

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 the amendment is issued before the expiration of the 30-day hearing period, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. If a hearing is requested, 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 William D. Bateman, Director, Project Directorate IV-2: 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 Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the 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 dated March 8, 1996, 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 rooms, located at the Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and the Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
James C. Stone,  
*Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 96-6113 Filed 3-11-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 40-3453]

#### Atlas Corporation

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** On January 30, 1996, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published a notice of availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and a Draft Technical Evaluation Report regarding the proposed reclamation by Atlas Corporation of an existing uranium mill tailings pile near Moab, Utah. The comment period for these documents was 60 days from the date of the notice. The NRC has received requests to extend the comment period, based on the complexity of the documents and delays in their receipt. After review, the NRC has determined that it would be appropriate to extend the comment period 30 days. Therefore, the comment period will be extended to April 29, 1996. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practical. Comments on either document should be sent to Chief, Uranium Recovery Branch, Mail Stop TWFN 7-J9, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Myron Fliegel, Uranium Recovery Branch, Mail Stop TWFN 7-J9, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone: (301) 415-6629.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of March 1996.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Joseph J. Holonich,  
*Chief, Uranium Recovery Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 96-5991 Filed 3-12-96; 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 February 16, 1996, through March 1, 1996. The last biweekly notice was published on February 28, 1996 (61 FR 7542).

**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 April 12, 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.

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 16, 1994, as supplemented on January 31, 1996.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the technical specifications to eliminate periodic response time testing requirements for selected pressure and differential pressure sensors in the reactor trip system and engineered safety features actuation instrumentation channels.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 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.

This change to the Technical Specifications does not result in a condition where the design, material, and construction standards that were applicable prior to the change are altered. The same RTS and ESFAS instrumentation is being used; the time response allocations/modeling assumptions in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), Chapter 15, Accident Analyses, are still the same; only the method of verifying time response is changed. The proposed change will not modify any system interface and could not increase the likelihood of an accident since these events are independent of this change. The proposed activity will not change, degrade or prevent actions or alter any assumptions previously made in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident described in the UFSAR. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not result in any 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.

This change does not alter the performance of the identified pressure and differential pressure transmitters and switches used in the plant protection systems. All sensors will still have response time verified by test before placing the sensor in operational

service, and after any maintenance that could affect response time. Changing the method of periodically verifying instrument response for these sensors (assuring equipment operability) from time response testing to calibration and channel checks does not result in any design, installation, or operational changes and thus will not create any new accident initiators or scenarios. Periodic surveillance of these instruments will detect significant degradation in the sensor response characteristics. Implementation of the proposed amendment 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.

This change does not affect the total system response time assumed in the safety analyses. The periodic system response time verification method for the identified pressure and differential pressure sensors and switches is modified to allow use of (1) historical records based on acceptable response time tests (hydraulic, noise, or power interrupt tests), (2) in-place, onsite or offsite (e.g. vendor) test measurements, or (3) using vendor engineering specifications.

The method of verification still provides assurance that the total system response is within that defined in the safety analyses, since calibration tests will detect any degradation which might significantly affect sensor response time. Based on the above, it is concluded that the proposed license amendment request does not result in a reduction in margin with respect to plant 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 requested amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

*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.

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

*NRC Project Director:* Robert A. Capra  
Duquesne Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50-334, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

*Date of amendment request:* February 12, 1996

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 4.6.2.2.d to delete the reference to the specific test acceptance criteria for the Containment Recirculation Spray Pumps and replace the specific test acceptance criteria with

reference to the requirements of the Inservice Testing (IST) Program. In addition, the 18-month test frequency would be replaced with the test frequency requirements specified in the IST Program. The proposed amendment would make this TS the same as Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 2 TS 4.6.2.2.d which was revised by License Amendment No. 68 on May 3, 1995.

The proposed amendment would also revise the Bases of TS 4.6.2.2.d for both Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to describe the proposed revision to TS 4.6.2.2.d.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 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 change does not result in a modification to plant equipment nor does it affect the manner in which the plant is operated. The Recirculation Spray System (RSS) pumps are normally in a standby condition and only operate during accident mitigation. Since the physical plant equipment and operating practices are not changed, as noted above, there is no change in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change, for Beaver Valley Power Station (BVPS) Unit No. 1 only, will not lower the pump performance operability criteria for the RSS pumps. The required values for developed pump head and flow will continue to satisfy accident mitigation requirements and will be maintained and controlled in the BVPS Unit No. 1 Inservice Testing (IST) Program.

Since the proposed change does not lower the RSS pump performance acceptance criteria, the containment depressurization system will continue to meet its design basis requirements. The proposed change will not impose additional challenges to the containment structure in terms of peak pressure. The calculated offsite dose consequences of a design basis accident (DBA) will remain unchanged since the one hour release duration remains unchanged. Future changes to the RSS pump head and flow requirements will be made under the 10 CFR 50.59 process to ensure that the containment performance requirements continue to be met.

The proposed change in the RSS pump surveillance interval from 18 months to every refueling, will not affect the ability of the pumps to perform as assumed in the Safety Analyses. The proposed change to the Bases section, for BVPS Unit Nos. 1 and 2, will ensure that safety analyses assumptions for assumed pump performance continue to be met. The words "required developed head" will be clearly defined to reflect that they refer to the value assumed in the safety analysis for the recirculation spray pump's developed head at a specific point. The proposed changes to the Index pages are administrative in nature and do not affect

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

Based on the above discussion, it is concluded that this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change does not alter the method of operating the plant. The recirculation spray system is an accident mitigation system and is normally in standby. System operation would be initiated following a containment pressure increase resulting from a DBA. The RSS pumps will continue to provide sufficient flow to mitigate the consequences of a DBA. RSS operation continues to fulfill the safety function for which it was designed and no changes to plant equipment will occur. As a result, an accident which is new or different than any already evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report will not be created due to this change.

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

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

The surveillance requirements for demonstrating that the RSS pumps are operable will continue to assure the ability of the system to satisfy its design function. Therefore, the proposed change will not affect the ability of the RSS to perform its safety function.

The containment spray system design requirement to restore the containment to subatmospheric condition within one hour will continue to be satisfied. This proposed change does not have any effect on the containment peak pressure since the containment peak pressure occurs prior to the initiation of any of the two containment spray systems. There is no resultant change in dose consequences since the containment will continue to reach a subatmospheric pressure within the first hour following a DBA.

The RSS pumps' performance requirements will continue to be controlled in a manner to ensure safety analysis assumptions are met.

Therefore, based on the above discussion, it can be concluded that 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 location:* B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 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:* November 30, 1995

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would implement the Option I-D long-term stability solution and remove the existing SIL-380 Rev. 1-based specifications. In addition, the proposed change would require a plant scram be initiated should the plant enter natural circulation conditions and would prohibit restarting a recirculation pump while in natural circulation. The proposed change would define natural circulation. Finally, this change would delete Technical Specification (TS) actions and surveillance requirements related to core plate differential pressure noise while in single recirculation pump operation (SLO).

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

1) The proposed license amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The implementation of the [boiling water reactor] BWR Owner's Group long term solution Option I-D does not modify the assumptions in the existing accident analysis. The use of an exclusion region and the operator actions required to avoid and minimize operation inside the region do not increase the possibility of an accident. Licensing Topical Report, 'Evaluation of the "Regional Exclusion with Flow-Biased APRM [average power range monitor] Neutron Flux Scram" Stability Solution', GENE-A000-04021-01 (attachment 1) demonstrates that the APRM flow-biased scram function provides a high degree of assurance that the fuel safety limit will not be exceeded should power oscillations occur during plant operation within the restricted region. Regional mode core oscillations are not predicted to occur at the [Duane Arnold Energy Center] DAEC because of its small core size and tight core inlet orifices. Conditions for operation outside of the exclusion region are within the assumptions of the existing accident analysis. The operator action requirement to exit the exclusion region upon entry minimizes the probability of an instability event occurring. Inserting control rods or increasing recirculation flow, the evolutions to be used to exit the region, are normal plant maneuvers.

The proposed clarifications to explicitly direct the operator to initiate a reactor scram

in the event of operation in natural circulation are conservative and consistent with current plant operating practices. Likewise, the proposed prohibition from starting a recirculation pump as a means of exiting the natural circulation mode of operation is also conservative. Therefore, the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The core plate differential pressure noise surveillances that are performed while in single recirculation pump operation were included in TS Amendment 1119 due to NRC concerns at the time that high core plate noise observed during [single-loop operation] SLO at Brown's Ferry in 1985 could be an indication of thermal hydraulic instability. [General Electric] GE has since determined that core plate differential pressure noise is not a cause of thermal hydraulic instability and that the noise does not pose a safety concern. Therefore, the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2) The proposed license amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. As stated above, the proposed changes either mandate operation within the envelope of previously analyzed plant operating conditions or direct the operator to immediately return the plant to within these analyzed conditions using normal plant maneuvers. In addition, analysis has demonstrated that the APRM flow-biased scram function provides a high degree of assurance that the fuel safety limit will not be exceeded should power oscillations occur during plant operation within the restricted region. Therefore, the potential for a new or different type of accident from those previously evaluated is not created.

The proposed clarifications to explicitly direct the operator to initiate a reactor scram in the event of operation in natural circulation are conservative and consistent with current plant operating practices. Likewise, the proposed prohibition from starting a recirculation pump as a means of exiting the natural circulation mode of operation is also conservative. Therefore, the potential for a new or different type of accident from those previously evaluated is not created.

The core plate differential pressure noise surveillances that are performed while in single recirculation pump operation were included in TS Amendment 1119 due to NRC concerns at the time that high core plate noise observed during SLO at Brown's Ferry in 1985 could be an indication of thermal hydraulic instability. GE has since determined that core plate differential pressure noise is not a cause of thermal hydraulic instability and that the noise does not pose a safety concern. Therefore, the potential for a new or different type of accident from those previously evaluated is not created.

3) The proposed amendment will not reduce the margin of safety. The combination of the proposed requirements to avoid possible unstable conditions and the

automatic flow biased high reactor flux scram provide defense in depth to provide fuel protection. Therefore the individual or combination of means to detect and suppress thermal hydraulic instability supplements the margin of safety.

The proposed specification related to initiating a reactor scram while in natural circulation is conservative. Likewise, the proposed prohibition from starting a recirculation pump as a means of exiting the natural circulation mode of operation is also conservative and therefore does not constitute a reduction in the margin of safety.

The core plate differential pressure noise surveillances that are performed while in single recirculation pump operation were included in TS Amendment 1119 due to NRC concerns at the time that high core plate noise observed during SLO at Brown's Ferry in 1985 could be an indication of thermal hydraulic instability. GE has since determined that core plate differential pressure noise is not a cause of thermal hydraulic instability and that the noise does not pose a safety concern. Therefore, the elimination of these surveillance tests does not constitute a 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:* 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  
Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska

*Date of amendment request:*  
November 16, 1995

*Description of amendment request:*  
The proposed amendment would revise the technical specifications (TS) to add a Limiting Condition for Operation and surveillance test for safety related inverters and deletes requirements for non-safety related instrument buses.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

*As required by 10 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 will delete requirements from the Technical

Specifications (TS) for non-safety related 120 Volt a-c instrument panels AI-42A and AI-42B, and incorporate new requirements for the safety-related 125 Volt d-c to 120 Volt a-c inverters (A, B, C, and D) similar to the Standard Technical Specification for Combustion Engineering plants as contained in NUREG-1432.

TS 2.7 requires that 120 Volt instrument panels AI-42A and AI-42B be operable whenever the reactor coolant temperature is above 300 —F. Either of these instrument panels may be inoperable for up to 8 hours or a plant shutdown is required. These instrument panels are non-safety related and do not receive or actuate any Engineered Safeguards Features (ESF) or Reactor Protection System (RPS) and the panels are not required for, nor do they indicate the status of, containment integrity. The FCS plant specific Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) model was reviewed to determine the effect of unavailability of these instrument panels on the core damage frequency. The results of the review show that the unavailability of these panels is not a contributor to risk. Therefore these instrument panels do not meet any of the four criteria contained in 10 CFR 50.36 for inclusion into TS. The operation of these panels are controlled by plant procedures that are governed by 10 CFR 50.59.

Therefore, deletion of the requirements for AI-42A and AI-42B from the TS would not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

It is also proposed to incorporate new requirements for the safety-related 125 Volt d-c to 120 Volt a-c inverters (A, B, C, and D). Currently, there are no TS requirements for inoperability of the safety-related inverters. However, if an inverter is inoperable and its associated 120 Volt a-c instrument bus is powered by its safety-related bypass transformer, the a-c instrument bus is considered inoperable and an 8 hour Limiting Condition for Operation is applied. The bus is declared inoperable even though it is being powered from a safety related power source because this source is not an uninterruptible power supply. Operating experience has shown that, in many instances, 8 hours is insufficient time to troubleshoot and conduct repairs on an inverter. FCS initiated a TS required plant shutdown in November 1994, and again in January 1995, due to inoperable inverters that could not be repaired in the 8 hours allowed by TS. If FCS had 24 hours to conduct repairs, a power reduction, and the potential to challenge plant systems, would not have been necessary.

The proposed change does not increase the probability of an accident since loss of power to a vital bus is not an initiator of any analyzed accident. The proposed change does not increase the consequences of any accident since the TS currently allow one 120 V instrument bus to be inoperable and de-energized. The proposed change would only allow one 120 V instrument bus to be energized from a safety related bypass source. The proposed changes do not reduce the number of RPS or ESF actuation channels that are required to be operable. Should a

loss of offsite power event occur, power to the instrument bus would only be interrupted during the time required for the emergency diesel generator to start and load.

The FCS plant specific PRA model was reviewed to determine the effect of unavailability of the 120 V instrument panels supplied by inserters A, B, C, and D on the core damage frequency. The results of the review show that the loss of one of the panels has an insignificant effect on the PRA model. Therefore, the proposed change of allowing a 24 hour period with one instrument panel powered from an interruptible power supply has a insignificant effect on the PRA results.

Therefore, the proposed change to include specific operability requirements for safety related inverters does not significantly increase 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.

There will be no physical alterations to the plant configuration, changes to setpoint values, or changes to the implementation of setpoints or limits as a result of these proposed changes. The proposed changes do not reduce the number of RPS or ESF actuation channels that are required to be operable. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes delete TS requirements for nonsafety related instrument panels and incorporate additional operability requirements for safety related inverters. The proposed changes do not revise any setpoints or limits monitored by the instrument panels or buses. In addition, a review of the FCS plant specific PRA shows that these proposed changes are insignificant to core damage frequency. 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 location:* W. Dale Clark Library, 215 South 15th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102

*Attorney for licensee:* Perry D. Robinson, Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005-3502

*NRC Project Director:* William H. Bateman

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 1, 1996

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise

the Technical Specifications (TS) to allow an increase in the initial nominal enrichment limit of fuel assemblies to be stored in the spent fuel pool.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

*As required by 10 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 change to the Technical Specifications to increase the enrichment limit for fuel assembly storage requirements does not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident. The enrichment limit is not a precursor to any analyzed event and therefore cannot impact probability.

The safety evaluation for the existing Spent Fuel Pool (SFP) storage racks was approved by the NRC in Amendment 155 (TAC M85116). This amendment approved the current limit on fuel enrichment, and the mechanical, structural, and thermal/hydraulic design of the fuel racks. This amendment also evaluated the radiological consequences of a fuel handling accident with fuel enrichments equivalent to the proposed change. The proposed change will not impact this previously approved evaluation with the exception of the nuclear criticality analysis. The nuclear criticality analysis supporting the proposed change used calculational methods conforming to NRC guidance, industry codes, standards, and specifications. In meeting the acceptance criteria for criticality in the SFP, such that  $k_{eff}$  is always less than or equal to 0.95 at a 95%/95% probability tolerance level, the proposed change from 4.2 weight percent (w/o) to 4.5 w/o Uranium-235 ( $U^{235}$ ) does not involve an increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed change to increase the enrichment limit for fuel storage 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 proposed change was evaluated in accordance with the guidance of the NRC Position Paper entitled, "OT Position for Review and Acceptance of Spent Fuel Storage and Handling Applications", appropriate sections of the NRC Standard Review Plan, Regulatory Guides, industry codes, and standards. In addition, the NRC Safety Evaluation Report for Amendment 155 was also reviewed with respect to the proposed change.

No new or different mode of operation is proposed. No unproven technology was utilized in the analytical techniques necessary to justify the planned fuel storage change. The analytical techniques used have been developed and used in over 15 applications previously approved by the

NRC. Based upon the reviews, it is concluded that the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different type accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The only margin of safety potentially impacted by the proposed change is related to nuclear criticality considerations. The established acceptance criterion for criticality is that the neutron multiplication factor in spent fuel pools shall be less than or equal to 0.95, including all uncertainties, under all conditions. This margin of safety has been adhered to in the criticality analysis methods for the proposed change. 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 location:* W. Dale Clark Library, 215 South 15th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102

*Attorney for licensee:* Perry D. Robinson, Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005-3502

*NRC Project Director:* William H. Bateman

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

*Date of application for amendments:* December 21, 1995

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would modify the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station (PBAPS), Units 2 and 3 Facility Operating Licenses (FOLs) to provide for elimination of outdated or superseded material regarding, among other things, environmental monitoring and modifications to the low pressure coolant injection system, and for making the FOL of Unit 2 consistent with the FOL of Unit 3.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

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

The changes proposed in the Application do not constitute a Significant Hazards Consideration in that:

i) The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or

consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the changes are purely administrative and do not involve any physical changes to plant SSC [structures, systems, and components]. Therefore, these changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

ii) The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the changes will not alter the plant or the manner in which the plant is operated. The changes do not allow plant operation in any mode that is not already evaluated in the safety analysis. The changes will not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis and licensing bases. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

iii) The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because they are purely administrative and have no impact on any safety analysis assumptions.

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:* Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

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

*NRC Project Director:* John F. Stolz

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

*Date of amendment request:* January 11, 1996

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment adds a new action statement to Section 3.8.3.1. of the Technical Specifications which precludes the need for entry into Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.0.3 to allow the performance of certain Emergency Diesel Generator testing.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 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:

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

The proposed change to allow 8 hours to perform Emergency Diesel Generator testing and eliminate the need to enter LCO 3.0.3 to perform this testing does not increase the chances for a previously analyzed accident to occur. The 8 hour time limit before requiring a unit shutdown balances the benefit of performing the required test with the low probability of a LOCA/LOOP [loss-of-coolant accident/loss of offsite power] while being in the degraded condition for the duration of the test. To ensure that this risk is minimized, a significant amount of precautions are taken prior to test initiation. The governing surveillance procedures have a very restrictive list of test prerequisites and limitations, which ensure the availability of remaining ac [alternating current] electrical power distribution systems and reduce the potential for any single failure. The allowance of 8 hours to complete the required test prior to initiating shutdown actions ensures operator attention is focused on minimizing the potential loss of power to the remaining division, and restoring power to the effected division upon test completion; thus, not redirecting operator attention towards a plant shutdown per 3.0.3. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Inhibiting the ESS [electronic switching system] Buses in Unit 1 requires that an LCO be entered in Unit 2 due to the common loads shared between the Units. However, performance of the LOCA/LOOP or LOOP surveillance procedures does not cause any diesel generator to become inoperable as a result of inhibiting an ESS Bus. The time frame the diesels are fully loaded in the testing evolution is for a five-minute period to fulfill a Technical Specification requirement. If at that precise moment a LOCA/LOOP occurs in the operating unit, the ESS Buses in Unit 1 and 2 will de-energize except for the ESS Buses that are already connected to the diesels. In the first few minutes of a postulated LOCA/LOOP occurring in the operating Unit while performing a LOCA/LOOP test, the operator would have to take immediate action to shed non-essential loads from the diesels in the Unit under test to prepare the diesels for the shutdown loads via the load sequence timers in the operating unit. Existing emergency procedures require that these actions will be taken. Therefore, the incorporation of this change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

With one or more required ac buses, (two load groups) de-energized, the remaining ac electrical power distribution subsystems are capable of supporting the minimum safety functions necessary to shutdown the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition, assuming no single failure. The overall reliability is reduced, however, because a single failure in the remaining power distribution subsystems could result in the

minimum required ESF [engineered safety feature] functions not being supported. Therefore, the required ac buses must be restored to OPERABLE status within a relatively short period of time. Eight hours has been accepted by the NRC as documented in NUREG-1433, Revision 1, "Standard Technical Specifications." Therefore, the incorporation of this change will not involve a significant reduction in the margin to 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:* Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701

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

*NRC Project Director:* John F. Stolz

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 5, 1996

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (DBNPS) Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.3.2.1 - Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation and its associated Bases. The revision changes the following items in the Sequence Logic Channels portion of Table 3.3-3: Functional Unit 4.a, Sequencer; Functional Unit 4.b, Essential Bus Feeder Breaker Trip (90%); Functional Unit 4.c, Diesel Generator Start, Load Shed on Essential Bus (59%); and the associated Bases, to clarify the design and actuation logic and to specify actions to take if instrumentation channels become inoperable.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

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

Toledo Edison has reviewed the proposed changes and determined that a significant hazards consideration does not exist because operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1 in accordance with these changes would:

1a. Not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously

evaluated because the proposed change to accurately reflect the design and actuation logic of the sequencers and essential bus undervoltage relays, and provide TS actions for two inoperable functional units does not make a change to any accident initiator, initiating condition or assumption. The accident previously evaluated in the DBNPS Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) Section 15.2.9, Loss of All AC Power to the Station Auxiliaries (Station Blackout), is not affected by this proposed change. The proposed action statements maintain the USAR requirement for starting and loading of one [emergency diesel generator] EDG to meet the minimum [engineered safety features] ESF requirements. The proposed change accurately reflects the plant design, therefore, the change does not involve a significant change to the plant design or operation.

1b. Not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes do not invalidate assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident, do not alter the source term or containment isolation and do not provide a new radiation release path or alter potential radiological releases.

2. Not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes do not introduce a new or different accident initiator or introduce a new or different equipment failure mode or mechanism.

3. Not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed changes do not reduce the margin to safety which exists in the present TS or USAR. The proposed changes permit continued operation with one unit of the sequencer, 59% or 90% undervoltage protection inoperable provided the unit is placed in the tripped condition which is consistent with the current TS. With two units of the same function inoperable the associated EDG is declared inoperable and the requirements of the TS for an inoperable EDG entered, including verification that the requirements of TS 3.0.5 are met to assure that the minimum ESF requirement is met. The operability requirements of the proposed TS are consistent with the initial condition assumptions of the safety analyses.

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 Toledo, William Carlson Library, Government Documents Collection, 2801 West Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606

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

*NRC Project Director:* Gail H. Marcus

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 5, 1996

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would correct typographical errors, textual inconsistencies, and minor errors. In addition, equipment identification numbers would be added to the tables.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

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

1. The administrative changes proposed herein will have no effect on plant hardware, plant design, safety limit setting, or plant system operation and therefore do not modify or add any initiating parameters that would significantly increase the probability or consequences of any previously analyzed accident.

2. These changes do not affect any equipment nor do they involve any potential initiating events that would create any new or different kind of accident. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. These changes do not affect any equipment involved in potential initiating events or safety limits. Therefore, it is concluded that 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 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:* Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, VT 05301

*Attorney for licensee:* R. K. Gad, III, Ropes and Gray, One International Place, Boston, MA 02110-2624

*NRC Project Director:* Ledyard B. Marsh

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 8, 1996

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments will modify Technical Specification Section 15.3.10, "Control Rod and Power Distribution Limits," and Section 15.4.1, "Operational Safety Review." Changes

and additions are proposed to clarify the specifications and to more closely conform to current staff guidance.

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

1. Operation of this facility under the proposed Technical Specifications change will not create a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The probabilities of accidents previously evaluated are based on the probability of initiating events for these accidents. Initiating events for accidents previously evaluated for Point Beach include: control rod withdrawal and drop, CVCS [chemical and volume control system] malfunction (boron dilution), startup of an inactive reactor coolant loop, reduction in feedwater enthalpy, excessive load increase, losses of reactor coolant flow, loss of external electrical load, loss of normal feedwater, loss of all AC power to the auxiliaries, turbine overspeed, fuel handling accidents, accidental releases of waste liquid or gas, steam generator tube rupture, steam pipe rupture, control rod ejection, and primary coolant system ruptures.

The consequences of the accidents previously evaluated in the PBNP [Point Beach Nuclear Plant] FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] are determined by the results of analyses that are based on initial conditions of the plant, the type of accident, transient response of the plant, and the operation and failure of equipment and systems.

This change request proposes to improve the clarity of the requirements concerning shutdown margin, rod group alignment limits, rod position indication, bank insertion limits, power distribution limits, at-power physics tests exceptions, and low power physics tests exceptions. The proposed changes do not affect the probability of any accident initiating event, because these Technical Specification requirements do not control any factors that could be accident initiators. These Technical Specifications establish the requirements that provide the limitations on the initial conditions, transient response of the plant, and operation and failure of equipment and systems. The proposed changes establish the appropriate limiting conditions for operation, action statements, and allowable outage times that will continue to ensure that the results of the accident analyses are not changed. Additionally, there is no physical change to the facility or its systems. Therefore, the probability and consequences of any accident previously evaluated is not increased.

2. Operation of this facility under the proposed Technical Specifications change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

New or different kinds of accidents can only be created by new or different accident initiators or sequences. This change request proposes to improve the clarity of the



Technical Specifications requirements contained in Technical Specification Section 15.3.10. The proposed specifications will clarify the existing Technical Specifications where identified by rewording, supplementing, or replacing existing requirements. There is no physical change to the facility or its systems. Therefore, a new or different kind of accident cannot occur, because no factors have been introduced that could create a new or different accident initiator.

3. Operation of this facility under the proposed Technical Specifications change will not create a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The margins of safety for Point Beach are based on the design and operation of the reactor and containment and the safety systems that provide their protection.

This change request proposes to improve the clarity of the Technical Specifications requirements contained in Technical Specification Section 15.3.10. The proposed specifications will clarify the existing Technical Specifications where identified by rewording, supplementing, or replacing existing requirements. There is no physical change to the facility or its systems. Section 15.3.10 of the Technical Specifications provides the requirements that limit the operation of the reactor and establish the operability requirements for reactivity control by the control rod system. The proposed Technical Specifications changes continue to provide the appropriate limiting conditions for operation, action statements, and allowable outage times that ensure the applicable margins of safety to protect the reactor are preserved. Therefore, no reduction in any margin of safety has been introduced.

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:* Joseph P. Mann Library, 1516 Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

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

*NRC Project Director:* Gail H. Marcus

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 cited period of the original notice.

Carolina Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

*Date of application for amendments:* February 16, 1996

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments provide a one-time surveillance requirement extension for the performance of the trip actuating device operational test for one of the safety injection manual initiation switches.

*Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register:* February 26, 1996 (61 FR 7125)

*Expiration date of individual notice:* March 27, 1996

*Local Public Document Room location:* Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605.

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 19, 1995, as supplemented by letter dated February 9, 1996.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments allow the implementation of the recently approved Option B to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B, by referring to Regulatory Guide 1.163, "Performance Based Containment Leakage - Test Program." This new rule allows a performance-based option for determining the test frequency for containment leakage rate testing. The amendment would modify Technical Specifications (TS) 1.7, 3/4.6.1.1, 3/4.6.1.2, 3/4.6.1.3, and 3/4.6.3, and the Bases of TS 3/4.6.1.2, and would add a new TS 6.16.

*Date of issuance:* February 23, 1996  
*Effective date:* February 23, 1996, to be implemented within 15 days of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 1 - Amendment No. 103; Unit 2 - Amendment No. 92; Unit 3 - Amendment No. 75.

*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 22, 1996 (61 FR 1627) The February 9, 1996, supplemental letter provided clarifying information and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 23, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Docket No. 50-317, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, Calvert County, Maryland

*Date of application for amendment:* December 21, 1995

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment allows the use of cladding material other than Zircaloy or ZIRLO. The Safety Evaluation addresses the safety significance of loading four (4) lead fuel assemblies (LFAs) into the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1, reactor vessel during cycles 13, 14, and 15. A Temporary Exemption was issued on November 28, 1995, (60 FR 62483) approving the loading of the 4 LFAs into the Unit 1 reactor vessel for the cycles noted above. The technical basis for the Temporary Exemption, which is the same basis for the requested TS amendment, was provided in the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company submittal dated July 13, 1995.

*Date of issuance:* February 21, 1996

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

*Amendment No.:* 211

*Facility Operating License No.* DPR-53: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 22, 1996 (61 FR 1627) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 21, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* June 8, 1995

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.8.1 by (1) replacing Table 4.8-1, "Diesel Generator Test Schedule," with a single surveillance interval of at least once per 31 days, and (2) deleting TS 4.8.1.1.3, "Reports." The amendments also revise ACTION statements and surveillances in TS 3.8.1.1 related to certain diesel generator testing and startup requirements. *Date of issuance:* February 16, 1996 *Effective date:* Immediately, to be implemented within 90 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 79 and 71

*Facility Operating License Nos.* NPF-37, NPF-66, NPF-72 and NPF-77: The

amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 30, 1995 (60 FR 45176) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 16, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

*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. 50-373 and 50-374, LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, LaSalle County, Illinois

*Date of application for amendments:* June 8, 1995

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.8.1 by (1) replacing Table 4.8.1.1.2-1, "Diesel Generator Test Schedule," with a single surveillance interval of at least once per 31 days, and (2) deleting TS 4.8.1.1.3, "Reports." The amendments also revise ACTION statements and surveillances in TS 3.8.1.1 related to certain diesel generator testing and startup requirements.

*Date of issuance:* February 16, 1996

*Effective date:* Immediately, to be implemented within 90 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 109 and 94

*Facility Operating License Nos.* NPF-11 and NPF-18: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 30, 1995 (60 FR 45176) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 16, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Jacobs Memorial Library, Illinois alley Community College, Ogleby, Illinois 61348.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* November 3, 1995

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment allows deferral of the Reactor Coolant Pump flywheel inspection until outage 11, scheduled for the spring of 1998.

*Date of issuance:* February 15, 1996

*Effective date:* February 15, 1996

*Amendment No.:* 153

*Facility Operating License No.* DPR-72: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 20, 1995 (60 FR 65679) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 15, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Coastal Region Library, 8619 W. Crystal Street, Crystal River, Florida 32629

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

*Date of application for amendments:* May 5, 1995, as supplemented by letter dated September 28, 1995

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) relating to implementation of a revised thermal design procedure and steam generator water level low-low setpoint

*Date of issuance:* February 20, 1996

*Effective date:* February 20, 1996

*Amendment Nos.:* 183 and 177 Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-31 and DPR-41: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 25, 1995 (60 FR 54719) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 20, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Florida International University, University Park, Miami, Florida 33199.

Houston Lighting & Power Company, City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company, City of Austin, Texas, Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499, South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, Matagorda County, Texas

*Date of amendment request:* May 22, 1995, as supplemented by letter dated October 9, 1995.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised Technical Specification 4.8.1.1.2.e.7 to allow the performance of the 24-hour surveillance test of the diesel generators during power operation. *Date of issuance:* February 21, 1996 *Effective date:* February 21, 1996, to be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 1 - Amendment No. 81; Unit 2 - Amendment No. 70

*Facility Operating License Nos.* NPF-76 and NPF-80. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37091) The October 9, 1995, supplement 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 February 21, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

*Local Public Document Room location:* Wharton County Junior College, J. M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, TX 77488

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:* October 27, 1995

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) 3.1.3, "Control Rod OPERABILITY," to include the 25% surveillance overrun allowed by Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.0.2 into the allowances of the surveillance Notes for control rod "notch" testing per Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.1.3.2 and SR 3.1.3.3. The amendment also includes a clarification to the description of TS Table 3.3.3.1-1, "Post Accident Monitoring Instrumentation," Function 7, to indicate that the Function's requirements apply to the position indication for only automatic primary containment isolation valves, rather than all primary containment isolation valves. Finally, the amendment includes changes to correct a number of editorial and typographical errors inadvertently contained in TS 3.3.4.1, "End of Cycle Recirculation Pump Trip (EOC-RPT) Instrumentation," TS 3.3.6.1, "Primary Containment and Drywell Isolation Instrumentation," TS 3.3.8.2, "Reactor Protection System (RPS) Electric Power Monitoring," and TS 3.6.5.2, "Drywell Air Lock."

*Date of issuance:* February 29, 1996

*Effective date:* February 29, 1996

*Amendment No.:* 102

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 20, 1995 (60 FR 65680) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is

contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 29, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* August 30, 1995, as supplemented by letter dated January 15, 1996.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises Technical Specification 1.3, "Reactor", to (1) allow the use of fuel rods clad with Zircaloy or ZIRLO, rather than restrict use to fuel rods clad with Zircaloy-4, and (2) replace the specified enrichment limit with a limitation similar to that found in NUREG-1432, "Standard Technical Specifications for Combustion Engineering Plants."

*Date of issuance:* February 29, 1996

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance, to be implemented concurrent with Amendment No. 144.

*Amendment No.:* 155

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 11, 1995 (60 FR 52932) The January 15, 1996, submittal provided clarifying information and did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in Safety Evaluation dated February 29, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket Nos. 50-220, and 50-410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Oswego County, New York

*Date of application for amendments:* October 25, 1995, as supplemented February 7, 1996.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise portions of Chapter 6 of the Technical Specifications to reflect management position title and responsibility changes. *Date of issuance:* February 20, 1996

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 157 and 71

*Facility Operating License Nos.* DPR-63 and NPF-69: Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 16, 1995 (60 FR 57605) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 20, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* August 1, 1995

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments revise the Technical Specifications Section 3/4.9.1, "Reactor Mode Switch," in order to provide alternate actions to allow the continuation of core alterations in the event certain Reactor Manual Control System (RMCS) and refueling interlocks are inoperable, while preserving the intended function of the inoperable interlocks.

*Date of issuance:* February 23, 1996

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 114 and 76

*Facility Operating License Nos.* NPF-39 and NPF-85. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* September 27, 1995 (60 FR 49944) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 23, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* October 31, 1994

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment deletes certain valves from Technical Specification Table 3.6.3-1, "Primary Containment Isolation Valves," that no longer need to be tested in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J.

*Date of issuance:* February 22, 1996

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

*Amendment No.:* 93

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* March 29, 1995 (60 FR 16198) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1996. 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:* February 5, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated February 14, 1996.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment changes Technical Specifications 4.6.2.2b, "Suppression Pool Spray," and 4.6.2.3b, "Suppression Pool Cooling," to include flow through the RHR heat exchanger bypass line (in addition to the RHR heat exchanger) in the Suppression Pool Cooling and Suppression Pool Spray flow path used during RHR pump testing.

*Date of issuance:* February 26, 1996

*Effective date:* As of date of issuance, to be implemented within 3 days.

*Amendment No.:* 94

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-57: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications. Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes (61 FR 5040) February 9, 1996. 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 March 11, 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 amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 26, 1996.

*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 28, 1995

*Brief description of amendments:* The changes relocate "Reactor Coolant System - Chemistry" Technical Specification 3/4.4.7 for Salem Unit 1 and 3/4.4.8 for Salem Unit 2 and their associated Bases to the Salem Updated Final Safety Analysis Report and the Surveillance Requirements and Limiting Conditions for Operations to applicable plant procedures controlled by the 10 CFR 50.59 process. Also, the applicability will be changed from "At all times" to "Modes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6."

*Date of issuance:* February 22, 1996

*Effective date:* Units 1 and 2, as of date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days of date of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* 180 and 161

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 8, 1995 (60 FR 56369) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* June 20, 1995, as supplemented on December 19, 1995 and February 7, 1996.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment modifies the technical specification requirements on qualifications for reviewers of facility modifications, programs, and documents affecting nuclear safety and changes the required schedule for reporting changes requested to environmental permits.

*Date of issuance:* February 26, 1996

*Effective date:* February 26, 1996

*Amendment No.:* 124

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-1: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 19, 1995 (60 FR 37099) The Commission's related evaluation of

the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 26, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Central Library, Government Documents, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814

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:* November 20, 1995

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment adds the following footnote to Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.5.2: "The allowable outage time for each RHR train may be extended to 7 days for the purpose of maintenance and modification. This exception may only be used one time per RHR train and is not valid after December 31, 1997."

*Date of issuance:* February 21, 1996

*Effective date:* February 21, 1996

*Amendment No.:* 132

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-12: Amendment revises the TS.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 20, 1995 (60 FR 65684) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 21, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 14, 1992, as supplemented by letter dated December 18, 1995

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments revise TS 3/4.7.5, "Control Room Emergency Air Cleanup System," by reducing the test duration for the control room emergency air cleanup system and deleting requirements for duct heaters and diverting valves. The associated Bases are also revised to reflect these changes.

*Date of issuance:* February 28, 1996

*Effective date:* February 28, 1996, to be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 1 - Amendment No. 128; Unit 2 - Amendment No. 117

*Facility Operating License Nos.* NPF-10 and NPF-15: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* March 3, 1993 (58 FR 12267) The December 18, 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 amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 28, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* December 8, 1995 supplemented January 10, 1996 (TS 364)

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendments implement recent changes to 10 CFR 50 Appendix J for performance-based testing of containment leakage.

*Date of issuance:* February 22, 1996

*Effective Date:* February 22, 1996

*Amendment Nos.:* 228, 243 and 203

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 22, 1996 (61 FR 1637) The letter dated January 10, 1996 provided information that did not change the initial proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: None

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

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:* November 22, 1995

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment added OES Nuclear, Inc. as an owner.

*Date of issuance:* February 27, 1996

*Effective date:* February 27, 1996

*Amendment No.:* 81

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-58: This amendment revised the license.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 20, 1995 (60 FR

65685) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 27, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* December 12, 1995, supplemented by facsimile transmission dated January 26, 1996

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revises TS 3/4.6.1.1, Containment Systems - Primary Containment - Containment Integrity; TS 3/4.6.1.2, Containment Systems - Containment Leakage; TS 3/4.6.1.6, Containment Systems - Containment Vessel Structural Integrity; TS 3/4.6.5.3, Containment Systems - Shield Building Structural Integrity; and associated Bases. The revisions incorporate changes to the TS to adopt the provisions of Appendix J, Option B for Type A containment leakage testing as modified by approved exemptions and in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.163, to provide consistency with these new requirements, and to make administrative changes.

*Date of issuance:* February 22, 1996

*Effective date:* February 22, 1996, and implemented not later than 90 days after issuance.

*Amendment No.:* 205

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-3. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 22, 1996 (61 FR 1637) The January 26, 1996, facsimile transmission was clarifying in nature and did not affect the initial no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo, William Carlson Library, Government Documents Collection, 2801 West Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* June 1, 1995, as supplemented on October 20, 1995, December 13, 1995, and January 26, 1996.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised the allowed outage time for one unavailable emergency diesel generator from 72 hours to 7 days.

*Date of issuance:* February 26, 1996

*Effective date:* February 26, 1996

*Amendment No.:* 206

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-3. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 2, 1995 (60 FR 39453) Supplemental information submitted on October 20, 1995, December 13, 1995, and January 26, 1996, provided clarification only and was not outside the scope of the original no significant hazards determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 26, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* September 29, 1995

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment increases the minimum available borated water volume requirement for the boric acid addition system, the minimum and maximum boron concentration requirements for the borated water storage tank, the minimum boron concentration requirement for the core flood tanks; modifies the surveillance requirements for trisodium phosphate dodecahydrate; and modifies the refueling boron concentration and the associated Action statement.

*Date of issuance:* February 27, 1996

*Effective date:* February 27, 1996

*Amendment No.:* 207

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-3. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 8, 1995 (60 FR

56371) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 27, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* University of Toledo, William Carlson Library, Government Documents Collection, 2801 West Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* November 29, 1994

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise and update the North Anna Units 1 and 2 Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) to reflect current obligations to the Commonwealth of Virginia, revise portions of the transmission corridor rights-of-way erosion control program for clarification and to be consistent with the state regulations, eliminate inconsistencies, and delete obsolete material.

*Date of issuance:* February 20, 1996

*Effective date:* February 20, 1996

*Amendment Nos.:* 197 and 198

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 30, 1995 (60 FR 45188) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 20, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* The Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-2498.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 17, 1995, as supplemented by facsimile dated February 26, 1996.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise the North Anna Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications (TS) to allow both of the containment personnel airlock doors to remain open during refueling operations, delete License Condition 2.G for Unit 1 and 2.I for Unit 2, which reference the analyses for limiting doses to control room operators, and modify the TS Bases to clarify the emergency power system requirements relative to mitigation of

the consequences of a Fuel Handling Accident.

*Date of issuance:* February 27, 1996

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

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 1 - 198; Unit 2 - 179

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 3, 1996 (61 FR 187) The February 26, 1996, facsimile provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the October 17, 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 February 27, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* The Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-2498.

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

*Date of amendment request:* November 22, 1995, as supplemented by letter dated February 8, 1996.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment allows the personnel airlock doors to be open during core alterations and movement of irradiated fuel in containment. The surveillance requirements for containment penetrations have also been revised to require that each be in its "required condition" instead of "closed/isolated condition." The Bases section has been updated.

*Date of issuance:* February 28, 1996

*Effective date:* February 28, 1996, to be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

*Amendment No.:* Amendment No. 95 *Facility Operating License No.* NPF-42. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 20, 1995 (60 FR 65687) The February 8, 1996, supplemental letter provided additional 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 February 28, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*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

Notice Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses And Final Determination Of No Significant Hazards Consideration And Opportunity For A Hearing (Exigent Public Announcement Or Emergency Circumstances)

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

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual 30-day Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing.

For exigent circumstances, the Commission has either issued a Federal Register notice providing opportunity for public comment or has used local media to provide notice to the public in the area surrounding a licensee's facility of the licensee's application and of the Commission's proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration. The Commission has provided a reasonable opportunity for the public to comment, using its best efforts to make available to the public means of communication for the public to respond quickly, and in the case of telephone comments, the comments have been recorded or transcribed as appropriate and the licensee has been informed of the public comments.

In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant or in prevention of either resumption of operation or of increase in power output up to the plant's licensed power level, the Commission may not have had an opportunity to provide for public comment on its no significant hazards

consideration determination. In such case, the license amendment has been issued without opportunity for comment. If there has been some time for public comment but less than 30 days, the Commission may provide an opportunity for public comment. If comments have been requested, it is so stated. In either event, the State has been consulted by telephone whenever possible.

Under its regulations, the Commission may issue and make an amendment immediately effective, notwithstanding the pendency before it of a request for a hearing from any person, in advance of the holding and completion of any required hearing, where it has determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved.

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

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

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

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendment. By April 12, 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 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. Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and 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.

Untimely 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 the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

*Date of application for amendment:* February 26, 1996

*Brief description of amendment:* The proposed amendment revises Technical Specifications (TS) to allow implementation of a proposed plant modification to preclude inadvertent transfer of the turbine-driven auxiliary feedwater pump suction from the condensate storage tank to the emergency raw cooling water system.

*Date of issuance:* February 28, 1996

*Effective date:* February 28, 1996

*Amendment No.:* 1

*Facility Operating License No.* NPF-90: Amendment revises the TS. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration, are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 28, 1996. Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No  
*Local Public Document Room location:* Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Steven A. Varga,

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

[Doc. 96-5817 Filed 3-12-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

## POSTAL SERVICE

### Board of Governors; Sunshine Act Meeting

"FEDERAL REGISTER" CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENTS: 61 FR 6297, February 16, 1996; 61 FR 6894, February 22, 1996.

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED DATE OF MEETING: March 4, 1996.

CHANGE: Addition of the following items to the closed meeting agenda:

1. Election of the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors.

2. Consideration of a Modification Concerning the Redesign of the Priority Mail Service Program.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Thomas J. Koerber, (202) 268-4800.

At its meeting on March 4, 1996, the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service voted unanimously to add to the agenda: (1) Election of the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors, and (2) consideration of a modification concerning the redesign of the Priority service program. Discussion on the first item was closed to the public pursuant to section 552b(c)(6) of Title 5, United States Code; and section 7.3(f) of Title 39, Code of Federal Regulations. Discussion of the second item was closed to the public pursuant to section 552b(c)(9)(B) of Title 5, United States Code, and section 7.3(i) of Title 39 Code of Federal Regulations. No earlier announcement of these additions was possible. In accordance with 552b(f)(1) of Title 5, United States Code, and section 7.6(a) of Title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, the General Counsel of the United States Postal Service certified that in her opinion discussion of these items could be properly closed to public observation. Thomas J. Koerber,

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96-6107 Filed 3-11-96; 2:33 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

### Board of Governors; Sunshine Act Meeting

At its meeting on March 4, 1996, the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service voted unanimously to close to public observation its meeting scheduled for April 1, 1996, in Phoenix, Arizona. The members will consider a filing with the Postal Rate Commission for classification reform of nonprofit rates and special services.

The meeting is expected to be attended by the following persons: Governors Alvarado, Daniels, del Junco, Dyhrkopp, Fineman, Mackie, McWherter, Rider and Winters; Postmaster General Runyon, Deputy Postmaster General Coughlin, Secretary to the Board Koerber, and General Counsel Elcano.

The Board determined that pursuant to section 552b(c)(3) of title 5, United States Code, and section 7.3(c) of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, this portion of the meeting is exempt from the open meeting requirement of the Government in the Sunshine Act [5 U.S.C. 552b(b)] because it is likely to disclose information in connection with proceedings under Chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code (having to do

with postal ratemaking, mail classification and changes in postal services), which is specifically exempted from disclosure by section 410(c)(4) of title 39, United States Code.

The Board has determined further that pursuant to section 552b(c)(10) of title 5, United States Code, and section 7.3(j) of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, the discussion is exempt because it is likely to specifically concern participation of the Postal Service in a civil action or proceeding involving a determination on the record after opportunity for a hearing.

The Board further determined that the public interest does not require that the Board's discussion of these matters be open to the public.

In accordance with section 552b(f)(1) of title 5, United States Code, and section 7.6(a) of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, the General Counsel of the United States Postal Service has certified that in her opinion the meeting may properly be closed to public observation pursuant to section 552b(c)(3) and (10) of title 5, United States Code; section 410(c)(4) of title 39, United States Code; and section 7.3 (c) and (j) of title 39, Code of Federal Regulations.

Requests for information about the meeting should be addressed to the Secretary of the Board, Thomas J. Koerber, at (202) 268-4800.

Thomas J. Koerber,

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96-6108 Filed 3-11-96; 2:33 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

### Sunshine Act Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the Railroad Retirement Board will hold a meeting on March 20, 1996, 9:00 a.m., at the Board's meeting room on the 8th floor of its headquarters building, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60611. The agenda for this meeting follows:

- (1) Draft Agreements with the Internal Revenue Service.
- (2) Office of Inspector General's Reinvention Proposals—Phase II.
- (3) Inspector General's Memorandum re Investment Policy.
- (4) Show of Interest—First Floor Headquarters Space.
- (5) Issues Concerning Coverage Terminations (Marine Atlantic and Durango and Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad).
- (6) Employee Status—Engineering Department Consultants for Souther Pacific Transportation Company.
- (7) Labor Member Truth in Budgeting Status Report.