Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506.

This meeting is for the purpose of application evaluation, under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including discussion of information given in confidence to the Agency by grant applicants. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman of February 8, 1994, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsections (c) (4), (6) and 9(b) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Yvonne Sabine, Advisory Committee Management Office, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC 20506, or call (202) 682–5439.

Dated: January 10, 1995.

**Yvonne M. Sabine,**

*Director, Council & Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.*

[FR Doc. 95–1213 Filed 1–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Wisconsin Electric Power Company; Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Denial of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for Hearing

**[Docket Nos. 50–266 and 50–301]**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has denied a request by Wisconsin Electric Power Company, the licensee, for an amendment to Facility Operating Licenses DPR–24 and DPR–27 issued to the licensee for operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, respectively, located in Two Creeks, Wisconsin. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating Licensee and Opportunity for a Hearing was published in the **Federal Register** on September 16, 1994 (59 FR 47656).

The licensee submitted the amendment request to revise Technical Specification (TS) Section 15.4.2, ''In-Service Inspection of Safety Class Components,'' by incorporating acceptance criteria to allow steam generator sleeved tubes with certain upper sleeve parent tube indications to remain in service as described in Westinghouse Electric Corporation's report WCAP–14157, ''Technical Evaluation of Hybrid Expansion Joint (HEJ) Sleeved Tubes With Indications Within the Upper Joint Zone.''

The NRC staff has concluded that the licensee's request cannot be granted because, based on available data, uncertainties in: the potential locations of cracking; crack growth rates; allowable maximum crack size; potential leakage rates; and the probability of detection of cracks are too great to demonstrate that licensing basis criteria would be satisfied for all normal and postulated accident conditions. The licensee was notified of the Commission's denial of the proposed change in a letter of

By February 17, 1995, the licensee may demand a hearing with respect to the denial described above. Any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a written petition for leave to intervene.

A request for hearing or 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.

A copy of any petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037, attorney for the licensee.

For further details on this action, see (1) the application for amendment of August 26, 1994, as supplemented by letters of September 2, 13, 22, and 29, 1994, October 5, and October 21, 1994, and (2) the Commission's letter to the licensee of January 11, 1995.

These documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Joseph P. Mann Library 1516 Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Leif J. Norrholm,**

*Project Director, Project Directorate III–3, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95–1173 Filed 1–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

### 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 December 12, 1994, through January 5, 1995. The last biweekly notice was published on January 4, 1995 (60 FR 494).

*Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed no Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing*

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

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

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would

result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. The filing of requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By February 17, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1–(800) 248–5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to (Project Director): petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that

the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

**Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50–293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts**

*Date of amendment request:* November 22, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the allowable leak rate for the main steam isolation valves (MSIVs) from the current 11.5 standard cubic feet per hour (scfh) for each valve, to a maximum combined main steam line leak rate of 46 scfh.

*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 operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed Amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment does not involve a change to structures, components, or systems which would affect the probability of an accident previously evaluated in the Pilgrim Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The proposed amendment results in no change in radiological consequences of the design basis LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident] as currently analyzed for Pilgrim Station. These analyses were calculated using the combined total leakage factor of 46 scfh for determining acceptance to the regulatory limits for the offsite, control room, and Technical Support Center (TSC) doses as contained in 10CFR100 and 10CFR50, Appendix A, GDC 19. The proposed change does not compromise existing radiological equipment qualification, since the combined total leakage rate of 46 scfh has been factored into our existing equipment qualification analyses for 10 CFR 50.49.

2. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

There is no modification to the MSIVs or other plant system or structure associated with this amendment which could impact their capability to perform their design function. The total MSIV leakage rate of 46 scfh is included in the current radiological analyses for the assessment of dose exposure following an accident. This proposal changes the allowable leakage rate from a per valve to a total combined line leakage acceptance criteria but does not change the cumulative allowable value. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

3. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The allowable leak rate limit specified for the MSIVs is used to quantify the maximum amount of bypass leakage assumed in the LOCA radiological analysis. Results of the analysis are evaluated against the dose guidelines contained in GDC [General Design Criteria] 19 and 10CFR100. The margin of safety in this context is considered to be the difference between the calculated dose exposures and the guidelines provided by the GDC 19 and 10CFR100. Therefore, since the maximum allowable leakage for each valve was assumed and used as the total allowable leakage for the purpose of calculating potential dose, the margin of safety is not affected because the dose levels remain the same.

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

*Local Public Document Room location:* Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

*Attorney for licensee:* W. S. Stowe, Esquire, Boston Edison Company, 800 Boylston Street, 36th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02199.

*NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler.*

**Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50–293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts**

*Date of amendment request:* November 22, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the mode conditions under which the Scram Discharge Instrument Volume-Scram Trip Bypass in Table 3.2.C.1 is required to be operable and changes the associated functional test frequency from quarterly to once per operating cycle in Table 4.2.C.

*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 operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to Table 3.2.C.1, and the associated change to Table 4.2.C, removes incorrect reactor modes listed for the Scram Discharge Instrument Volume (SDIV)—Scram Trip Bypass function. The Pilgrim control rod block logic for the SDIV Bypass is not operable nor is it required by design when in the Run and Startup modes. The control logic and the FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] (section 7.2.3.10) specifies SDIV—Scram Trip Bypass operability only in the Refuel and Shutdown modes.

This change will not result in any physical modification or operation of the control rod block system. The change conforms the technical specifications to the actual design of the SDIV Scram Trip Bypass as described in the FSAR. Changing the functional surveillance frequency from quarterly to once per operating cycle also conforms the technical specifications to the applicable mode for the function.

The change is classified as an administrative change because it corrects an administrative requirement that does not reflect the logic design. It improves safety by removing the need to install jumpers during reactor operations to perform unnecessary and potentially risky functional surveillances.

Therefore, because this is an administrative change, operation of Pilgrim will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

This proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because it is administrative and requires no physical alteration of the plant configuration, changes to setpoints, or operating parameters.

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

The proposed change serves to enhance the margin of safety by eliminating the potential for error caused by installing jumpers to the control logic during reactor operation. Changing the functional surveillance frequency from quarterly to once per operating cycle also enhances the margin of safety by allowing test performance off-line, the mode for which the SDIV scram trip bypass control rod blocks are designed to be operable.

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

*Local Public Document Room location:* Plymouth Public Library, 11

North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

*Attorney for licensee:* W. S. Stowe, Esquire, Boston Edison Company, 800 Boylston Street, 36th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02199.

*NRC Project Director:* Walter R. Butler.

**Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50–293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts**

*Date of amendment request:* November 22, 1994

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the suppression chamber water level operating range, increasing it 2 inches, and revise the water level recorder range.

*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 operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously identified.

The probability of an accident is not increased by this proposed change because there is no relation between the Suppression Chamber water level operating range and the probability of an accident.

The consequences of an accident identified are not increased. The Suppression Chamber is an accident mitigating device. Increasing the water level operating range has been analyzed and does not significantly increase the structural loads and the calculated stress levels remain within Mark 1 Acceptance Criteria.

We have reviewed the FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] Containment Analyses and concluded that the safety margin is not affected. An increase in water level enhances the Suppression Pool's ability to mitigate an accident by providing more water for use by emergency cooling systems. The higher water level increases the sink capabilities resulting in lower torus water temperatures from steam blowdowns. There is a minor reduction in the free air volume of the torus which has a negligible effect on containment post accident pressures. Therefore, there is no significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously identified.

The change in water level recorder range does not involve an increase in the probability or consequence of an accident because the new recording range accounts for instrument loop uncertainties and is thus more conservative than the previous range.

2. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

An increase in the Suppression Chamber water level operating range does not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed because the Suppression Chamber is an accident mitigating device. The Suppression Chamber serves as the heat sink for any postulated transient or accident condition when the primary heat sink (main condenser) is unavailable and as a source of water for the Core Standby Cooling Systems. The structural affects of the increase in water volume have been analyzed and do not significantly effect the Mark 1 containment loads.

Revising the water level recording range is more conservative than that previously used and does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Operation with an increased Torus water level does not affect the structure and attached piping of the Pilgrim Suppression Chamber and does not significantly affect the calculated stress levels; therefore, there is no significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The change in the water level recording range is due to replacing the transmitter with a smaller span. The change from 0 to 32 inches to -7 to +7 inches enhances resolution and accuracy of the water level instrument loop.

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

*Local Public Document Room location:* Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

*Attorney for licensee:* W. S. Stowe, Esquire, Boston Edison Company, 800 Boylston Street, 36th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02199.

*NRC Project Director:* Walter R. Butler.

**Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket Nos. 50–313, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1, Pope County, Arkansas**

*Date of amendment request:* August 30, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment relocates refueling cycle specific parameters from the technical specifications to the Core Operating Limits Report as per recommendations promulgated by NRC Generic Letter 88–16. Additionally, the amendment adds a 24 hour limit on operations when only one reactor coolant pump is operating in each loop.

*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:

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

The relocation of cycle-specific variables from the Technical Specifications to the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR) is considered to be administrative in nature and has no impact on plant operation or safety. The Technical Specifications will continue to require operation within the core operational limits for each cycle reload as calculated by the NRC approved reload methodologies. The values and setpoints placed in the COLR are addressed in the reload report for each particular fuel cycle. The reload report presents the results of evaluations of accidents addressed in the ANO–1 Safety Analysis Report. These evaluations demonstrate that changes in the fuel cycle design and the corresponding COLR do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The revision of Specification 3.1.1.1.a and addition of the footnote to Table 2.3–1 result in additional restrictions on operation with one reactor coolant pump in each loop with the reactor critical. This more restrictive specification limits operation with one reactor coolant pump in each loop to a 24 hour period when the reactor is critical. This change incorporates a more restrictive control and does not affect any previously analyzed event.

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

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

This relocation of cycle-specific variables from the Technical Specifications to the COLR does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed. The cycle-specific variables will continue to be calculated using NRC approved methodologies. Technical Specifications will continue to require operation within the required core operating limits and appropriate actions will be taken if the limits are exceeded. Because plant operation continues to be limited in accordance with the values of cycle-specific parameter limits that are established using NRC approved methodologies, the relocations included in this submittal are considered to be administrative in nature and have no impact on plant safety as a consequence.

The revision of Specification 3.1.1.1.a and addition of the footnote to Table 2.3–1 result in additional restrictions on operation with one reactor coolant pump in each loop with the reactor critical. This more restrictive specification limits operation with one reactor coolant pump in each loop to a 24 hour period when the reactor is critical. This proposed change introduces no new mode of plant operation.

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

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

The proposed relocations are considered to be administrative in nature and do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety since they only involve transferring limits from the Technical Specifications to the COLR. The values and setpoints placed in the COLR are addressed in the reload report for each particular fuel cycle. The development of limits for future reloads will continue to conform to methodologies described in NRC approved documentation. Each future reload involves a 10CFR50.59 safety review to assure that operation of the unit within the cycle-specific limits will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The revision of Specification 3.1.1.1.a and addition of the footnote to Table 2.3–1 result in additional restrictions on operation with one reactor coolant pump in each loop with the reactor critical. This more restrictive specification limits operation with one reactor coolant pump in each loop to a 24 hour period when the reactor is critical. This change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety, rather, it constitutes an additional limitation not previously included in the Technical Specifications.

Therefore, this change does *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:* Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801.

*Attorney for licensee:* Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005–3502.

*NRC Project Director:* William D. Beckner.

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

*Date of amendment request:* November 9, 1994.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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, Mississippi 39120.

*Attorney for licensee:* Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., 12th Floor, Washington, DC 20005–3502.

*NRC Project Director:* William D. Beckner.

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

*Date of amendment request:* December 6, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications to allow the use of the Combustion Engineering sleeving process for repairing steam generator tubes. (The current requirement specifies that degraded steam generator tubes be repaired by plugging.)

*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 has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standard of 10 CFR 59.92(c). The staff's review is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the

probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

With the sleeve dimensions, materials, and connecting joints designed to the applicable American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code), the proposed sleeving repair becomes an in-kind substitution for the steam generator tube being repaired. The design criteria for the sleeves conform to the stress limits and safety margins of Code Section III. Safety factors of 3 (normal operation) and 1.5 (accident conditions) were applied to the sleeve design. Mechanical testing using Code stress allowables also has been performed in support of the sleeve design. Based on the results of vendor test and analysis programs, the sleeves fulfill their intended function as leak tight structural members and meet or exceed all design criteria.

Evaluation of the steam generator tubes and proposed sleeves indicates no detrimental effects on the sleeve or sleeve-tube assembly from reactor coolant system flow, reactor or steam generator coolant chemistry, or thermal or pressure conditions (including transients) that may be experienced by the Maine Yankee plant. Corrosion testing of sleeve-tube assemblies indicates no evidence of sleeve or steam generator tube corrosion considered detrimental under anticipated service conditions.

Installation of the proposed sleeves will be controlled via Combustion Engineering's proprietary equipment and process. The process has been used 24 separate times since 1984 to install approximately 4100 steam generator sleeves in nuclear facilities worldwide. The Maine Yankee steam generator design has been reviewed and found compatible with the sleeve installation equipment and process. Installation of the proposed sleeves will have no significant effect on either plant configuration or operation.

The licensee therefore concludes that implementation of the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

As discussed above, the structural integrity, thermal characteristics, and material properties of the proposed sleeves are compatible with Maine Yankee's steam generators. Therefore, the functions of the steam generators will not be significantly affected by installation of the proposed sleeves. In addition, the proposed sleeves do not interact with any other plant systems. Finally, the continued integrity of installed sleeves is periodically verified by the steam generator inspections required by plant Technical Specifications.

The licensee therefore concludes that implementation of the proposed change will not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Repair of degraded steam generator tubes via the use of the proposed sleeves has been confirmed to restore the structural integrity of faulted tubes under normal operating and postulated accident conditions. The design safety factors used for the sleeves are consistent with ASME Code safety factors required in the design of Maine Yankee's steam generators. The repair limit for the proposed sleeves is consistent with that established for Maine Yankee's steam generators. The design of the sleeve-to-tube joint has been verified by testing to preclude significant leakage during normal and postulated accident conditions. Use of the previously identified design safety factors design verification testing assures that margin to safety with respect to installation of the proposed sleeves is not significantly different from the original steam generator tubes.

The licensee therefore concludes that implementation of the proposed change would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

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

*NRC Project Director:* Walter R. Butler.

**Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York**

*Date of amendment request:* December 23, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specifications (TSs) 2.1.2, ''Fuel Cladding Integrity,'' 3.6.2/4.6.2, ''Protective Instrumentation,'' and associated Bases to extend the calibration frequency of the reactor recirculation flow transmitters from once per quarter to once per operating cycle and for the square rooters and summers from once per quarter to once per year. The proposed amendment would revise the flow biased average power range monitor (APRM) scram and rod block, recirculation flow comparator, and flow unit upscale setpoints and the associated Bases of TSs 2.1.2, 2.2.2, and 3.6.2/4.6.2.

*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 operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes extend the calibration interval for the recirculation flow square rooters, summers and transmitters and revise the setpoints for the recirculation flow upscale and comparator rod block trips. The associated analytical limits for APRM flow biased scram and rod block increase by 2% and 8% respectively. Setpoints are for plant protective functions (i.e., scram and rod block) which respond to an accident or transient. The scram and rod block function responds to mitigate the consequences of an accident or transient. Therefore, a change to the setpoints cannot increase the probability of these accidents or transients. Likewise, changes to surveillance intervals for the protective functions which respond to an accident or transient cannot increase the probability. In fact, the proposed increase in the surveillance intervals reduce the probability of an inadvertent scram by reducing the duration that the plant is in the one-half scram condition.

The new surveillance intervals, setpoints and allowable setpoint deviations are calculated using the approved GE [General Electric Company] setpoint methodology documented in NEDC–31336. The methodology in NEDC–31336 provides assurance that safety system actuation (i.e., reactor scram or control rod withdrawal block) will occur prior to the associated system parameters (neutron flux and recirculation flow) exceeding their analytical limits. Based upon re-evaluation of NMP1 [Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1] accidents and transients, it has been shown that the fuel thermal limits are not significantly impacted. Therefore, the consequences of an accident or transient has not significantly increased.

Thus, plant response to previously analyzed accidents remains within previously determined limits. Therefore, the operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to extend the calibration frequency do not represent a physical change to the plant as described in the NMP1 Final Safety Analysis Report (Updated). However, this change results in increasing the analytical limits for the APRM flow based scram and rod block by 2% and 8% respectively. The proposed changes do not alter the plant configuration and the initial conditions used for the design basis accident analysis are still valid. Thus, no potential initiating events are created which would cause any new or different kinds of accidents. As such, the plant initial conditions utilized for the design basis accident analysis are still valid. Therefore, operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1 in accordance with the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously assessed.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The analytical limits for the APRM flow biased scram and rod block increase by 2% and 8% respectively. The trip units in the APRM and recirculation flow instrumentation systems will continue to be calibrated every three months. In addition, the entire APRM and recirculation flow instrumentation systems will still be subject to Instrument Channel Tests every three months. These tests, together with the calibration of the flow square rooters and summers once per year and the flow transmitters once per operating cycle, will assure that system reliability and availability are maintained at their current levels. Reanalysis of the design basis transients was performed utilizing these new values. The results showed that the increase had an insignificant effect on the consequences of these events. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 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:* Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

*Attorney for licensee:* Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005–3502.

*NRC Project Director:* Michael J. Case

**Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–410, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 2, Oswego County, New York**

*Date of amendment request:* December 13, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification Table 3.6.1.2–1, ''Allowable Leak Rates Through Valves in Potential Bypass Leakage Paths,'' to increase the maximum allowable leakage rate of each of the eight main steamline isolation valves from 6.0 scfh to 24.0 scfh.

*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 operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes to Technical Specification Table 3.6.1.2–1 would allow a maximum leakage of 24.0 scfh for each of the eight MSIVs [main steamline isolation valves]. The current Technical Specifications allow a maximum leakage for an MSIV of 6.0 scfh.

Closure of one or more of the MSIVs at rated power is a pressure transient for the reactor coolant pressure boundary. This pressure transient is evaluated in Section 15.2.4 of the USAR [Updated Safety Analysis Report]. Closure of MSIV(s), as analyzed in the USAR, could occur due to manual or automatic actions. A change to the leakage limit for the MSIVs does not affect either the manual or automatic actions that would close the MSIVs. Therefore, the proposed change to the table cannot affect the probability of the closure of one or more MSIVs at rated power.

The radiological evaluation of the DBA–LOCA [Design Basis Accident—Loss-of-Coolant Accident] incorporates a maximum leakage of 24.0 scfh for each of the four main steam lines. In addition, the revised radiological evaluation includes the impact of the proposed license amendment currently under review by the Staff which would increase the rated operation of NMP2 from 3323 to 3467 megawatts thermal (see NMPC letter dated July 22, 1993 to the NRC). The revised radiological evaluation also includes the impact of License Amendment No. 56 (see NMPC letter dated July 1, 1994 to the NRC and License Amendment No. 56, dated August 30, 1994).

The new doses from the revised radiological analysis for a DBA–LOCA, as shown in Table 1 [of December 13, 1994, amendment request], continue to remain below 10 CFR [Part] 100 guideline values and GDC [General Design Criterion] 19 limits. The impact of the increased MSIV leakage on vital area access and equipment qualification is minimal and acceptable. Therefore, operation with the proposed change to the Technical Specifications will not significantly increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The safety function of the MSIVs is to isolate the main steam lines in a timely manner to preclude the uncontrolled leakage of radioactive steam. This is accomplished by providing the MSIVs with the capability of rapidly closing automatically in response to various plant conditions. The increase in the leakage limit for the MSIVs from 6.0 scfh to 24.0 scfh will not inhibit the MSIVs' isolation function. Therefore, operation with the proposed increase in the MSIV leakage will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The revised radiological analysis follows the very conservative fuel failure and instantaneous release assumptions of RG [Regulatory Guide] 1.3, with the exception of regulatory position C.1.f as permitted by SRP [Standard Review Plan] Section 6.5.5, ''Pressure Suppression Pool as a Fission Product Cleanup.'' The Staff approved the use of SRP Section 6.5.5. as part of the licensing basis of NMP2 in License Amendment No. 56.

The revised radiological analysis incorporates the maximum allowable leakage limit of 24.0 scfh for each of the four main steam lines. The revised radiological analysis also includes the impacts of the proposed power uprate of NMP2 and License Amendment No. 56. The new doses from the revised radiological analysis remain below the Staff acceptance criteria of 10 CFR [Part] 100 guideline values and GDC 19 (see Table 1 [of December 13, 1994, amendment request]). Therefore, operation with the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications will not significantly reduce a margin of safety.

Accordingly, as determined by the analysis above, this proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005–3502.

*NRC Project Director:* Michael J. Case.

**Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Dockets Nos. 50–277 and 50–278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania**

*Date of application for amendments:* August 3, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed changes would delete a footnote in the Technical Specifications (TS) regarding snubber functional testing frequency and make permanent the current one-time snubber functional test frequency of 24 months.

*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, because the probability of a seismic or other dynamic event is independent of the surveillance period for snubber tests. The change does not introduce any failure mechanisms to the previously considered events. The consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the SAR [Safety Analysis Report] is not increased by the proposed revision to [t]he snubber TS. No physical changes are being made to the plant. The snubbers' role in mitigating the consequences of an accident is to provide restraint during seismic or other dynamic events while permitting the slow movement of piping and components during heatup and cooldown. The proposed TS change will not affect the snubbers ability to continue to perform this role for the following reasons: (1) Changing the inspection cycle to 24 months will not reduce the ability of the functional testing to confirm the operability of the snubber population. The original interval of 18 months was selected to accommodate the need to test snubbers that were inaccessible during normal operation. Since snubbers do not require preventative maintenance during the operating cycle, the additional time added by a 24 month operating cycle has minimal impact, if any, on snubber operability. (2) The requirement to monitor service life remains part of TS. The review of snubber service life records is a documentation review of the snubbers service life. If a snubber's service life would expire prior to the next scheduled review then the snubber is reconditioned, replaced or reevaluated to extend its service life. (3) Snubber functional testing has shown no failure mechanism which would be aggravated by an extension of the test interval to 24 months. A historical search of completed snubber functional STs was completed. The historical search indicated that even though the snubbers did not always meet the initial screening functional test criteria of the ST, the piping system was operable based on an engineering evaluation and there was no evidence of a time dependent failure mechanism. To ensure the snubber remains operational during the next operating cycle, snubbers not meeting the screening ST acceptance criteria are either replaced or reconditioned.

(2) The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because the proposed change does not involve operational procedure or physical changes to the plant. Since snubbers will continue to meet their design basis of protecting the piping and equipment during dynamic events, the possibility of a different type of accident will not be created.

(3) The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. There may be a slight increase, if any, in the possibility of undetected snubber failures because of the increase in the interval of functional testing for snubbers; however, the historical data of previous snubber functional surveillance testing and the supporting engineering evaluations indicate that on those occasions where snubbers did not meet initial surveillance testing requirements, the piping systems were all operable. Therefore, the probability of occurrence of a malfunction of equipment is minimal and equipment important to safety (ITS) that use snubbers will continue to meet design requirements and the margin of safety will be unaffected.

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

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

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

*NRC Project Director:* John F. Stolz.

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

*Date of amendment request:* September 29, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment requests revision of Table 4.3.6–1 ''Control Rod Block Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements.'' The channel calibration frequencies for the Source Range Monitor (SRM) and the Intermediate Range Monitor (IRM) would be changed as follows: the up-scale and the down-scale trip functions on each instrument would be changed from Note ''SA'', once-per-184 days to note ''R'', once-per-refuel interval.

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

The proposed changes involve no hardware changes, no changes to the operation of any systems or components, and no changes to existing structures. The revision of channel calibration frequencies for the SRM and IRM trip function portion of the control rod block instrumentation represent changes that do not affect plant safety and do not alter existing accident analyses.

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

The proposed changes are procedural in nature concerning the calibration frequency of instrumentation that have historically shown little set point drift. The channel calibration methodology for the SRM and IRM control rod block trip functions remain unchanged. The proposed changes while slightly increasing the possibility of an undetected instrument error will not create a new or unevaluated accident or operating condition.

3. Will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes are in accordance with recommendations provided by the NRC regarding the improvement of Technical Specifications. These changes will result in the perpetuation of current safety margins while reducing regulatory burden and decreasing equipment degradation.

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:* Pennsville Public Library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, New Jersey 08070.

*Attorney for licensee:* M. J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005–3502.

*NRC Project Director:* John F. Stolz.

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

*Date of amendment request:* December 16, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) Technical Specification (TS) 3.4 by removing the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs) for the Turbine Overspeed Protection System (TOPS). Tables TS 4.1–1 and TS 4.1–3 would also be revised to remove the surveillance requirements for the TOPS instrumentation and turbine valves. The TOPS and related requirements would be relocated to the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR).

*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:

Significant Hazards Determination for Proposed Changes to TS 3.4.c and Table TS 4.1–1 and Associated Bases Changes

In accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.91 and using the standards provided in Section 50.92, the proposed change has been reviewed to determine that no significant hazards exist as a result of this change. The analysis showed:

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

The purpose of the Turbine Overspeed Protection System (TOPS) is to prevent an overspeed event, which is a precursor to a potential turbine-generated missile. Neither Transient Analyses nor Design Basis Accidents (DBAs) evaluated in the accident analyses contained in Chapter 14 of the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) assume operation of the TOPS. The calculations and probabilities associated with USAR section 14.2.7, ''Turbine Missile Damage to the Spent Fuel Pool,'' are not affected by this amendment. This amendment does not implement physical changes to the plant and does not change the KNPP's existing requirements. As a result, this change will not increase the probability of a previously evaluated accident.

The purpose of the TOPS is preventative and it serves no function to mitigate the consequences of any accident previously evaluated. Therefore, removing the requirements associated with the TOPS from the TSs will not affect the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

This amendment does not involve any changes in the operational characteristics of the surveillance tests and will impose no new requirements. This change will simply relocate the same testing requirements from the KNPP Technical Specifications to the KNPP USAR. Since this change is administrative in nature, it will not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

KNPP's USAR section 14.2.7, ''Turbine Missile Damage to the Spent Fuel Pool,'' will not be affected by this amendment. Relocating the TOPS and related requirements is a change that is administrative in nature and does not alter the intent of any requirements. Therefore it can be concluded that this change will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Significant Hazards Determination for Proposed Change to Table TS 4.1–3 and associated Basis Change

In accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.91 and using the standards provided in Section 50.92, the proposed change has been reviewed to determine that no significant hazards exist as a result of this change. The analysis showed:

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

This amendment does not involve any changes in the operation or frequency of the turbine valve tests. This amendment will simply relocate the turbine valve testing requirements from the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant's (KNPP's) Technical Specifications (TSs) to the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR). This change is administrative in nature and therefore will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

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

This amendment is administrative in nature and will not change any requirements. This change will simply relocate the requirements from the KNPP TSs to the USAR. The purpose of the turbine stop and governor valves is to control steam flow to the turbine. This amendment will not adversely affect the steam flow control capability of the turbine valves. Therefore, this change will not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

This amendment will simply relocate the existing turbine valve testing requirements and will not result in any changes to the requirements. The KNPP will continue to follow the recommendations of WCAP 11525, ''Probabilistic Evaluation of Reduction in Turbine Valve Test Frequency.'' As a result, KNPP will continue to maintain acceptably low probabilities of turbine valve failure. Since the same requirements still exist and turbine valve testing will continue to be consistent with the recommendations of WCAP 11525, this amendment will not involve a significant decrease 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:* University of Wisconsin Library Learning Center, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

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

*NRC Project Director:* Leif J. Norrholm.

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

*Date of amendment request:* December 12, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request proposes revising Technical Specifications 4.7.1.2.1.b.1 and 4.7.1.2.1.b.2 to clarify the surveillance requirements for verifying the correct required position for the valves in the auxiliary feedwater system.

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

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

The proposed changes do not affect the ability of the auxiliary feedwater system to perform its intended safety function. The changes are administrative in nature since they merely clarify the demonstration of operability required in the surveillance requirements.

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

There are no new failure modes or mechanisms associated with the proposed changes. The changes are administrative changes to remove confusion when performing surveillance requirements to demonstrate operability.

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

These proposed changes do not effect [sic] any technical specification margin of safety. The changes only provide clarification for performance of surveillance requirements.

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

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

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

*NRC Project Director:* Theodore R. Quay

**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.

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

*Date of amendment request:* November 25, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification 5.3.1.E to allow 2645 fuel assemblies to be stored in the fuel pool. This is an increase of 45 fuel assemblies from the current limit of 2600. The 45 additional storage locations currently exist in the racks in the fuel pool. They were included in the re-racking project allowed by License Amendment No. 76 but were not incorporated in the Technical Specifications since, at the time, it was believed they would not be needed.

*Date of publication of individual notice in* **Federal Register**: December 20, 1994 (59 FR 65542).

*Expiration date of individual notice:* January 19, 1995.

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

**Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50–298, Cooper Nuclear Station, Nemaha County, Nebraska**

*Date of amendment request:* December 22, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment is a Line Item Technical Specifications Improvement and would revise the Cooper Nuclear Station Technical Specifications, definition 1.0.J, concerning entering an operational condition consistent with the wording proposed in NRC Generic Letter 87–09, ''Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of the Standard Technical Specifications on the Applicability of Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements,'' dated June 4, 1987.

*Date of individual notice in the* **Federal Register**: January 3, 1995 (60 FR 153).

*Expiration date of individual notice:* February 2, 1995.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Auburn Public Library, 118 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68305.

**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:* August 11, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment deletes the requirement to perform a 5-year interval hydrostatic test on the auxiliary coolant system critical headers from TS Section 4.1.3, Table 4.1–3, Item 11.

*Date of issuance:* December 28, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 28, 1994.

*Amendment No.:* 155.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60379).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 28, 1994. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College, 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:* July 28, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment allows an increased limit for fuel enrichment. The changes allow for the storage of fuel with an enrichment not to exceed 4.95 + 0.05 w/o U–235 in the new and spent fuel storage racks.

*Date of issuance:* January 5, 1995.

*Effective date:* January 5, 1995.

*Amendment No.* 156.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: August 31, 1994 (59 FR 45018).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 4, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised the Technical Specification to eliminate a compliance conflict when swapping the Centrifugal Changing (NV) pumps in Modes 4, 5, and 6. In eliminating the conflict, this amendment permits flexibility in the operation of the NV pumps during unit startup without a safety concern.

*Date of issuance:* November 17, 1994.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 152 and 134.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–9 and NPF–17:* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: October 13, 1994 (59 FR 52003).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 17, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223

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

*Date of application of amendments:* November 11, 1993, as supplemented February 23, April 12, and July 29, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments reflect the consolidation of the Quality Verification Department with the Nuclear Generation Department that realigned the Nuclear Safety Review Board to report to the Senior Nuclear Officer, change an organizational unit term from ''group'' to ''division,'' modify titles of positions designated to approve modifications, clarify the responsibilities of the Safety Assurance Manager, and delete the requirement to perform an annual fire protection audit.

*Date of Issuance:* January 4, 1995.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 208, 208, and 205.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–38, DPR–47, and DPR–55:* The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: January 5, 1994 (59 FR 619). The February 23, April 12 and July 29, 1994, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the November 11, 1993, application or the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 4, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Duquesne Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50–412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania**

*Date of application for amendment:* February 16, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment deletes the Appendix B Section 4.2.2 requirement to perform infrared aerial photography every other year.

*Date of issuance:* January 5, 1995.

*Effective date:* January 5, 1995.

*Amendment No:* 65.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF–73.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: July 6, 1994 (59 FR 34663). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* November 29, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated December 20 and 21, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment deleted the requirement to perform the full complement of steam generator surveillances as outlined in the technical specifications (TSs) when the steam generators are subjected to special inspections that are in addition to the periodic inspections required by the TSs. This amendment is applicable only to the special steam generator inspection scheduled for January 1995.

*Date of issuance:* January 5, 1995.

*Effective date:* January 5, 1995.

*Amendment No.:* 158.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: December 5, 1994 (59 FR 62416). The additional information contained in the supplemental letters dated December 20 and 21, 1994, was clarifying in nature and thus, within the scope of the initial notice and did not affect the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Mississippi Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50–416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi**

*Date of application for amendment:* June 17, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated August 17, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment removed License Condition 2.C.(25)(b) and Attachment 2 to Facility Operating License No. NPF–29, ''Transamerica Delaval Inc. (TDI) Diesel Generator Maintenance and Surveillance Requirements (NUREG–1216, August 1985).''

*Date of issuance:* January 4, 1995.

*Effective date:* January 4, 1995.

*Amendment No:* 114.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF–29.* Amendment revises the License.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: September 14, 1994 (59 FR 47167).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 4, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Florida Power and Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50–389, St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 2, St. Lucie County, Florida**

*Date of application for amendments:* September 23, 1993 and clarified July 25, 1994. The July 25, 1994 submission did not change the amendment described in the initial **Federal Register** notice.

*Brief description of amendments:* This amendment makes changes to Technical Specification 6.2.3, Independent Safety Engineering group. The change maintains the requirement to perform independent technical reviews while providing increased flexibility to accomplish this function.

*Date of Issuance:* December 22, 1994.

*Effective Date:* December 22, 1994.

*Amendment Nos.:* 69.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–67 and NPF–16:* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: October 27, 1993 (58 FR 57851). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 22, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Indian River Junior College Library, 3209 Virginia Avenue, Fort Pierce, Florida 34954–9003.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 20, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments relocate the diesel fuel oil testing program requirements to Technical Specifications (TS) Section 6 and to the Bases section of the TS. Also added were actions statements to address diesel fuel oil which does not meet the program limits.

*Date of issuance:* December 28, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 28, 1994.

*Amendment Nos.* 169 and 163.

*Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–31 and DPR–41:* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 9, 1994 (59 FR 55870).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 28, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 20, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments remove the schedule for withdrawal of reactor vessel material specimens from the Technical Specifications as discussed in Generic Letter 91–01.

*Date of issuance:* December 28, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 28, 1994.

*Amendment Nos.* 170 and 164.

*Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR–31 and DPR–41:* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60381).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 28, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* September 13, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated December 6, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments replace Containment Systems Technical Specification (TS) 3.6.2.2 for the Spray Additive System with a new Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) TS 3.5.5 for the ECCS Recirculation Fluid pH Control System.

*Date of issuance:* January 5, 1995.

*Effective date:* Phase I to be implemented following Unit 2 Cycle 4 refueling outage; Phase II to be implemented following Unit 1 Cycle 6 refueling outage.

*Amendment Nos.:* 77 and 56 Phase 1; 78 and 57 Phase II.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: October 26, 1994 (59 FR 53840). The December 6, 1994, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* October 19, 1991, as supplemented March 9, April 27, and December 15, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment establishes additional requirements for the availability of Local Power Range Monitors (LPRMs) associated with the Average Power Range Monitoring (APRM) system. These additional requirements further restrict the allowable number of out of service LPRM/APRM detectors in order to ensure a sufficient response to regional thermal hydraulic oscillations in the reactor core to prevent violation of the Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) safety limit. The amendment also identifies a lower bound MCPR operating limit for each cycle as identified in the Core Operating Limits Report. This limit shall be greater than or equal to 1.47.

*Date of Issuance:* December 29, 1994.

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

*Amendment No.:* 176.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR–16.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 13, 1991 (56 FR 57697). The March 9, April 27, and December 15, 1994, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**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:* July 18, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised TS Table 4.3–1, Reactor Trip System Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements; TS 3.3.4, Turbine Governor Valves; and TS

3.7.1.2, Turbine Driven Auxiliary Feedwater Pump, to remove one-time amendments that are no longer necessary. In addition, six minor editorial changes were made.

*Date of issuance:* December 27, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 27, 1994, to be implemented within 31 days of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 1—Amendment No. 67; Unit 2—Amendment No. 56.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: August 31, 1994 (59 FR 45024).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 27, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* June 30, 1994, as supplemented November 10, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The proposed amendment would add Operability Requirements, Limiting Conditions for Operations (LCO) and Surveillance Requirements for the Control Building Chillers.

*Date of issuance:* December 29, 1994.

*Effective date:* Date of issuance, to be implemented within 120 days.

*Amendment No.:* 205.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR–49.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: August 3, 1994 (59 FR 39592). The additional information contained in the supplemental letter dated November 10, 1994, was clarifying in nature and did not change the NRC staff's initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* November 15, 1993.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments make various administrative and editorial changes to the Technical Specifications.

*Date of issuance:* December 30, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 30, 1994.

*Amendment Nos.:* 186 and 172.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–58 and DPR–74.* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: December 22, 1993 (58 FR 67849).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 30, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* July 19, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments remove the specific requirements for Types A, B, and C containment leakage rate tests from the Technical Specifications and replace these requirements with a requirement to perform Types A, B, and C testing in accordance with Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50.

*Date of issuance:* January 5, 1995.

*Effective date:* January 5, 1995.

*Amendment Nos.:* 187/173.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–58 and DPR–74.* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: September 28, 1994 (59 FR 49430).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* November 15, 1993, and supplemented October 7, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments replace the current Technical Specification testing requirements for the Event V reactor coolant system pressure isolation valves with the requirements from ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI.

*Date of issuance:* January 5, 1995.

*Effective date:* January 5, 1995.

*Amendment Nos.:* 188/174.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–58 and DPR–74.* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: January 5, 1994 (59 FR 623).

At the request of the NRC, the licensee submitted the October 7, 1994, supplement to clarify the new requirements. This supplement did not change the NRC's initial proposed no significant hazards considerations finding; therefore, renoticing was not warranted.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Oswego County, New York**

*Date of application for amendment:* August 26, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises Technical Specification 4.3.3.c.(1) to permit a one-time extension of the second 10-year service period for the primary containment integrated leakage rate (Type A) test. The one-time extension permits delaying the third Type A test of the second 10-year service period from the 1995 refueling outage until the 1997 refueling outage. This delay will result in an interval of approximately 46 months between the second and third Type A tests of the second 10-year service period.

*Date of issuance:* December 29, 1994.

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

*Amendment No.:* 151.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF–63:* Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: September 28, 1994 (59 FR 49431). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**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:* April 22, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment changes Table 3.3–9 of the Technical Specifications by modifying the indicated measurement range for the neutron flux monitor on the remote shutdown panel. The amendment also includes some corrections of typographical errors in the Technical Specifications.

*Date of issuance:* December 20, 1994.

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

*Amendment No.:* 183.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: May 25, 1994 (59 FR 27059).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 20, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Learning Resources Center, Thames Valley State Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut 06360.

**Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50–423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut**

*Date of application for amendment:* July 22, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment (1) changes the title of Figure 3.1–5 to be consistent with the applicable Limiting Condition For Operation (LCO), (2) relocates the Chemical and Volume Control System (CVCS) valve position requirements to the Reactivity Control Systems—Shutdown Margin specifications, and (3) consolidates action statements to be expressed in the LCOs rather than in Surveillance Requirements. The amendment also clarifies the requirements for calculating the heat flux hot channel factor $F_Q(z)$ when using the base load option.

*Date of issuance:* December 29, 1994.

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

*Amendment No.:* 99.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF–49.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: August 31, 1994 (59 FR 45029).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50–423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut**

*Date of application for amendment:* June 2, 1994, as supplemented August 25, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TS) to remove expired one-time extensions of surveillance, removes an obsolete definition of charging pump operability, and incorporates 11 line item improvements in accordance with the guidance provided in Generic Letter 93–05. Several editorial changes have been made to renumber TS pages and delete the blank pages from the TS.

*Date of issuance:* January 3, 1995.

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

*Amendment No.:* 100.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF–49.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: September 14, 1994, (59 FR 47170).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 3, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 3, 1994, as supplemented November 30, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant Technical Specification 4.6, ''Periodic Testing of Emergency Power Systems.'' Specifically, the amendments modify the emergency diesel generator (EDG) 24-hour load test requirements to provide an indicated load range of 103–110 percent of the continuous rating. These amendments also rephrase various EDG test requirements to provide clarity and delete the requirements to verify that the auto-connected loads do not exceed 3000 kilowatts (Unit 2 5100 kilowatts).

*Date of issuance:* January 5, 1995.

*Effective date:* January 5, 1995, with full implementation within 30 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 113 and 106.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–42 and DPR–60.* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 9, 1994 (59 FR 55877).

The November 30, 1994, request provided additional clarification that was within the scope of the initial notice and did not affect the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration findings.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 5, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of amendment request:* October 7, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment (1) deletes the surveillance requirements contained in Technical Specification (TS) 3.6(3)a for the raw water backup valves to the containment cooling coils, (2) deletes the surveillance requirements in TS 3.2, Table 3–5, item 6, for raw water valves, and (3) revises the basis of TS 2.4 to reflect these changes.

*Date of issuance:* December 29, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 29, 1994.

*Amendment No.:* 166.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR–40.* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 9, 1994 (59 FR 55879).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**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:* April 5, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments delete the frequency requirements for a number of audits listed under Technical Specification 6.5.2.8 and also remove the audit requirements for the Emergency Plan and the Security Plan since these requirements have been added to the respective plan documents. The TS changes included in the April 5, 1994, application were approved with the exception of those related to the fire protection and loss prevention programs. These proposed changes are still under evaluation by the staff and will be addressed in a future safety evaluation.

*Date of issuance:* December 22, 1994.

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

*Amendment Nos.:* 137 and 107.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: May 25, 1994 (59 FR 27061).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 22, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50–333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York**

*Date of application for amendment:* September 16, 1994, as supplemented November 29, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised Technical Specifications Section 6.0 (Administrative Controls) to reflect, in part, licensee management changes in the corporate organization. Specifically, the title of Executive Vice President—Nuclear Generation was changed to Executive Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer and a new position, Vice President Regulatory Affairs and Special Projects, which reports to the Executive Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer, was established. In addition, the list of Safety Review Committee (SRC) members, which was previously by job title, was deleted and replaced with a description of SRC membership requirements, including individual qualifications and the minimum number of SRC members was reduced from 8 to 6.

*Date of issuance:* December 22, 1994.

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

*Amendment No.:* 220.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR–59:* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: September 30, 1994 (59 FR 50021).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 22, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50–333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York**

*Date of application for amendment:* August 4, 1994, as supplemented November 10, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises requirements in the Technical Specifications (TSs) related to primary containment atmosphere monitoring and drywell to torus differential pressure. Specifically, TS 3.7.A.6. has been revised to adopt primary containment inerting/deinerting requirements that are consistent with NUREG–1433, ''Standard Technical Specifications—General Electric Plants, BWR/4.'' TSs 4.7.A.6.a. and 4.7.A.7.a. have been revised to provide frequencies for the verification of primary containment oxygen concentration and pressure differential between the drywell and torus. TSs 3.7.A.7.a.(1), 3.7.A.7.a.(3), and 3.7.A.8. have been revised to provide requirements for establishing and maintaining differential pressure between the drywell and torus that are consistent with NUREG–1433. TS 3.7.A.9. has been deleted and related requirements have been incorporated into Notes for Table 3.2–8. Several administrative changes to Tables 3.2–8 and 4.2–8 have also been made to improve the overall quality of the TSs.

*Date of issuance:* December 28, 1994.

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

*Amendment No.:* 221.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR–59:* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: August 31, 1994 (59 FR 45032).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 28, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**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:* September 16, 1994, as supplemented November 29, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised Technical Specifications Section 6.0 (Administrative Controls) to reflect, in part, licensee management changes in the corporate organization. Specifically, the title of Executive Vice President—Nuclear Generation was changed to Executive Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer and a new position, Vice President Regulatory Affairs and Special Projects, which reports to the Executive Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer, was established. In addition, the list of Safety Review Committee (SRC) members, which was previously by job title, was deleted and replaced with a description of SRC membership requirements, including

individual qualifications and the minimum number of SRC members was reduced from 8 to 6.

*Date of issuance:* December 22, 1994.

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

*Amendment No.:* 156.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: September 30, 1994 (54 FR 50021).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 22, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* September 29, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments change the Technical Specification surveillance interval for performing an air or smoke flow test through each containment spray header from 5 to 10 years.

*Date of issuance:* December 27, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 27, 1994.

*Amendment Nos.* 163, 144.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60385).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 27, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

**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:* April 18, 1994, as supplemented October 26, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises Sections 2.C and 2.D of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (SONGS 1) Operating License. Section 2.C will be revised to modify or delete several licensing conditions which either no longer apply or require revision to apply to SONGS 1 in its permanently shutdown and defueled condition. Section 2.D will be revised to exempt Fire Protection reporting from the reporting requirements of Section 2.D.

*Date of issuance:* December 22, 1994.

*Effective date:* January 21, 1995.

*Amendment No.: 156.*

*Facility Operating License No. DPR–13:* The amendment revised the license conditions.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: May 25, 1994 (59 FR 27066).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 22, 1994.

*No significant hazards consideration comments received:* No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Main Library, University of California, P.O. Box 19557, 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:* October 20, 1994.

*Brief Description of amendments:* The amendments delete the requirements for the control room chlorine detection system from the TS and the associated Bases Sections. This request is based on the fact that all stored gaseous chlorine has been removed from the plant site except for containers having an inventory of 150 pounds or less.

*Date of issuance:* December 28, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 28, 1994.

*Amendment Nos.:* 111 and 102.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–2 and NPF–8.* Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60386).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 28, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* September 9, 1994 (TS 94–04).

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise the technical specifications related to the cold leg injection accumulators.

*Date of issuance:* December 27, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 27, 1994.

*Amendment Nos.:* 192 and 184.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–77 and DPR–79:* Amendments revise the technical specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: October 12, 1994 (59 FR 51629).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 27, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1101 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50–327, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1, Hamilton County, Tennessee**

*Date of application for amendment:* November 2, 1994 (TS 94–17).

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment adds Operating License Condition 2.C.(25) to provide a limited extension of the surveillance test intervals for certain specified instrumentation on Unit 1 to coincide with the Cycle 7 refueling outage. The surveillance intervals that are affected are specified in the attached safety evaluation and are for tests that would be extended to October 1, 1995, and would result in extension of the specified 18-, 36- and 54-month surveillances to 29.5, 48 and 71.5 months, respectively.

*Date of issuance:* January 3, 1995.

*Effective date:* January 3, 1995.

*Amendment No.:* 193.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–77:* Amendment revises the operating license.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60387).

The Commission's related evaluation of the change to the operating license is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 3, 1995.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1101 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402

**Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50–280 and 50–281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia**

*Date of application for amendments:* October 11, 1994.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise the surveillance frequencies of the hydrogen analyzer channel functional test and channel calibration.

*Date of issuance:* December 23, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 23, 1994.

*Amendment Nos.* 195 and 195.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–32 and DPR–37:* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: November 9, 1994 (59 FR 55893).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 23, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 22, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revises Section 6 of the Technical Specifications to reflect title changes in the Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation organization.

*Date of issuance:* December 29, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 29, 1994.

*Amendment No.:* 81.

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

*Date of initial notice in* **Federal Register**: October 26, 1994 (59 FR 53845).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 23, 1994.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revised Technical Specifications 3.8.1.1, ''AC Sources Operating,'' and 3.8.1.2, ''AC Sources Shutdown,'' to increase the minimum volume of fuel oil required for the emergency diesel generator fuel oil day tanks. Several other revisions are included that make editorial corrections and incorporate requirements that were inadvertently omitted from previous amendment requests that have been approved.

*Date of issuance:* December 29, 1994.

*Effective date:* December 29, 1994.

*Amendment No.:* 82.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 13, 1994 (59 FR 17609).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated December 29, 1994.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Jack W. Roe,**

*Director, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation*

[FR Doc. 95–1026 Filed 1–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

**[Release No. 34–35219; International Series Release No. 770; File No. SR–ISCC–94–4]**

## Self-Regulatory Organizations; International Securities Clearing Corporation; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change Relating to a Data Transmission Link With Monte Titoli, S.P.A.

January 11, 1995.

On August 9, 1994, the International Securities Clearing Corporation (''ISCC'') submitted a proposed rule change (File No. SR–ISCC–94–4) to the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') pursuant to Section 19(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'').[1] Notice of the proposal appeared in the **Federal Register** on September 22, 1994.[2] The Commission received no comments. This order approves the proposal.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b) (1988).

[2] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34679 (September 15, 1994), 59 FR 48652.

### I. Description of the Proposal

ISCC has entered into a contract to establish a data transmission link with Monte Titoli (''MT'').[3] The link will permit MT to hold U.S. securities listed on Italian stock exchanges in The Depository Trust Company (''DTC'') through ISCC. The service agreement, dated June 1, 1992, between ISCC and MT provides that ISCC will sponsor an account for MT at DTC which will provide MT access to certain DTC services.[4]

ISCC on behalf of MT will initiate book-entry deliveries for no value and will accept receives of securities by book-entry for no value.[5] Both the receive and deliver functions will be pursuant to instructions received from MT, and such instructions will identify the MT member for whom the receipt or delivery is being effected.[6] In special circumstances and at ISCC's discretion, DTC's withdrawal-by-transfer service also may be utilized. In such case, the securities will be delivered as directed by MT. MT will deposit with ISCC collateral to cover MT's obligations to ISCC.[7] To the extent that any money settlement is required, ISCC will receive payment in the form of an official bank check or a wire transfer through the MT designated correspondent bank.

On each business day at about 4:00 p.m., ISCC will transmit a preliminary settlement statement which will detail the net amount due to ISCC from MT or from ISCC to MT. Under the service agreement, MT agrees to pay to ISCC all

[3] MT provides settlement and depository services for securities listed on Italian stock exchanges.

[4] Under the service agreement, ISCC upon instructions received from MT will: (1) Accept receives of securities by book-entry through DTC; (2) initiate book-entry delivery of securities on deposit at DTC; (3) initiate reclamations of securities received at DTC; (4) make delivery of due bill checks or payments received by ISCC with respect to securities; (5) initiate messages to other DTC participants through the broadcast function of DTC; (6) process securities on deposit at DTC and securities subject to a reorganization, takeover, or similar action provided that requisite funds, if applicable, have been received in advance; (7) withdraw rights exited from DTC and deliver such rights to the agent designated by MT along with instructions received with respect to such rights; (8) at the discretion of ISCC, facilitate withdrawals-by-transfer of securities on deposit at DTC; and (9) order proxy materials for securities on deposit at DTC and complete such proxy materials as instructed.

[5] The related money settlements for the securities movements will take place between the parties outside of ISCC.

[6] As reflected on the DTC, records securities deposits will form the basis for the bookkeeping entries at MT on behalf of MT's participants.

[7] The amount of the deposit shall be the average of the three highest one-month fees over the prior twelve months plus the amount ISCC is required to deposit with DTC with respect to the sponsored account. However, the amount of MT's cash deposit with ISCC cannot be less than $50,000.