures that there is no reduction in a margin of safety.

Therefore, the proposed revision will not significantly reduce any 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: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 500 First Street, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Kathleen H. Shea, Morgan, Lewis, & Bockius, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036-5869
NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

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

Date of amendment request:
December 14, 1995

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specifications 3.3.1.1, "Reactor Protection System (RPS) Instrumentation," and 3.3.6.1, "Primary Containment and Drywell Isolation Instrumentation," to eliminate periodic response time testing of selected analog trip modules (ATMs). This request is supported by analyses prepared by the Boiling Water Reactor Owners' Group topical report NEDO-32291, "System Analyses for Elimination of Selected Response Time Testing Requirements," which demonstrate that other periodic tests required by technical specifications, such as channel calibrations, channel functional tests and logic system functional tests, are adequate to ensure ATM response times remain within acceptable limits.

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 purpose of the proposed Technical Specification (TS) change is to eliminate response time testing requirements for selected analog trip modules (ATMs) in the Reactor Protection System (RPS) and the main steam isolation valve (MSIV) isolation actuation instrumentation. The Boiling Water Reactor Owners' Group (BWROG) has completed an evaluation which demonstrates that response time testing is redundant to the other TS-required testing. These other tests, in conjunction with actions taken in response to NRC Bulletin 90-01, "Loss of Fill-Oil in Transmitters Manufactured by Rosemount," and Supplement 1, are sufficient to identify failure modes or degradations in instrument response time and ensure operation of the associated systems within acceptable limits. There are no known failure modes that can be detected by response time testing that cannot also be detected by other TS-required testing. This evaluation was documented in NEDO-32291, "System Analyses for Elimination of Selected Response Time Testing Requirements," January 1994. Illinois Power (IP) has confirmed the applicability of this evaluation to Clinton Power Station (CPS). In addition, IP has completed the actions identified in the NRC staff's safety evaluation of NEDO-32291.

Because of the continued application of other existing TS-required tests such as channel calibrations, channel checks,

channel functional tests, and logic system functional tests, the response time of these systems will be maintained within the acceptance limits assumed in plant safety analyses and required for successful mitigation of an initiating event. The proposed changes do not affect the capability of the associated systems to perform their intended function within their required response time, nor do the proposed changes themselves affect the operation of any equipment. As a result, IP has concluded that the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(2) The proposed changes only apply to the testing requirements for ATMs in the systems identified above and do not result in any physical change to these or other components or their operation. As a result, no new failure modes are introduced. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) The current TS-required response times are based on the maximum values assumed in the plant safety analyses. These analyses conservatively establish the margin of safety. As described above, the proposed changes do not affect the capability of the associated systems to perform their intended function within the allowed response time used as the basis for the plant safety analyses. The potential failure modes for the components within the scope of this request were evaluated for impact on instrument response time. This evaluation confirmed that the remaining TS-required testing is sufficient to identify failure modes or degradations in instrument response times and to ensure that operation of the instrumentation within the scope of this request is within acceptable limits. As a result, it has been concluded that plant and system response to an initiating event will remain in compliance with the assumptions of the safety analysis.

Further, although not explicitly evaluated, the proposed changes will provide an improvement to plant safety and operation by reducing the time safety systems are unavailable, reducing the potential for safety system actuations, reducing plant shutdown risk, limiting radiation exposure to plant personnel, and eliminating the diversion of key personnel resources to conduct unnecessary testing. Therefore, IP has concluded that this request will result in an overall increase 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: Vespasian Warner Public Library, 120 West Johnson Street, Clinton, Illinois 61727

Attorney for licensee: Sheldon Zabel, Esq., Schiff, Hardin and Waite, 7200

Sears Tower, 233 Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

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

Date of amendment request:
December 11, 1995

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specification (TS) Section 4.7, Surveillance Requirements for Primary Containment Automatic Isolation Valves. Specifically, the proposed amendment would delete TS Surveillance Requirement 4.7.D.4, which requires replacement of the seat seals for the drywell and suppression chamber purge and vent valves every 5 years.

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

An evaluation of the operational performance of the 18-inch purge and vent valves has concluded that deletion of the Monticello Technical Specification surveillance requirement 4.7.D.4 will have no adverse impact on the seat leakage performance of these primary containment isolation valves, no adverse impact on the testing performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, and thus no adverse impact on the containment isolation function of these primary containment isolation valves. The material of which the T-shaped elastomer seat is comprised of has been found to withstand normal and accident thermal exposures for the design life of the plant based on a thermal aging analysis. Radiation effects will not have an adverse impact on the elastomer seat material. Therefore, this amendment will not cause a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated for the Monticello plant.

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

The proposed change to the Technical Specifications for the Primary Containment Purge and Vent valves does not alter the function of these components or their interrelationships with other systems. Therefore, this amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

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

The operating experience of these valves has demonstrated that the testing performed

in accordance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, provides a high level of confidence in the ability of these valves to perform their safety function with respect to valve leak tightness. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant 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: Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

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

NRC Project Director: John N. Hannon
Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County, California

Date of amendment requests:
December 27, 1995

Description of amendment requests:
The amendments would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) 3/4.6.1.1, "Containment Integrity;" 3/4.6.1.2, "Containment Leakage;" 3/4.6.1.3, "Containment Air Locks;" 3/4.6.1.6, "Containment Structural Integrity;" 3/4.6.3, "Containment Isolation Valves;" and their associated Bases; and would add TS 6.8.4.j, "Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program," to implement the performance-based leakage rate testing program, as permitted by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. These changes will support the implementation of the performance-based testing of Option B to Appendix J for Types A, B, and C containment leakage rate testing and the appropriate rescheduling of testing. The amendment changes the TS to implement 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B, by referring to Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance-Based Containment Leakage Test 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 change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.6.1.1, 3/4.6.1.2, 3/

4.6.1.3, 3/4.6.1.6, 3/4.6.3, and the addition of 6.8.4.j., to implement the performance-based Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program have no effect on plant operation. The proposed changes only provide mechanisms within the TS for implementing a performance-based methodology for determining the frequency of leak rate testing that has been approved by the Commission. The test type and test method used for testing would not be changed. The test acceptance criteria would not be changed, and containment leakage will continue to be maintained within the required limits.

Directly referencing the Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program for containment ILRT [integrated leak rate testing] and LLRT [local leak rate test] requirements does not involve any modification to plant equipment or affect the operation or design basis of the containment. Leakage rate testing is not a precursor to or an initiating event for any accident.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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 proposed changes only allow for the implementation of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Option B, testing frequencies and do not involve any modifications to any plant equipment or affect the operation or design basis of the containment. The proposed changes do not affect the response of the containment during a design basis accident.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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.

The proposed changes do not affect or change a Safety Limit or affect plant operations. The changes only implement the allowed 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Option B testing frequencies that have been determined by the Commission not to involve a safety concern. The testing method, acceptance criteria, and basis for testing are not changed and still provide assurance that the containment will provide its intended function.

Therefore, the proposed 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 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: California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Attorney for licensee: Christopher J. Warner, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric

Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corporation (SNEC), Docket No. 50-146, Saxton Nuclear Experimental Facility (SNEF), Bedford County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request:
November 21, 1995.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would change the license and technical specifications to add GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPUN) as a licensee for the SNEF along with SNEC and would transfer from SNEC to GPUN all management-related responsibilities for the SNEF. Responsibility for safely maintaining the containment vessel and performing characterization activities would change from SNEC to GPUN. Technical specification organizational positions would be changed from SNEC titles to GPUN titles. GPUN would take responsibility from SNEC for administration of all SNEF functions, for radiation safety activities, and for providing on-site management and continuing oversight of production activities. The appointment of members to the Saxton Radiation Safety Committee and the reporting of the Committee would change from the SNEC President to the GPUN Vice President of the Nuclear Services Division. The GPUN President would have the authority to request audits and would receive audit reports instead of the SNEC President. Procedure control methodology and the administrative procedure for procedures would be changed from SNEC procedures to GPUN procedures. The responsibility for records retention and reporting would change from SNEC to GPUN. The organization chart for the facility would be changed to reflect the addition of GPUN as a licensee.

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 do not involve a significant hazards considerations because the changes would not:

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

Because the proposed changes are administrative in nature they would have no effect on the likelihood or impact on the potential accidents of fire, flood or radiological hazard.

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

Because the proposed changes are administrative in nature they would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

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

Because the proposed changes are administrative in nature they would not involve any reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the analysis of the licensee 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: Saxton Community Library, 911 Church Street, Saxton, Pennsylvania 16678
Attorney for the Licensee: Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Seymour H. Weiss

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

Date of amendment request: January 4, 1996 (TS 95-22)

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would extend the functional testing interval for the following isolation radiation monitor instruments from monthly to quarterly: (1) Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements Table 4.3-2, Item 3.c.3, Containment Purge Air Exhaust Monitor Radioactivity-High; (2) Radiation Monitoring Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements Table 4.3-3, Item 1.a, Fuel Storage Pool Area Radiation Monitor; (3) Table 4.3-3, Item 2.a, Containment Purge Air Exhaust; (4) Table 4.3-3, Item 2.b.i, Containment Gaseous Activity RCS Leakage Detection; (5) Table 4.3-3, Item 2.b.ii, Containment Particulate Activity RCS Leakage Detection; and (6) Table 4.3-3, Item 2.c, Control Room Isolation.

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:

TVA has evaluated the proposed technical specification (TS) change and has determined that it does not represent a significant hazards consideration based on criteria

established in 10 CFR 50.92(c). Operation of Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN) in accordance with the proposed amendment will not:

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

Review of the past history for the affected and similar radiation monitors revealed that extending the functional testing interval for these monitors will not adversely affect system operability and will effectively increase system availability. These radiation monitors are not accident initiating equipment, thus increasing the surveillance interval on these monitors will not affect the probability of any accident previously evaluated. Based on the above statements, it is concluded that the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated is not increased.

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

No new type of accident or malfunction will be created since the radiation monitors are not accident initiating equipment. The proposed change merely increases the functional testing interval for the affected radiation monitors, and does not change the method and manner of plant operation. The safety design bases in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report have not been altered.

Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

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

The proposed changes do not change the plant configuration in a way that introduces a new potential hazard to the plant and do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The proposed changes do not affect applicable safety analysis acceptance criteria and will not affect system operating conditions. Additionally, plant operating experience with similar monitors has shown that there has not been additional failures due to the quarterly testing frequency. Thus, it is concluded that the margin of safety is not reduced.

The NRC 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: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1101 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402

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

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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

Date of amendment request: November 22, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment replaces the requirements associated with the boron dilution mitigation system (BDMS) in the Wolf Creek Generating Station Technical Specifications with alarms, indicators, procedures, and controls to assure proper resolution of potential inadvertent boron dilution events.

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

The only event potentially impacted by the proposed change is the inadvertent boron dilution event. The discussion of the probability and consequences of an inadvertent boron dilution event at WCGS is provided in USAR [Updated Safety Analysis Report] Section 15.4.6. Primarily, the proposed changes revise the method of detecting and mitigating the event. The only aspect of the changes that impact[s] the potential causes of an inadvertent boron dilution event is the increased requirement to isolate potential dilution sources in Modes 3, 4 and 5. As a result, the overall probability of the event is slightly decreased.

The alternate methods to detect and mitigate this event achieve the same basic goal as the current BDMS; to prevent a return to critical during an inadvertent dilution event. The proposed changes to the BDMS will result in an improved system that will provide an improved response to the inadvertent boron dilution event, and that will prevent a return to critical. Thus, it can be concluded that the proposed change will not significantly increase the consequences of a postulated inadvertent boron dilution event.

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

The revisions to plant procedural requirements to either operate a reactor coolant pump or to isolate/control potential dilution sources does [sic] not create the potential for a new or different kind of accident because these new requirements are configurations which have always been allowed. Similarly, the new normal position for the letdown divert valve does not create a new or different accident because the new normal position has always been an allowed position. The other procedural changes only increase the plant operators' awareness of potential boron dilution problems or provide the steps needed to respond to available indications and alarms to mitigate the potential event. As a result, these procedural changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed changes also include addition of new redundant VCT high level alarms and a new alarm indicating that the

letdown divert valve is not in the "VCT" position. Because the alarms are passive, they do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

The design criterion and margin of safety for the current BDMS is that the dilution event is terminated prior to the loss of all shutdown margin. The same criterion will be met following the implementation of the proposed changes. Therefore, 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 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

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

Date of amendment request:
December 20, 1995

Description of amendment request: This amendment request proposes to revise Technical Specification 3/4.6.1.1, "Containment Integrity," and 3/4.6.1.3, "Containment Air Locks," and to add Technical Specification 6.8.4i, "Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program," to implement the new performance-based leakage rate testing program as permitted by 10 CFR 50, Appendix J. Also, Technical Specification 1.7e, "Containment Integrity," would be revised to reference Technical Specification 4.6.1.1.c. These proposed changes will implement the performance-based testing of Option B to Appendix J, for Type A, B, and C containment leak testing by referring to Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance-Based Containment Leakage-Test 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 change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or

consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to Technical Specifications 3/4.6.1.1 and 3/4.6.1.3, and the addition of Technical Specification 6.8.4i to implement the new performance based Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program, have no effect on plant operation. The proposed changes only provide mechanisms within the technical specifications for implementing a performance-based methodology, for determining the frequency of leak rate testing, which has been approved by the NRC. The test type and test method used for testing would not be changed. The test acceptance criteria would not be changed, and containment leakage will continue to be maintained within the required limits.

Directly referencing the Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program for containment integrated leak rate test and local leak rate test requirements does not involve any modification to plant equipment or affect the operation or design basis of the containment. Leakage rate testing is not a precursor to or an initiating event for any accident.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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 proposed changes only allow for implementation of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, Option B, testing frequencies and do not involve any modifications to any plant equipment or affect the operation or design basis of the containment. The proposed changes do not affect the response of the containment during a design basis accident.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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.

The proposed changes do not affect or change a Safety Limit, any limiting condition for operation or affect plant operations. The changes only implement the allowed Option B testing frequencies that have been determined by the NRC not to involve a safety concern. The testing method, acceptance criteria, and bases are not changed and still provide assurance that the containment will provide its intended function.

Therefore, the proposed 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 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

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.

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: November 14, 1995, as supplemented January 4, 1996.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications to incorporate 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, "Primary Reactor Containment Leakage Testing for Water-Cooled Power Reactors," Option B. Technical Specification changes for the LaSalle facility will be addressed under separate correspondence.

Date of issuance: January 11, 1996

Effective date: January 11, 1996

Amendment Nos.: 148, 142, 169, and 165

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: December 7, 1995 (60 FR 62896). The January 4, 1996, supplement provided a specific implementation date for the requested amendment. This information was within the scope of the original application and did not change the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 1996. 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.

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

Date of application for amendment: November 14, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Haddam Neck Technical Specifications (TS) to provide an one-time exception to TS 3.9.12, "Fuel Building Storage Air Cleanup System," to allow the fuel storage building air cleanup system to be inoperable for a limited duration during intervals in which new fuel rack modules will be moved into and old fuel rack modules will be moved out of the fuel storage building.

Date of Issuance: January 17, 1996
Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 187

Facility Operating License No. DPR-61. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 28, 1995 (60 FR 58688) The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 17, 1996 No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, CT 06457.

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50-155, Big Rock Point Plant, Charlevoix County, Michigan Date of application for amendment: November 8, 1995, as supplemented November 17, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment removes the prescriptive Type A containment leakage test rate frequency of 40 plus or minus 10 months and adds a reference to perform containment leakage rate tests in accordance with the criteria specified in Appendix J of 10 CFR Part 50 as modified by approved exemptions. In addition, the amendment revises the test pressure for Type B and C testing to correct a typographical error.

Date of issuance: January 16, 1996

Effective date: January 16, 1996

Amendment No.: 117

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 6, 1995 (60 FR 62489) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 16, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: North Central Michigan College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: March 29, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated September 18 and November 16, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Technical Specification requirements for the Low Temperature Overpressure Protection system and update the heatup and cooldown curves for both units.

Date of issuance: January 11, 1996

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

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - 162; Unit 2 - 144

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-9 and NPF-17: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications. Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 27, 1995 (60 FR 49933) The September 18 and November 16, 1995, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the March 29, 1995, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of application for amendments: December 2, 1994

Brief description of amendments: The amendments replace Appendix B, "Environmental Technical Specifications," with an Environmental Protection Plan (Nonradiological) and revise the Operating Licenses to reflect these changes.

Date of issuance: December 19, 1995

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

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - 199 - Unit 2 - 140

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications and Operating Licenses.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 4, 1995 (60 FR 502) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 19, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia 31513

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

Date of application for amendments: March 17, 1995, as supplemented by letter dated July 6, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Technical Specification 3/4.9.4, Containment Building Penetrations, to allow the personnel airlock to be open during core alterations or movement of irradiated fuel within the containment.

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

Amendment Nos.: 92 and 70

Facility Operating License Nos.: NPF-68 and NPF-81: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 5, 1995 (60 FR 35077) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 30, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Gulf States Utilities Company, Cajun Electric Power Cooperative, and Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-458, River Bend Station, Unit 1, West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: August 17, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated November 22, and December 18, 20, and 27, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the primary containment air lock technical specifications to allow the air locks to be open in Mode 5 (refueling) during core alterations except for movement of recently irradiated fuel. All other provisions of the August 17, 1995, requests are deferred.

Date of issuance: January 11, 1996

Effective date: January 11, 1996

Amendment No.: 85

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 13, 1995 (60 FR 47619) The additional information contained in the supplemental letters dated November 22, and December 18, 20, and 27, 1995, was clarifying in nature and thus, within the scope of the initial notice and did not affect the

staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

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

Gulf States Utilities Company, Cajun Electric Power Cooperative, and Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-458, River Bend Station, Unit 1, West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: November 20, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment revised the technical specifications to eliminate the response time testing requirements for selected Reactor Protection System Instrumentation.

Date of issuance: January 11, 1996

Effective date: January 11, 1996

Amendment No.: 86

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 6, 1995 (60 FR 62492) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: May 25, 1995 (AEP:NRC:1071T)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments incorporate a cycle- and burnup-dependent peaking factor penalty in the Core Operating Limits Report and add an appropriate reference to the COLR and update the topical report reference in the Technical Specifications.

Date of issuance: January 4, 1996

Effective date: January 4, 1996, with full implementation within 45 days
Amendment Nos.: Unit 1, 206, Unit 2, 190

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated

January 4, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: October 3, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment removes the Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) and Surveillance Requirements for the loss-of-normal power (LNP) trip function from Tables 3.2.2 and 4.2.1 and inserts new LCO 3.2.F and Surveillance Requirement 4.2.F. In addition, the amendment adds a new table to specify the required LNP instrumentation for each bus, updates the Table of Contents, makes some editorial changes, and revises the associated Bases section.

Date of issuance: January 17, 1996

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

Amendment No.: 92

Facility Operating License No.: DPR-21. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 4, 1995 (60 FR 62111) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety evaluation dated January 17, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: September 11, 1995, as supplemented November 15, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes 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.

Date of issuance: January 17, 1996

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

Amendment No.: 194

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 11, 1995 (60 FR 52933) The November 15, 1995, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 17, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: September 29, 1995, as supplemented November 9, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment provides three changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) relating to the pressurizer safety valves (PSV) and the main steam safety valves (MSSV).

The first change is to TS 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.2.2 and involves relaxing the as-found setpoint tolerance for the pressurizer safety valves (PSVs) and the main steam safety valves (MSSVs) from the current value of plus or minus 1% to plus or minus 3%. Table 4.7-1 is also modified to correct the as-found tolerance for the MSSV from plus or minus 1% to plus or minus 3%. Notes are added to TS 3.4.2.2 and Table 4.7-1 which specify that the lift setting should be determined at nominal operating conditions and should be set at plus or minus 1% of the lift setting.

For the second change, Surveillance Requirement 4.7.1.1 and Table 4.7-1 are modified to eliminate the need to verify the orifice size of each MSSV.

The third change modifies the statement for TS 3.7.1.1 so that if a MSSV is inoperable and compensating action cannot be taken, the plant must be brought to hot shutdown (Mode 4) within 12 hours instead of cold shutdown (Mode 5) in 30 hours.

Date of issuance: January 18, 1996
Effective date: As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 195
Facility Operating License No. DPR-65. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 25, 1995 (60 FR

54723) The November 9, 1995, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 18, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

PECO Energy Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: November 30, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the technical specification requirements for control rod drive scram accumulator and charging water header minimum pressure.

Date of issuance: January 11, 1996
Effective date: Unit 2, as of date of issuance, to be implemented concurrently with Amendment 210, issued August 30, 1995; Unit 3, as of date of issuance, to be implemented concurrently with Amendment 214, issued August 30, 1995.

Amendments Nos.: 211 and 216
Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 8, 1995 (60 FR 63073) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 1996 No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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.

PECO Energy Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: November 21, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the test pressure requirements for the high pressure

coolant injection system and the reactor core isolation cooling system surveillance tests. The amendments also change Section 5.5.7 of the technical specifications to eliminate reference to a section which was previously eliminated.

Date of issuance: January 11, 1996
Effective date: As of date of issuance.
Amendments Nos.: 212 and 217
Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 5, 1995 (60 FR 62271) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 11, 1996 No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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.

PECO Energy Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: December 19, 1995

Brief description of amendments: These amendments change the ventilation filter test program bypass and penetration leakage test acceptance criteria from less than 0.05 percent to less than 1.0 percent. The change corrects an administrative error that occurred during the development of the Peach Bottom Improved Technical Specifications which were issued as Amendments 210 and 214 to the Peach Bottom licenses on August 30, 1995.

Date of issuance: January 16, 1996
Effective date: Unit 2, effective as of date of issuance, to be implemented concurrently with Amendment 210, issued August 30, 1995; Unit 3, effective as of date of issuance, to be implemented concurrently with Amendment 214, issued August 30, 1995.

Amendments Nos.: 213 and 218
Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes (60 FR 66997, December 27, 1995). That notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed no significant hazards

consideration determination. No comments have been received. The notice also provided for an opportunity to request a hearing by January 26, 1996, but indicated that if the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments, finding of exigent circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 16, 1996

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.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Steven A. Varga,

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

[Doc. 96-1683 Filed 1-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

Draft Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued for public comment a draft of a guide planned for its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

The draft guide is a proposed Revision 1 to Regulatory Guide 5.15, and it is temporarily identified as DG-5005, "Tamper-Indicating Seals for the Protection and Control of Special Nuclear Material." The guide will be in Division 5, "Materials and Plant Protection." This regulatory guide is being revised to describe features of security seal systems and types of seals that are acceptable to the NRC staff for tamper-safing containers of special nuclear material.

This draft guide is being issued to involve the public in the early stages of the development of a regulatory position in this area. It has not received complete staff review and does not represent an official NRC staff position.

Public comments are being solicited on the guide. Comments should be

accompanied by supporting data. Written comments may be submitted 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. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Comments will be most helpful if received by April 12, 1996.

Although a time limit is given for comments on this draft guide, comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time.

Comments may be submitted electronically, in either ASCII text or Wordperfect format (version 5.1 or later), by calling the NRC Electronic Bulletin Board on FedWorld. The bulletin board may be accessed using a personal computer, a modem, and one of the commonly available communications software packages, or directly via Internet.

If using a personal computer and modem, the NRC subsystem on FedWorld can be accessed directly by dialing the toll free number: 1-800-303-9672. Communication software parameters should be set as follows: parity to none, data bits to 8, and stop bits to 1 (N,8,1). Using ANSI or VT-100 terminal emulation, the NRC NUREGs and RegGuides for Comment subsystem can then be accessed by selecting the "Rules Menu" option from the "NRC Main Menu." For further information about options available for NRC at FedWorld, consult the "Help/Information Center" from the "NRC Main Menu." Users will find the "FedWorld Online User's Guides" particularly helpful. Many NRC subsystems and data bases also have a "Help/Information Center" option that is tailored to the particular subsystem.

The NRC subsystem on FedWorld can also be accessed by a direct dial phone number for the main FedWorld BBS, 703-321-3339, or by using Telnet via Internet, fedworld.gov. If using 703-321-3339 to contact FedWorld, the NRC subsystem will be accessed from the main FedWorld menu by selecting the "Regulatory, Government Administration and State Systems," then selecting "Regulatory Information Mall." At that point, a menu will be displayed that has an option "U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission" that will take you to the NRC Online main menu. The NRC Online area also can be accessed directly by typing "/go nrc" at a FedWorld command line. If you access

NRC from FedWorld's main menu, you may return to FedWorld by selecting the "Return to FedWorld" option from the NRC Online Main Menu. However, if you access NRC at FedWorld by using NRC's toll-free number, you will have full access to all NRC systems but you will not have access to the main FedWorld system.

If you contact FedWorld using Telnet, you will see the NRC area and menus, including the Rules menu. Although you will be able to download documents and leave messages, you will not be able to write comments or upload files (comments). If you contact FedWorld using FTP, all files can be accessed and downloaded but uploads are not allowed; all you will see is a list of files without descriptions (normal Gopher look). An index file listing all files within a subdirectory, with descriptions, is included. There is a 15-minute time limit for FTP access.

Although FedWorld can be accessed through the World Wide Web, like FTP that mode only provides access for downloading files and does not display the NRC Rules menu.

For more information on NRC bulletin boards call Mr. Arthur Davis, Systems Integration and Development Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone (301)415-5780; e-mail AXD3@nrc.gov. For more information on this draft regulatory guide, contact S.D. Frattali at the NRC, telephone (301)415-6261; e-mail SDF@nrc.gov.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Requests for single copies of draft or final guides (which may be reproduced) or for placement on an automatic distribution list for single copies of future draft guides in specific divisions should be made in writing to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Distribution and Mail Services Section; or by fax at (301)415-2260. Telephone requests cannot be accommodated. Regulatory guides are not copyrighted, and Commission approval is not required to reproduce them.

(5 U.S.C. 552(a))

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of January 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank A. Costanzi,

Deputy Director, Division of Regulatory Applications, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 96-1878 Filed 1-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F