can be made to allow the necessary time during the meeting for such statements. Use of still, motion picture, and television cameras during this meeting may be limited to selected portions of the meeting as determined by the Chairman. Information regarding the time to be set aside for this purpose may be obtained by contacting the Chief of the Nuclear Reactors Branch prior to the meeting. In view of the possibility that the schedule for ACRS meetings may be adjusted by the Chairman as necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, persons planning to attend should check with the Chief of the Nuclear Reactors Branch if such rescheduling would result in major inconvenience.

In accordance with Subsection 10(d) P.L. 92–463, I have determined that it is necessary to close portions of this meeting noted above to discuss matters that relate solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of this Advisory Committee per 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(2), and to discuss matters the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy per 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6).

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting Mr. Sam Duraiswamy, Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch (telephone 301/415–7364), between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. edt.

ACRS meeting notices, meeting transcripts, and letter reports are now available on FedWorld from the ''NRC MAIN MENU.'' Direct Dial Access number to FedWorld is (800) 303–9672; the local direct dial number is 703–321–3339.

Dated: September 19, 1996.

Andrew L. Bates,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–24558 Filed 9–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Planning and Procedures; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Planning and Procedures will hold a meeting on October 8, 1996, Room T–2B1, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance, with the exception of a portion that may be closed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (2) and (6) to discuss organizational and personnel matters that relate solely to internal personnel rules and practices of ACRS, and matters the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Tuesday, October 8, 1996—1:30 p.m. Until 3:30 p.m.

The Subcommittee will discuss proposed ACRS activities and related matters. It may also discuss the qualifications of candidates for appointment to the ACRS. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff person named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, the scheduling of sessions open to the public, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements, and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the cognizant ACRS staff person, Dr. John T. Larkins (telephone: 301/415–7360) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., that may have occurred.

Dated: September 18, 1996.

Sam Duraiswamy,

Chief, Nuclear Reactors Branch.

[FR Doc. 96–24559 Filed 9–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DATE: Weeks of September 23, 30, October 7, and 14, 1996.

PLACE: Commissioners' Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of September 23

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of September 23.

Week of September 30—Tentative

Thursday, October 3

1:00 p.m.—Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed).

Week of October 7—Tentative

Monday, October 7

2:00 p.m.—Briefing on Site Decommissioning Management Plan (SDMP) (Public Meeting) (Contact: Mike Webber, 301–415–2797).

Wednesday, October 9

11:30 a.m.—Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed).

Week of October 14—Tentative.

Tuesday, October 15

1:00 p.m.—Briefing by Executive Branch (Closed—Ex. 1).

Wednesday, October 16

9:00 a.m.—Briefing on Containment Degradation (Public Meeting).

2:00 p.m.—Briefing PRA Implementation Plan (Public Meeting).

3:30 p.m.—Affirmation Session (Public Meeting) (if needed).

Friday, October 18

9:00 a.m.—Briefing on Integrated Safety Assessment Team Inspection (ISAT) at Maine Yankee (Public Meeting).

The Schedule for Commission Meetings is Subject to Change on Short Notice. To Verify the Status of Meeting Call (Recording)—(301) 415–1292. Contact Person for More Information: Bill Hill (301) 415–1661.

* * * * *

The NRC Commission Meeting Schedule can be found on the Internet at: http://www.nrc.gov/SECY/smj/schedule.htm

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, D.C. 20555 (301–415–1661).

In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to wmh@nrc.gov or dkw@nrc.gov.

* * * * *

Dated: September 20, 1996.

William M. Hill, Jr.,

SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–24693 Filed 9–23–96; 11:09 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97-415 revised section 189

of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from August 30, 1996, through September 13, 1996. The last biweekly notice was published on September 11, 1996.

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

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

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

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

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, 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 October 25, 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 20555-0001, 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 20555-0001, 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: August 2, 1996

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would eliminate from the licenses the requirement to conduct corrosion testing for the laser welded steam generator sleeves.

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

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

This proposed change only involves deleting laboratory testing requirements designed to demonstrate service life of laser welded sleeved tubes in the presence of a crevice. Current inspection requirements ensure that premature degradation is identified and that tubes containing degraded sleeve joints are plugged. Operational primary-to-secondary leakage limits ensure that appropriate action is taken if sleeve degradation results in leakage. These actions will ensure that offsite dose will be maintained within a small percentage of 10 CFR 100 limits. Failure of a sleeve joint is bounded by the Steam Generator Tube Rupture event evaluated in the [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report] UFSAR. Therefore, the laboratory testing to determine service life of sleeved tube joints in the presence of a crevice does not provide any further useful data. The change does not result in the installation of any new equipment, and no existing equipment is modified.

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

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

This proposed change only addresses deleting the laboratory testing requirements designed to demonstrate service life of sleeved tubes in the presence of a crevice. Sleeved tubes will continue to be inspected and plugged in accordance with existing requirements which are sufficient to ensure detection and repair of degraded tubes. Premature degradation of tubes is addressed through primary-to-secondary leakage monitoring and leakage limits. No new equipment is being installed and no existing equipment is being modified by this proposed change. Also, no new system configurations will be introduced as a result of this proposed change. Therefore, no new or different failure modes are being introduced by deleting the laboratory testing.

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

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

This proposed change only involves deleting laboratory testing requirements designed to demonstrate service life of sleeved tubes in the presence of a crevice. Sleeve integrity will be monitored during the operating cycle through the current primary-to-secondary leakage monitoring program. In the event of premature degradation of a sleeve joint that results in tube leakage, plant shutdown will occur as required by Technical Specifications and administrative requirements in accordance with approved plant procedures. Sleeved tubes will be monitored for degradation in accordance with the existing inservice inspection requirements which monitors a minimum 20 percent random sleeve sample size. Any tubes with defective sleeve joints will be plugged as required by Technical Specifications. Service life of sleeved tubes in the presence of a crevice, as predicted by laboratory testing, does not affect the margin of safety of the plant. Therefore, this 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 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

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

Date of amendment request: July 15, 1996

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specifications (TS) and associated Bases to relocate the fire protection program elements from the TS to the Fire Protection Program. The affected TS sections are 3/4.3.7.9, ''Fire Detection Instrumentation;'' 3/4.7.5, ''Fire Suppression Systems;'' 3/4.7.6, ''Fire Rated Assemblies;'' and 6.1.C.4,

''Fire Brigade Staffing.'' In addition, the amendments revise the Operating License to replace existing fire protection license conditions with the NRC's standard fire protection license condition. These changes are made in accordance with the guidance provided in Generic Letter (GL) 86-10, ''Implementation of Fire Protection Requirements,'' and GL 88-12, ''Removal of Fire Protection Requirements from Technical Specifications.'' Also, the May 19, 1995, proposed revision to remove the fire protection requirements from the TS (60 FR 35067) is withdrawn.

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

1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because:

This amendment request does not involve any actual changes to the fire protection systems at the station. It involves an administrative change which relocates the control of the Fire Protection Program from each unit's operating license and technical specifications to the station Fire Protection Program, as suggested in Generic Letters 86-10 and 88-12. Therefore, the relocation of these controls does not affect the assumptions for any of the accident analysis contained in Chapter 15 of the [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report] UFSAR.

The Fire Protection Technical Specifications which are to be relocated to the Fire Protection Program will be controlled by the proposed fire protection license condition and 10CFR 50.59. These controls ensure that the requested changes maintain the same level of control for the Fire Protection Program as that which currently exists in the Technical Specifications. Therefore, this change is administrative in nature and does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because:

This amendment request does not involve any physical changes to the fire protection systems or reduce the level of control of the Fire Protection Program. It therefore does not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident than any previously described in the UFSAR.

3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because:

The same level of control which is currently applied to the Fire Protection Program by the limiting conditions for operation and the surveillance requirements of the technical specifications will be included in the controls applied by the unit licenses and the Fire Protection Program. Therefore, the margin of safety as defined in the technical specification bases will not be reduced by this proposed amendment.

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: Jacobs Memorial Library, Illinois Valley Community College, Oglesby, Illinois 61348.

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of amendment request: July 26, 1996, and supplemented on September 3, 1996

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would allow licensee control of the reactor coolant system (RCS) pressure and temperature (P/T) limits for heatup, cooldown, low temperature operation and hydrostatic testing. They would also revise the reactor vessel material surveillance program specimen withdrawal schedule such that the Unit 2 removal of capsule X is delayed until 19 Effective Full Power Years (EFPY). This change affects the schedule for withdrawing surveillance capsules from the reactor vessel for testing to measure the impact of neutron irradiation of the vessel material and is required by Section III.B.3 of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix H, ''Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program Requirements.'' The schedule must be approved by the Nuclear Regulator Commission (NRC) before implementation.

Based on input from the Babcock and Wilcox Owners Group Reactor Vessel Working Group, the data from Zion, Unit 2, capsule X would be more useful in the overall Master Integrated Reactor Vessel Surveillance Program (MIRVP) context if irradiated to the ASTM E185-82 maximum of twice the peak End Of Life (EOL) vessel fluence, because data at higher fluences is needed to characterize irradiation behavior at the higher EOL fluences characteristic of other non-Commonwealth Edison MIRVP vessels. For this reason, the licensee is proposing withdrawing and testing Zion, Unit 2, capsule X at 19 EFPY, which is currently estimated to occur at refueling outage Z2R18, in the year 2002.

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

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

The proposed change revises the 10 CFR 50, Appendix H reactor vessel material specimen withdrawal schedule. Neither the specimens, nor the process of withdrawal of the specimens, are considered as initiators for any previously evaluated accident. Further, data at all fluence levels of current interest based on ASTM E185-82 has already been obtained from seven Zion Unit 1 and 2 capsules which have been tested, and the existing evaluations show the reactor vessel fracture toughness properties to be as expected, and providing the required safety margin. Extending the time for withdrawal of the specimen does not adversely affect the pressure and temperature limit curves for the reactor vessel. Regulatory Guide 1.99, Rev. 2, was used to prepare the conservative pressure and temperature limit curves which continue to be requirements.

Additionally, Zion Station participates in the B&W Owners Group Reactor Vessel Working Group designed to significantly increase the amount of PWR surveillance data. Under this Working Group, Zion Station data contributes to the overall understanding of reactor vessel material irradiation behavior at high EOL fluences, and obtains the benefit of data from other plants. This program complements the Zion Station program so that postponement of the specimen withdrawal will have minimal impact on the understanding of the irradiation effects on the Zion Station reactor vessel. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed revision to the specimen withdrawal schedule does not change the system operation or design, and therefore, does not change the response of any required structures, systems or components in the mitigation of any evaluated accident. As such, this change does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change relocates the RCS P/T, LTOP [low-temperature overpressure protection] limitations, and supporting information from the Technical Specifications to Licensee control, specifically a Pressure Temperature Limits Report (PTLR). Compliance with these limitations will continue to be required by the Technical Specifications, however the limitations themselves will be relocated to a Licensee controlled document. Changes to these limitations will be controlled by Section 5.6.6 of the Technical Specifications. Changes to the RCS P/T limits can only be made in accordance with the approved methodologies listed in the Technical Specifications which will, in combination with the limitations that continue to be

imposed by the Technical Specifications, continue to assure the function of the reactor vessel as a pressure boundary. Revisions to the LTOP limits can only be made in accordance with the approved methodologies listed in the Technical Specifications, with any resulting setpoint changes controlled through a process which utilizes 10 CFR 50.59. Therefore, 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 necessitate a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different equipment will be installed). The proposed revision to the specimen withdrawal schedule does not change the system operation or design, and therefore, does not introduce any new failure mechanisms. The proposed specimen withdrawal schedule continues to provide the required data for subsequent reactor vessel evaluations, and previous data has confirmed the confidence in the integrity of the reactor vessel well beyond the completion of the evaluations following the proposed withdrawal. Therefore, this revision to the withdrawal schedule does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not necessitate a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different equipment will be installed). The Technical Specifications will continue to retain requirements to maintain the RCS within acceptable operational limitations and to assure operability of the LTOP system. As such, the Technical Specifications will continue to require compliance with these limitations. Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change to the specimen withdrawal schedule will not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety because it has no impact on any safety analysis assumptions. Additionally, data at all fluence levels of current interest based on ASTM E185-82 has already been obtained with the seven Zion Unit 1 and 2 capsules which have been tested, and the existing evaluations show the reactor vessel fracture toughness properties to be as expected, and providing the required safety margin. The current pressure and temperature limits are conservative and also provide sufficient margin to ensure the integrity of the reactor vessel. The proposed change to the withdrawal schedule does not adversely impact these curves. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change will not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety because it has no impact on any safety analysis assumptions. Any future changes to the RCS P/T, LTOP limits, or supporting information must be performed in accordance with approved NRC methodologies, and compliance with the limitations relocated to the PTLR will continue to be required by the Technical Specifications. Additionally, any revision to the LTOP limits which result in setpoint changes will be controlled through a process which utilizes 10 CFR 50.59. Therefore, this 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 requested amendments involve no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi-2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: September 5, 1996 (NRC-96-0075)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) sections 2.1.2 and 3.4.1.1 to incorporate cycle-specific safety limit minimum critical power ratios (SLMCPRs) for the core that will be loaded during the upcoming refueling outage expected to commence in November 1996.

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

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

The derivation of the revised SLMCPRs for Fermi 2 for incorporation into the TS, and its use to determine cycle-specific thermal limits, have been performed using NRC-approved methods. Additionally, interim implementing procedures, which incorporate cycle-specific parameters, have been used which result in a more restrictive value for the SLMCPR. These calculations do not change the method of operating the plant and have no effect on the probability of an accident initiating event or transient. The basis of the MCPR Safety Limit is to ensure that no mechanistic fuel damage is calculated to occur if the limit is not violated. The new SLMCPRs preserve the existing margin to transition boiling and the probability of fuel damage is not increased. Therefore, the proposed TS change does not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change results from analysis of the Cycle 6 core reload using the same fuel types as previous cycles. These changes do not involve any new method for operating the facility and do not involve any facility modifications. No new initiating events or transients result from these changes. Therefore, the proposed TS change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The margin of safety as defined in the TS Bases will remain the same. The new SLMCPRs are calculated using NRC-approved methods which are in accordance with the current fuel design and licensing criteria. Additionally, interim implementing procedures, which incorporate cycle-specific parameters, have been used. The MCPR Safety Limit remains high enough to ensure that greater than 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core will avoid transition boiling if the limit is not violated, thereby preserving the fuel cladding integrity. Therefore, the proposed TS change does not involve a reduction in a margin of safety.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Monroe County Library System, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161

Attorney for licensee: John Flynn, Esq., Detroit Edison Company, 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48226

NRC Project Director: John Hannon

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

Date of amendment request: July 31, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated September 5, 1996. These letters supersede the application submitted in letter dated May 9, 1996, which was noticed in the Federal Register on June 5, 1996 (61 FR 28614).

Description of amendment request: The amendment request would (1) increase the safety limit minimum critical power ratio (MCPR) for two loop operation and single loop operation to 1.12 and 1.14, respectively, and (2) add a General Electric topical report to the list of documents describing the analytical methods used to determine the core operating limits. The proposed changes are to Section 2.1.1, Reactor

Core Safety Limits, and Section 5.6.5, Core Operating Limits Report (COLR), respectively, of the Technical Specifications (TSs). This amendment would go into effect in Operating Cycle 9, at the end of the upcoming Refueling Outage 8, and the plant will have a mixed core of Siemens Power Corporation (SPS) 9x9-5 and General Electric (GE) GE11 reload fuel. The licensee also proposed changes to the Bases of the TSs associated with the above proposed changes.

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

I. The proposed change does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) safety limit is defined in the Bases to Technical Specification 2.1.1 as that limit which ''ensures that during normal operation and during Anticipated Operational Occurrences (AOOs), at least 99.9% of the fuel rods in the core do not experience transition boiling.'' The MCPR safety limit is re-evaluated for each reload and, for GGNS [Operating] Cycle 9, the analyses have concluded that a two-loop MCPR safety limit of 1.12 based on the application of the generic GE MCPR methodology is necessary to ensure that this acceptance criterion is satisfied. For single-loop operation, a MCPR safety limit of 1.14 based on the generic GE MCPR methodology was determined to be necessary. Core MCPR operating limits are developed to support the Technical Specification 3.2 requirements and ensure these safety limits are maintained in the event of the worst-case transient. Since the MCPR safety limit will be maintained at all times, operation under the proposed changes will ensure at least 99.9% of the fuel rods in the core do not experience transition boiling. Therefore, The Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) safety limit change does not affect the probability or consequences of an accident.

The implementation of GE's GESTAR-II approved methodology has no effect on the probability or consequences of any accidents previously evaluated. One exception to GESTAR is that the mis-oriented and mis-located bundle events will continue to be analyzed as accidents subject to the acceptance criteria in the current licensing basis. The design of the GE11 fuel bundles is such that the bundles are not likely to be mis-oriented or mis-located and the normal administrative controls will be in effect for assuring proper orientation and location. Therefore, the probability of a fuel loading error is not increased. This analysis ensures that postulated dose releases will not exceed a small fraction (10 percent) of 10 CFR 100 limits.

Therefore, the consequences of accidents previously evaluated are unchanged.

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

The GE11 fuel to be used in [Operating] Cycle 9 is of a design compatible with fuel present in the core and used in the previous cycle. Therefore, the GE11 fuel will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident. The proposed changes do not involve any new modes of operation, any changes to setpoints, or any plant modifications. They introduce revised MCPR safety limits that have been proved to be acceptable for Cycle 9 operation. Compliance with the applicable criterion for incipient boiling transition continues to be ensured. The proposed MCPR safety limits do not result in the creation of any new precursors to an accident.

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

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

The MCPR safety limits have been evaluated to ensure that during normal operation and during AOOs [abnormal operating occurrences], at least 99.9% of the fuel rods in the core do not experience transition boiling. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed changes in the MCPR safety limit ensure there is no reduction in the margin of safety.

As with the current SPC methodology, GGNS will implement only the NRC-approved revisions to GE's GESTAR methodology. This GE methodology is similar to those SPC reports currently listed in TS 5.6.5 and it will be applied in a similar, conservative fashion. One exception to GESTAR is that the mis-oriented and mis-located bundle events will continue to be analyzed as accidents subject to the acceptance criteria in the current licensing basis. This analysis ensures that postulated dose releases will not exceed a small fraction (10 percent) of 10CFR100 [10 CFR Part 100] limits. On this basis, the implementation of this GE methodology 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: Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce Street, Natchez, MS 39120

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

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

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

Date of amendment request: August 1, 1996

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to incorporate requirements for limiting the time that the hydrogen mixing isolation valves on the drywell are open. The requirements were contained in the old TSs and with the conversion to the Improved Standard Technical Specifications, the requirements were inadvertently changed. The proposed action is to restore requirements to meet the licensing basis for the River Bend Station. The proposed amendment would also change the time from 7 days to 31 days to determine the cumulative time the valves are open.

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

The proposed changes in this submittal put the requirements that were in the original Technical Specifications for the Hydrogen Mixing System back into the current Technical Specifications. The changes reenstate into the Technical Specifications limitations that were previously agreed to between River Bend and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the FSAR Safety Evaluation Report for the Hydrogen Mixing System.

The River Bend SER states in Supplement 2, Section 6.2.4, ''Since the applicant has not demonstrated that these valves are capable of closing under accident conditions in the drywell, certain restrictions apply. Technical Specification 3.6.6.2 specifies that in Operating Modes 1 and 2, the total number of hours used should not exceed 5 hours/365 days and in Operating Mode 3 the number of hours should be limited to 90 hours/365 days.'' To date, the hydrogen mixing isolation valves have not been fully demonstrated to be capable of closing under accident conditions in the drywell. The old Standard Technical Specifications (Attachment 2) used at River Bend reflected this condition. When conversion to ITS was made, these requirements were dropped but should not have been. In addition, the requirement to operate the hydrogen mixing system every 92 days during Modes 1, 2, and 3 was added without consideration for the requirements in the River Bend Safety Evaluation Report.

Consequently, for these proposed change, since the requirements already exist and are being reenstated into the Technical Specifications, this change is administrative in nature. The requirements have remained in place through the SER, but were

inadvertently removed from the Technical Specifications. This change places the requirements from the SER back into the Technical Specifications.

In addition, changing the requirement from the old Technical Specifications for determining the cumulative time that the hydrogen mixing inlet and outlet valves are open from every 7 days to every 31 days is again administrative in nature, since this only changes the frequency with which a given requirement is tracked administratively. It does not change the actual requirement in any way.

Consequently, since both of these changes are administrative in nature and only incorporate requirements into the Technical Specifications that already existed in the RBS FSAR Safety Evaluation Report, the changes proposed in this amendment request do not change the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

This proposed change does not involve a change to the plant design or operation. As a result, the proposed change does not affect any of the parameters or conditions that could contribute to the initiation of any accidents.

The changes proposed in this amendment request are administrative in nature and merely add requirements back into the Technical Specifications that were inadvertently deleted during the conversion to ITS. Because of the administrative nature of the proposed changes, it is not possible to create a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes in this amendment request reenstate requirements into the Technical specifications that are contained present in the RBS FSAR Safety Evaluation Report. These requirements were inadvertently deleted during the conversion to ITS.

Because of the administrative nature of these Technical Specification changes, there is no change to 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: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Attorney for licensee: Mark Wetterhahn, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

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: August 15, 1996.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would remove a requirement for performance of a surveillance incorporating a high toxic gas test signal.

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

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

Analyses were performed to evaluated postulated releases of potentially hazardous chemicals for their impact on Control Room habitability. The latest revision of these analyses shows that none of the potentially hazardous chemicals utilized onsite or in the surrounding 5-mile radius around the South Texas Project pose a credible hazard to the Control Room. Consequently, there is no need to ensure that the Control Room Makeup and Cleanup Filtration System can automatically switch into a recirculation mode of operation by isolating the normal supply and exhaust flow in response to a High Toxic Gas test signal. Therefore, elimination of the unnecessary surveillance has no effect on the probability of an accident or its consequences.

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

The Toxic Gas Monitoring System was provided to protect against hazardous toxic gas releases only. Verifying automatic switch into the recirculation mode of operation is no longer necessary since the Toxic Gas Analyzers have been removed. This change does not affect other tests for verification of automatic switching into the recirculation mode of operation. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Analyses have shown that none of the chemicals onsite and within a 5-mile radius of the South Texas Project pose a credible hazard to the facility. Automatic switching of the Control Room Makeup and Cleanup Filtration System will continue to be verified using test signals from other sources.

Based upon this evaluation, the South Texas Project has concluded that these changes do not involve any significant hazards considerations.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Jack R. Newman, Esq., Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036-5869

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

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

Date of amendment request: August 15, 1996

Description of amendment request: A Federal Register Notice on May 22, 1996 (61 FR 25707), stated that revisions were being proposed to Clinton Power Station Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.6.2, ''Secondary Containment Isolation Instrumentation;'' TS 3.3.7.1, ''Control Room Ventilation System Instrumentation;'' TS 3.6.1.2, ''Primary Containment Air Locks;'' TS 3.6.1.3, ''Primary Containment Isolation Valves;'' TS 3.6.4.1, ''Secondary Containment;'' TS 3.6.4.2, ''Secondary Containment Isolation Dampers;'' TS 3.6.4.3, ''Standby Gas Treatment;'' TS 3.7.3, ''Control Room Ventilation;'' and TS 3.7.4, ''Control Room AC System.'' By letter dated August 15, 1996, the licensee revised their proposal to consolidate the above changes under a newly proposed Special Operations LCO (i.e., LCO 3.10.10, ''Single Control Rod Withdrawal - Refueling''). Therefore, the Description of Amendment Request to the TSs has changed as described herein. The Basis for No Significant Hazards Consideration has not changed and is repeated below.

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

1. The proposed changes eliminate CORE ALTERATIONS as an applicable condition requiring operability of the primary and secondary containment and control room ventilation system. As stated in the BASES for the associated Technical Specifications, operability of these systems is primarily required for mitigation of the design basis accident - fuel handling accident (DBA-FHA) and design basis accident - loss of coolant accident (DBA-LOCA). The performance of CORE ALTERATIONS alone is neither a

precursor to, nor a condition during which these DBAs are postulated to occur. The proposed changes only delete CORE ALTERATIONS as an applicable condition for the affected Technical Specifications. All other applicable MODES or specified conditions, including operations with the potential for draining the reactor vessels (OPDRVs) and the movement of irradiated fuel assemblies within the primary or secondary containment, remain unchanged. Further, the limitations placed on the handling of light loads are also unchanged. The Technical Specifications (and the separate requirements imposed on the handling of light loads) will thus continue to require that systems or functions designed to mitigate design-basis/previously evaluated accidents are OPERABLE during the relevant operating MODES or conditions. On the basis of the above, it is concluded that the requested amendment will not increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes do not involve any modification to the plant design or to the operation of plant systems (except to determine when certain analyzed accident-mitigating systems or features are required to be OPERABLE). The failure modes considered for the proposed changes are the same as those previously considered, therefore, it can be concluded that no new failure modes will be created. On this basis, the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The changes being made to eliminate CORE ALTERATIONS as an applicable condition for which certain LCOs must be met, do not eliminate the requirements for operability of those systems or features assumed to mitigate design-basis or analyzed accidents during the applicable MODES when such systems or features are assumed to be available for performing their mitigating function. The safety margins assumed or established by the accident analyses for those design-basis events (as described in the accident analyses of the Clinton Power Station Updated Final Safety Analysis Report) therefore remain unchanged. Further, the proposed changes do not impact the controls imposed on the handling of light loads (including unirradiated fuel assemblies) for ensuring that such activities cannot result in an event that yields consequences more severe than those calculated for the DBA-FHA. With respect to reactivity concerns during refueling operations (MODE 5), all systems or features required to be OPERABLE for precluding inadvertent criticality and monitoring reactivity changes will continue to be required OPERABLE as per the current Technical Specification requirements. The deletion of CORE ALTERATIONS as an applicable condition only applies to the noted systems which do not contribute to precluding reactivity events. Based on the above, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Leah Manning Stetzner, Vice President, General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary, 500 South 27th Street, Decatur, Illinois 62525

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

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

Date of amendment request: August 12, 1996

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add an additional circumstance to Exception 2 of Technical Specification (TS) 3.6, Emergency Core Cooling and Containment Spray Systems, during which operation of a service water/component cooling pump subsystem is permitted at reduced flow to flush the service water header or inlet strainer. The Bases for this TS would be augmented to support the additional circumstance of reduced service water flow.

The proposed amendment would also modify the valve surveillance requirements of TS 4.6.A.1.b, Periodic Testing of ECCS Valves, to provide an exception to surveillance requirements for those locked valves that are inaccessible during power operations or located in a locked high radiation area. The Bases for this TS would be augmented to support the change in surveillance requirements.

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

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

Invocation of the proposed addition to Exception 2 to TS 3.6 would not alter any associated Remedial Action completion time, nor those of TS 3.0.A, Nonconformance with a Limiting Condition for Operation. The evolutions for which this amendment is intended (flushing a heat exchanger inlet strainer or cleaning a service water header that has become fouled)are administratively controlled by procedures that require review and approval by the Plant Operation Review Committee.

The proposed change to TS 4.6.A.1.b would revise the surveillance requirements for a very limited number of locked manual valves in the emergency core cooling system (ECCS). The purpose of the surveillance requirements is unchanged and is intended to verify that locked valves remain in their correct position. The position of the valves is not changed and the revised surveillance requirements will continue to demonstrate ECCS valve operability.

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

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

The proposed addition to Exception 2 to TS 3.6 recognizes that service water cleaning and flushing are operations that are required to maintain heat transfer capability and equipment reliability. The proposed amendment does not affect the design of the plant and do not permit operation of the plant outside the currently allowed modes of operation.

The proposed change to TS 4.6.A.1.b maintains verification of ECCS valve operability, while requiring no changes in system configuration to perform surveillance testing. System functional performance is not adversely affected.

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

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

The proposed change to TS 3.6 does not significantly alter the availability or condition of applicable equipment and therefore does not alter the accident analyses or the conclusions associated with that equipment. The proposed change permits service water flow to be reduced below that required for operation of the ECCS in the recirculation mode, for a short time. The time during which flow is reduced and both the mussel control and flushing evolutions are administratively controlled by procedures reviewed and approved by the Plant Operation Review Committee.

The proposed change to TS 4.6.A.1.b maintains verification of valve operability. Valve position surveillances will continue to be conducted in accordance with plant Technical Specifications to ensure valve operational readiness.

Thus, there is no significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to

determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Mary Ann Lynch, Esquire, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, 329 Bath Road, Brunswick, ME 04011 NRC Deputy Director: John A. Zwolinski

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

Date of amendment requests: June 7, 1996

Description of amendment requests: The proposed amendments would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 by revising Technical Specifications (TS) 3/4.9.14.1, ''Spent Fuel Assembly Storage - Spent Fuel Pool Region 2,'' and 3/4.9.14.3, ''Spent Fuel Assembly Storage - Spent Fuel Pool Region 1,'' to allow storage of fuel assemblies in a checkerboard pattern in region 2 of the spent fuel pool.

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

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

Analysis indicates that allowing fuel storage in a checkerboard

pattern with empty storage cells in region 2 of the spent fuel

pool will not result in an inadvertent criticality event. The k_{eff} will continue to remain below 0.95 as required to meet the acceptance criteria in the NRC Standard Review Plan, Section 9.1.1.

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

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

The change to allow fuel storage in a checkerboard pattern with no minimum burnup requirements in region 2 of the spent fuel pool would designate locations where a fuel assembly could be incorrectly placed. However, the incorrect placement of a fuel assembly has been analyzed and would not cause an inadvertent criticality or any other accident.

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

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

The NRC Standard Review Plan, Section 9.1.1, acceptance criterion of a k_{eff} of 0.95 provides the margin to criticality. An analysis was performed that concluded that the proposed change to allow fuel storage in spent fuel pool region 2 in a checkerboard pattern meets the acceptance criterion.

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

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Christopher J. Warner, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

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 amendment request: June 6, 1996 (TS 372)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment revises Section 6 of the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Units 1, 2, and 3 technical specifications. Administrative controls associated with quality assurance are relocated to the licensee's Nuclear Quality Assurance Plan, consistent with Administrative Letter 95-06, and provides revisions that make Section 6 more consistent with the improved Standard Technical Specifications. Additional administrative changes are included to ensure consistent terminology within the specifications, and to update obsolete items such as titles and addresses. The proposed amendment also includes minor editorial changes.

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

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

The proposed TS change to revise items 1 through 28 above (Section I, Description of the Proposed Change) was evaluated and the proposed TS changes were determined to be administrative in nature. The changes [items 2 through 9, 11, 17 through 21, 23, 26, and 27] involve administrative title changes of TVA management positions, the updating of an NRC mailing address and an NRC regional office title. In addition, certain sections [items 1, 10, 12, 13, 24, and 25] are being relocated into other licensee documents for which those provisions are adequately controlled by regulatory requirements. [Items 14, 15, 16, 22, and 28 are editorial changes.] These changes do not affect any of the design basis accidents. They do not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed TS change to revise items 1 through 28 above (Section I, Description of the Proposed Change) was evaluated and the proposed TS changes were determined to be administrative in nature. The changes involve administrative title changes of TVA management positions, the updating of an NRC mailing address and an NRC regional office title. In addition, certain sections are being relocated into other licensee documents for which those provisions are adequately controlled by regulatory requirements. These changes do not affect any of the design basis accidents. No modifications to any plant equipment are involved. There are no effects on system interactions made by these changes. They do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed TS change to revise items 1 through 28 above (Section I, Description of the Proposed Change) was evaluated and the proposed TS changes were determined to be administrative in nature. The changes involve administrative title changes of TVA management positions, the updating of an NRC mailing address and an NRC regional office title. In addition, certain sections are being relocated into other licensee documents for which those provisions are adequately controlled by regulatory requirements. The margin of safety as reported in the basis for the TSs is not reduced. The proposed change is administrative and does not impact any technical information contained in the bases of the TS.

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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 amendment request: August 30, 1996 (TS 380)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment deletes License Condition 2.C.(3) regarding thermal water quality standards from the licenses for the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Units 1, 2, and 3.

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

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

The proposed License Condition change is an adminstrative change and has no relationship to plant safety analyses. Therefore, this change does not increase the frequency of the precursors to design basis events or operational transients analyzed in the BFN [Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant] Final Safety Analysis Report. Likewise, the proposed changes will not increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed License Condition change is an administrative change and has no relationship to plant safety analyses. Thus, the change does not create any type of new accident sequences. Likewise, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed License Condition change is an administrative change and has no relationship to plant safety analyses. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve 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: Athens Public Library, South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611

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

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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

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

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

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

Date of amendment request: August 16, 1996

Description of amendment request: This notice relates to your submittal to remove the uncertainty term from the specified distance and remove the footnote which specifies the time frame it is applicable.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: September 11, 1996 (61 FR 47968)

Expiration date of individual notice: October 11, 1996

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

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

Date of amendment request: September 3, 1996

Description of amendment request: This notice relates to your submittal to modify Technical Specification Section 4.3.1.B.4.A.10.a which provides the acceptance criteria for steam generator tube repairs by adding a footnote which references the cleanliness and nondestructive examination requirements as described in CEN-629-P, Revision 00, ''Repair of Westinghouse Series 44 and 51 Steam Generator Tubes Using Leak Tight Sleeves.'' Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: September 11, 1996 (61 FR 47966)

Expiration date of individual notice: October 11, 1996

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

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

Date of amendment request: March 25, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated August 23, 1996

Brief description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the safety limit minimum critical power ratios (SLMCPRs) to support use of GE-13 fuel at PBAPS, Units 2 and 3. Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: August 30, 1996 (61 FR 45997)

Expiration date of individual notice: September 30, 1996

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

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-387 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: May 28, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated July 25, 1996

Brief description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Minimum Critical Power Ratio safety limit values, adding two references to reflect the use of the ANF-B Critical Power Ratio Correlation and to reflect the use of the ABB Combustion Engineering licensing methodology, with a modification to the associated Bases.

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: September 9, 1996 (61 FR 47529)

Expiration date of individual notice: October 9, 1996

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701

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.

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

Date of application for amendment: January 30, 1996, as supplemented May 20, 1996

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TS) to: (1) add TS 4.6.1.5 to provide criteria for 24-hour full-load testing of the emergency diesel generators (EDGs) to be performed during each refueling outage; (2) revise TS 4.6.1.2 to allow testing of the EDG protective bypasses listed in TS 3.7.1.d to be done independent of the safety injection or loss of offsite power testing; and (3) revise TS 4.6.1.3 to include the EDG protective bypass inspection.

Date of issuance: September 11, 1996

Effective date: September 11, 1996

Amendment No. 174

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 28, 1996 (61 FR 7546) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 11, 1996. The May 20, 1996, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: location: Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College Avenue, Hartsville, South Carolina 29550

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

Date of application for amendment: December 10, 1995, as supplemented August 1, 1996, and September 4, 1996.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) Section 3.5.1 and Tables 3.5-2, 3, and 4 concerning the reactor trip system, engineering safety feature actuation system, and isolation function.

Date of issuance: September 12, 1996Effective date: September 12, 1996

Amendment No. 175

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 14, 1996 (61 FR 5812). The August 1, 1996, and September 4, 1996, submittals provided administrative changes to the TS pages that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 12, 1996.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College Avenue, Hartsville, South Carolina 29550

Duke Power Company, et al., Docket No. 50-413, Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1, York County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: September 30, 1994, as supplemented September 18, 1995, January 19, March 15, May 16, and August 27, 1996

Description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to reflect the new setpoints, operational parameters, and approved analysis methodologies associated with replacement of the Unit 1 steam generators. The amendment also deletes references to steam generator tube repair methods, which will no longer be applicable after the replacement, and clarifies initial surveillances.

Date of issuance: August 29, 1996

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

Amendment No.: 151

Facility Operating License No. NPF-35: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 10, 1996 (61 FR 15986) The May 16 and August 27, 1996, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the September 30, 1994, 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 August 29, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey

Date of application for amendment: July 17, 1996, as supplemented August 28, 1996 (TSCR 242, Rev. 2). This application supersedes applications dated February 23 (TSCR 242) and June 19, 1996 (TSCR 242, Rev. 1).

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications (TS) to allow the implementation of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B.

Date of Issuance: September 3, 1996

Effective date: September 3, 1996, to be implemented within 30 days of issuance

Amendment No.: 186

Facility Operating License No. DPR-16. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 31, 1996 (61 FR 40019) Supersedes notice dated March 27, 1996 (61 FR 13526). The August 28, 1996, supplement provided updated and corrected TS and bases pages. These

revisions were within the scope of the original application and did not change the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. Therefore renoticing was not warranted. The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: location: Ocean County Library, Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753

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: February 22, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated July 3, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Clinton Power Station Technical Specifications for the drywell to permit bypass testing on a 10-year frequency with increased testing if performance degrades, changes the drywell air lock testing and surveillance requirements, deletes action notes for the drywell air lock and drywell isolation valves when the bypass leakage limit is not met, and deletes the specific leakage limits for the drywell air lock seal.

Date of issuance: September 4, 1996

Effective date: September 4, 1996

Amendment No.: 106

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 24, 1996 (61 FR 18170) The July 3, 1996, submittal consisted of supporting technical information which did not change the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the scope of the original notice. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-443, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire

Date of amendment request: June 20, 1996

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment modifies the Seabrook Station Appendix A Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Electrical Power Systems, Onsite Power Distribution. Specifically, the proposed amendment changes TS 3.8.3.1, Action a., to increase from 8 hours to 7 days the allowable time that 480-volt Emergency Bus tE64 may be less than fully energized.

Date of issuance: August 30, 1996

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

Amendment No.: 48

Facility Operating License No. NPF-86. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 26, 1996 (61 FR 33142) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 30, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: location: Exeter Public Library, Founders Park, Exeter, NH 03833

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

Date of application for amendment: April 25, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the calibration requirement for the source range monitors and intermediate range monitors by noting that the sensors are excluded.

Date of issuance: August 19, 1996

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

Amendment No.: 96

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 19, 1996 (61 FR 31183) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 19, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, CT 06385

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

Date of application for amendment: March 28, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes Technical Specification 3.7.7, ''Sealed Source Contamination,'' and its Bases that modify the criteria for testing sealed sources for contamination and leakage. The approved changes are consistent with the testing criteria currently used at the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, the Haddam Neck Plant, and the Seabrook Station.

Date of issuance: September 4, 1996

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

Amendment No.: 202

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 8, 1996 (61 FR 20853) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1996 No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, CT 06385

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket No. 50-133, Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit 3, Humboldt County, California

Date of application for amendment: March 13, 1996

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revised the Technical Specification by incorporating position changes to reflect a proposed plant staff reorganization.

Date of issuance: September 6, 1996

Effective date: This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance and must be fully implemented no later than 30 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 31Facility License No. DPR-7: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 24, 1996 (61 FR 18174) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 6, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Humboldt County Library, 1313 3rd Street, Eureka, California 95501

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: February 23, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated June 28, 1996

Brief description of amendments: These amendments change the Technical Specification Requirement 4.6.2.1d concerning drywell-to-suppression chamber bypass testing interval to correspond with the interval for Primary Containment Integrated Leak Rate Testing under 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B.

Date of issuance: September 6, 1996

Effective date: September 6, 1996

Amendment Nos.: 160 and 131

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 10, 1996 (61 FR 15992) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 6, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18701

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

Date of application for amendment: June 21, 1996, as supplemented August 19, 1996, and August 21, 1996.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment extends the surveillance interval on certain instruments from 18 to 24 months.

Date of issuance: September 5, 1996

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

Amendment No.: 168

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 31, 1996 (61 FR 49027) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 5, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: March 6, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated May 30, 1996.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1, ''A.C. Sources - Operating,'' to decrease the minimum fuel oil storage capacity of the Emergency Diesel Generator Fuel Oil Storage Tanks, from 48,800 to 44,800 gallons. In addition, footnote ** is deleted from TS 3.8.1.1.b.2. The TS change also adds an Action Statement to address remedial action when a fuel oil transfer pump becomes inoperable.

Date of issuance: September 10, 1996

Effective date: As of date of issuance, to be implemented within 90 days.

Amendment No.: 96

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 3, 1996 (61 FR 34897) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 10, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: December 22, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The change revises the San Onofre Unit 1 License Condition to delete a reference to License Condition 2.C(4) from License Condition 2.D. This change eliminates a reporting requirement for violations of the physical protection plans that is redundant to reporting requirements in 10 CFR 73.71 and 10 CFR Part 73 Appendix G.

Date of issuance: August 30, 1996

Effective date: August 30, 1996 and shall be implemented no later than 30 days from August 30, 1996.

Amendment No.: 157

Facility Operating License No. DPR-13: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 31, 1996 (61 FR 40028) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 30, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Science Library, University of California, Irvine, California 92713

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama

Date of amendments request: June 12, 1996

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the reactor core safety limits, Overtemperature delta T (OTDT) and Overpressure delta T (OPDT) reactor trip setpoints and allowable values, and the power distribution limits associated with implementation of Relaxed Axial Offset Control (RAOC) and F_Q surveillance. The amendments also include changes to the Bases associated with these specifications and surveillances.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1996

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

Amendment Nos.: 121 and 113

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8: Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 31, 1996 (61 FR 40029) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: location: Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama 36302

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama

Date of amendments request: June 20, 1996

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications to reflect the implementation of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1996

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

Amendment Nos.: 122 and 114

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8: Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 31, 1996 (61 FR 40030) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: location: Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama 36302

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-390 Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendment: July 31, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification 3.6.12 to allow a one-time extension of the 3-month surveillance requirement for the ice condenser lower inlet doors.

Date of issuance: September 9, 1996

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

Amendment No.: 3

Facility Operating License No. NPF-90: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 8, 1996 (61 FR 41431) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 9, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: None

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

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

Date of application for amendment: February 19, 1996, as supplemented on July 3 and August 26, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant Technical Specification Section 4.2 and its associated basis by allowing the application of a voltage-based repair limit for the steam generator tube support plate intersections experiencing outside diameter stress corrosion cracking. The repair criteria are based on guidance provided in Generic Letter 95-05, ''Voltage-Based Repair Criteria for Westinghouse Steam Generator Tubes affected by Outside Diameter Stress Corrosion Cracking,'' dated August 3, 1995, and on associated industry guidance.

Date of issuance: September 11, 1996

Effective date: September 11, 1996, and is to be implemented within 30 days of the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 126

Facility Operating License No. DPR-43: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 10, 1996 (61 FR 15999) The July 3 and August 26, 1996, submittals provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 11, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of amendment request: October 24, 1995, and superseded by letter dated May 16, 1996.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment adopts ASTM D3803-1989 as the laboratory testing standard for charcoal samples from the charcoal absorbers in the control room filtration system, control building pressurization system, and the auxiliary/fuel building emergency exhaust system. The output of the heaters in the control building pressurization system is reduced from a nominal 15kW to a nominal 5kW and the acceptance criterion for the testing of the charcoal absorbers is changed.

Date of issuance: September 4, 1996

Effective date: September 4, 1996, to be implemented within 120 days of the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 102

Facility Operating License No. NPF-42. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 5, 1996 (61 FR 28622) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1996. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: locations: Emporia State University, William Allen White Library, 1200 Commercial Street, Emporia, Kansas 66801 and Washburn University School of Law Library, Topeka, Kansas 66621 Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of September 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Steven A. Varga,

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

[Doc. 96-24413 Filed 9-24-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Privacy Act of 1974; Computer Matching Programs OPM/Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

ACTION: Publication of notice of computer matching to comply with Public Law 100–503, the Computer Matching and Privacy Act of 1988.

SUMMARY: OPM is publishing notice of its computer matching program with the Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) to meet the reporting and publication requirements of Public Law 100–503. The purpose of the match is to identify and/or prevent erroneous payments under the Civil Service Retirement Act (CSRA) or the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act (FERSA) and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA). The match will identify individuals receiving prohibited concurrent benefits under CSRA or FERSA and the FECA. Both the CSRA and FERSA, on one hand, and the FECA, on the other, prohibit the receipt of certain concurrent payments covering the same period of time. The match will involve the OPM system of records published as OPM CENTRAL–1, Civil Service Retirement and Insurance Records at 60 FR 63075, December 8, 1995, and the Department of Labor system of records published as DOL/GOVT–1, entitled ''Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Federal Employees' Compensation Act File'', at 58 FR 49548, on September 23, 1993, with amendments published at 59 FR 47361 on September 15, 1994.

DATE: The matching program will begin in October 1996, or 40 days after agreements by the parties participating in the match have been submitted to Congress and the Office of Management and Budget, whichever is later. The matching program will continue for 18 months from the beginning date and may be extended an additional 12 months thereafter. The data exchange will begin at a date mutually agreed upon between OPM and OWCP after October 1, 1996, unless comments are received which will result in a contrary determination. Subsequent matches will take place semi-annually on a recurring basis until one of the parties advises the other in writing of its intention to reevaluate, modify and/or terminate the agreement.

ADDRESS: Send comments to Kathleen M. McGettigan, Assistant Director for