operation with higher enriched fuel have been evaluated by the NRC staff. Based on its review, the NRC staff has concluded that such changes would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed changes have no adverse affect on the probability of any accident. The higher enrichment, with increased fuel burnup, may slightly change the mix of fission products that might be released in the event of a serious accident, but such small changes would not significantly affect the consequences of serious accidents. No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment fuel and extended irradiation were published and discussed in the staff assessment entitled ''NRC Assessment of the Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel Enrichment and Irradiation,'' dated July 7, 1988. This assessment was published in connection with an Environmental Assessment related to the Shearon Harris Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, which was published in the **Federal Register** (53 FR 30355) on August 11, 1988, as corrected on August 24, 1988 (53 FR 32322). As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of an increase in the fuel enrichment of up to 5.0 weight percent Uranium-235 and irradiation limits of up to 60,000 gigawatt-days-per-metric-ton (GWD/MT) are either unchanged or may, in fact, be reduced from those summarized in Table S–4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c). These findings are applicable to the proposed increase at BVPS–1 given that the proposal involves 5% and burnup of less than 60,000 GWD/MT. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts of reactor operation with higher enrichment and extended irradiation, the proposed action involves features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any other alternative would have equal or greater environmental impacts and need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the requested amendment. This would not reduce environmental impact of plant operations and would result in reduced operational flexibility.

Alternative Use of Resources

The action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1 dated July 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 14, 1997, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. Michael P. Murphy of the Bureau of Radiation Protection, Department of Environmental Protection, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed license amendment.

Based upon the foregoing environmental assessment, we conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the application for amendment dated February 27, 1997, that 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—5- room located at the B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stolz,

Director, Project Directorate I–2, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97–13271 Filed 5–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice

Applications And Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from April 28, 1997 through May 9, 1997. The last biweekly notice was published on May 7, 1997 (62 FR 24984).

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

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

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

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the

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

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. The filing of requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By June 20, 1997, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

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

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

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

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

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

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to **(Project Director)**: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

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

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

Date of amendments request: December 27, 1996

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.6.1.3.b (peak containment internal pressure for the design basis loss of coolant accident (LOCA)) from 49.5 psig to 52 psig and the associated Bases Sections. The proposed amendments reflect values based on a revised LOCA analysis. The LOCA analysis was revised to reflect the maximum primary containment internal pressure specified in other TS. This maximum primary containment internal pressure was not used in the original LOCA analysis.

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

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed amendment increases the peak calculated containment internal pressure for the design basis LOCA from 49.5 psig to 52 psig. The maximum pressure occurs following an accident. Since the pressure is a consequence of an accident, this change has no effect on the probability of accident initiation, and therefore, the probability of an accident previously evaluated has not been significantly increased.

The consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) will not be significantly increased. UFSAR Section 15.6.5.6, ''Analyses of Effects and Consequences - Large Break LOCA,'' states that ''It is assumed that the containment leaks at the maximum rates allowed by the Technical Specifications, i.e., 0.1 vol. %/d for the first 24 hours and half of that rate thereafter.'' The dose calculation assumes that under accident conditions, the release of radionuclides to the containment is instantaneously homogenized within the containment free air volume. This results in a constant radioactivity per volume (curies/cc) regardless of containment internal pressure. Since radioactivity is assumed to be homogenized in the containment free air volume, the volume percent leaked per day is equivalent to the fraction of radioactivity which leaks from the containment per day. Therefore, the increase in the peak calculated containment internal pressure for the design basis LOCA from 49.5 psig to 52 psig does not effect dose consequences associated with the design basis LOCA. The proposed change to the peak calculated containment internal pressure for the design basis LOCA does not impact the radiological consequences of a LOCA as analyzed in Chapters 6 and 15 of the UFSAR.

The proposed amendments do not, therefore involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The possibility of a new or different kind of accident has not been created. The increase in the peak calculated containment internal pressure for the design basis LOCA does not affect the design or operation of existing plant equipment, nor involve new plant equipment. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The containment design pressure is 60 psig. The acceptance criteria in NRC Standard Review Plan, Section 6.2.1.1.A, ''PWR Dry Containments, including Subatmospheric Containments,'' requires in Item 11.1 that ''the containment design pressure should provide at least a 10% margin above the accepted peak calculated containment pressure following a loss of coolant accident.'' For PVNGS to maintain the required margin, this requires that the peak calculated containment internal pressure for the design basis LOCA would be no higher than 54 psig. Since the revised peak calculated containment internal pressure for the design basis LOCA remains below the 54 psig limit, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendments request involve no significant hazards consideration. Local Public Document Room location: Phoenix Public Library, 1221 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Attorney for licensee: Nancy C. Loftin, Esq., Corporate Secretary and Counsel, Arizona Public Service Company, P.O. Box 53999, Mail Station 9068, Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

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

Date of amendment request: April 9, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed change will extend the existing Technical Specifications surveillance intervals from 7 days to 14 days for the Channel Functional Tests for the refueling equipment interlocks and for the one-rod-out interlock. The change will permit, under most normal circumstances, a complete offloading, shuffling, or onloading of fuel, without the need to halt refueling activities solely for the performance of these surveillance tests.

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

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

The proposed change extends the Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement (SR) Frequency for the Channel Functional Tests (CFTs) for the refueling equipment interlocks and the one-rod-out interlock. The refueling equipment interlocks and the one-rod-out interlock are explicitly assumed in the analysis of the control rod removal error during refueling. Criticality, and therefore, subsequent prompt reactivity excursions are prevented during the insertion of fuel, provided all control rods are fully inserted during the fuel insertion. The refueling equipment interlocks accomplish this by preventing loading fuel into the core with any control rod withdrawn, or by preventing withdrawal of a control rod from the core during fuel loading. The one-rod-out interlock and adequate shutdown margin prevent criticality by preventing withdrawal of more than one control rod. With one control rod withdrawn, the core will remain subcritical, thereby preventing any prompt critical excursion. The proposed change does not change the function of any of these interlocks, only the frequency at which the interlocks undergo channel functional testing. A review of past test performances has demonstrated that extending the Frequency from 7 days to 14 days will not result in any increase in test failures. Therefore, the proposed change will not change the ability of these interlocks to perform when required. Based on this, there can be no significant increase in the radiological consequences of any previously evaluated accident since all interlocks will continue to perform as presently analyzed. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the

probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change extends the SR Frequency for performing CFTs for refueling equipment and one-rod-out interlocks. This change does not result in a modification to the plant or to the manner in which the plant is operated. The testing will still demonstrated the operability of the interlocks. Thus, the interlocks will still function in the same manner. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change extends the SR Frequency for performing CFTs on the refueling equipment and one-rod-out interlocks from 7 days to 14 days. Reviews of past test results indicate that extending the test interval to 14 days will not result in an increase in the number of CFT failures for these interlocks. This implies that extending the SR Frequency to 14 days will not result in an increase in the amount of time the instrument channels will be inoperable when required to be operable. Since the proposed change does not result in any reduction in the amount of time the instrument channels will be operable, the proposed 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: Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, Ohio 44081.

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

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

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

Date of amendment request: April 21, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications that would (1) reduce the volume of borated water in the core flood tank (CFT) from 1040 cubic feet to 940 cubic feet, (2) reduce the surveillance acceptance criteria for the emergency core cooling system (ECCS) high pressure injection (HPI) flowrate from 500 gallons per minute (GPM) to 431 GPM, and (3) revise a limiting condition for operation (LCO) which currently allows either local or remote manual operability of decay heat valves to delete the local manual valve operability option.

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

1. State the basis for the determination that the proposed activity will not represent a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident.

This TSCR [Technical Specification change request] revises the LCO for RB [reactor building] sump isolation valves, the LCO for the core flood tank level, and the surveillance requirement for HPI injection flow rate. The Core Flood and HPI systems are not actuated until an event occurs. The CFT level used in the new accident analysis is that level required to be maintained in the CFT throughout operation (i.e., pre-accident). The new CFT level does not prevent safe accident mitigation.

Likewise, the reduced HPI flow cannot cause an event to occur, and while such flow results in less injection to the RCS [reactor coolant system] when actuated, this is acceptable as demonstrated in the LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident] analyses. Changes to the LCO for the RB sump isolation valves support the safety analysis assumptions. The action statements related to both the level requirement and flow rates remain unchanged by this request. The function, operation and surveillance intervals for the isolation valves (DH-V-6A/B), the CFT level and HPI injection system are not changed by this request. Therefore, this activity does not increase the probability of occurrence of an accident, previously evaluated in the SAR [safety analysis report].

Reducing the CFT nominal volume and reducing the HPI flow acceptance criteria in the Technical Specifications will not increase the radiological consequences of any LOCA evaluated in the SAR. The results of analyses using the reduced CFT inventory and reduced HPI flow demonstrate that the consequences are within the limits of 10 CFR 50.46. No fuel failure in addition to that assumed in the evaluation of the dose consequences would occur. Therefore, the radiological consequences would not increase.

The editorial changes described above have no impact upon the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident.

2. State the basis for the determination that the activity does not create the possibility of an accident of a new or different type than any previously analyzed in the SAR.

This TSCR revises the LCO for RB sump isolation valves, the LCO for the core flood tank level, and the surveillance requirement for HPI injection flow rate. This change will not adversely affect the capability of the emergency core cooling systems in the event of a LOCA. The function, operation and surveillance intervals for both the borated water level in the core flood tank, and ECCS systems are not changed by this request and no physical changes or modifications are being made to Core Flood and HPI system boundaries. Therefore, because there are no configuration changes this activity does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than previously analyzed in the SAR.

In addition, the editorial changes described above do not create the possibility of an accident of a new or different type than any previously analyzed in the SAR.

3. State the basis for the determination that the margin of safety is not significantly reduced.

This TSCR revises the LCO for RB sump isolation valves, the LCO for the core flood tank level, and the surveillance requirement for HPI injection flow rate. No system configuration changes (hardware modifications) will be made to implement the change request, upon approval of the license amendment. The action requirements for these technical specifications have not changed. Actions to be taken if operability requirements are not met include plant shutdown under certain conditions.

Furthermore, impact upon the margin to safety is limited because the results of the LOCA analyses demonstrate that the 10 CFR 50.46 acceptance criteria are met, specifically: the PCT [peak clad temperature] limit and the core-wide oxidation limit of 1 percent of the fuel cladding, as identified in the Technical Specification bases. Hence the margin of safety as defined in the bases of any technical specification is not significantly reduced or impacted by the implementation of this change request, or the editorial changes described above.

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: Law/Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105.

Attorney for licensee: Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: Patrick D. Milano, Acting

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: April 22, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specifications 5.3.1, Fuel Assemblies, and 6.9.1.6, Core Operating Limits Report, to allow use of

an alternate zirconium-based fuel cladding, ZIRLO, and limited substitution of fuel rods by ZIRLO filler rods.

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

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

The methodologies used in the accident analyses remain unchanged. With the exception of a reduction in the heat flux hot channel factor (F_Q), the operating limits will not be changed. The proposed changes will not result in any equipment exceeding its design limits under normal or accident conditions. The calculated doses presented in the UFSAR will remain bounding. Other than the changes to the fuel assemblies, there are no physical changes to the plant associated with this Technical Specification change. A reload safety analysis will continue to be performed for each cycle to demonstrate compliance with fuel safety design bases.

VANTAGE+ fuel assemblies with ZIRLO clad fuel rods meet the same fuel assembly and fuel rod design bases as VANTAGE 5H fuel assemblies. Since the original design criteria are met, the ZIRLO clad fuel rods will not be an initiator for any new accident. The clad material is similar in chemical composition and has similar physical and mechanical properties to Zircaloy. Thus, cladding integrity is maintained and the structural integrity of the fuel assembly is not affected. ZIRLO cladding improves corrosion performance and dimensional stability. No concerns have been identified with respect to the mixed core of Zircaloy and ZIRLO clad assemblies. Also, no concerns have been identified with respect to the use of an individual assembly containing a combination of Zircaloy and ZIRLO clad fuel rods.

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

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

The proposed changes do not result in any equipment exceeding its design limits under normal or accident conditions. All design and performance criteria continue to be met and no new failure mechanisms have been identified. The ZIRLO cladding material offers improved corrosion resistance and structural integrity.

The proposed changes do not affect the operation of any system or component in the plant. The safety functions of the related structures, systems, or components are not changed, nor is the reliability of any structure, system, or component reduced. The changes do not affect the manner by which the facility is operated and do not change any facility design feature, structure, or system. No new or different type of equipment will be installed. Since there is no other change to the facility or operating procedures, and the safety functions and reliability of structures, systems, or components are not affected, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new accident or an accident different from those previously evaluated.

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

Use of ZIRLO fuel cladding material will not result in any equipment exceeding its design or licensing bases limits under normal or accident conditions. VANTAGE 5H reload design and safety analysis limits are unchanged. For each cycle reload core, the fuel assemblies will be evaluated using NRC-approved reload design methods, including consideration of the core physics analysis peaking factors and core average linear heat rate effects. ZIRLO fuel assemblies will be assessed for use under conditions consistent with normal core operating conditions allowed in the Technical Specifications. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

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 amendment request: March 26, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the technical specifications (TSs) which describe the control room ventilation system autostart functions.

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:

Per 10 CFR 50.92, the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration if the proposed changes do not:

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

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

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

Criterion 1

These changes are administrative in nature, intended to correct and clarify the TS description of control room ventilation system operation. Because no changes to plant operations or physical changes to the plant will occur due to these changes, they do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

Criterion 2

Because no changes to plant operations or the physical plant will occur due to these changes, the changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Criterion 3

These changes are administrative in nature, intended to correct and clarify the present TSs with regard to system operation descriptions. Thus, the changes involve no reduction in margins 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: Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

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

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

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 amendment request: March 26, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would make three administrative changes to the technical specifications (TSs) dealing with a grammatical error, an inadvertently deleted frequency requirement, and a footnote which is no longer applicable.

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:

Per 10 CFR 50.92, the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration if the proposed changes do not:

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

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

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

Criterion 1

This amendment request does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes to the TSs do not affect the assumptions, parameters, or results of any UFSAR accident analysis. The firstproposed change, ''A'', is a grammatical correction; the second proposed change, ''B'', reformats the page, and returns a frequency requirement that, while inadvertently deleted from the TSs, was still met via procedure; the third proposed change deletes a footnote which is no longer applicable. As described in Section II.C. of licensee's application request dated March 26, 1997, a load drop analysis is not required for single-failure-proof load blocks.

Criterion 2

The proposed changes do not involve physical changes to the plant or changes in plant operating configuration. The changes described above are essentially administrative in nature, and thus do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3

The proposed changes are essentially administrative in nature. Per NUREG-0612, single-failure-proof cranes are exempt from the requirements of a load drop analysis; therefore, there is no 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: Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

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

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

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

Date of amendment request: February 12, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change position titles in certain Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 (Seabrook) Appendix A Technical Specifications (TS) to reflect the present Seabrook organization, would clarify the approval authority for the Station Qualified Reviewer Program, and would correct a reference. Specifically, the proposed amendment would:

1. Change TS 6.0, ''Administrative Controls'' to reflect accurately the current North Atlantic Management organization, their assigned duties as previously reported to the NRC, and their proper titles,

2. Corrects an incorrect reference in TS 6.4.3.9.b., and

3. Clarifies the term ''Manager'' in TS 6.4.2, ''Station Qualified Reviewer Program.''

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

A. The changes do not involve a significant increase in the probabilityor consequences of an accident previously evaluated (10 CFR 50.92(c)(1)) because the proposed changes are merely administrative or editorial in nature. The proposed changes involve position title changes to reflect current organization, correct an incorrect reference, and provide clarification with regard to the organizational level for certain approvals. The changes do not affect the manner by which the facility is operated and do not change any facility design feature or equipment. Since there is no change to the facility or operating procedures, there is no effect upon the probability or consequences of any accident previously analyzed.

B. The changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated (10 CFR 50.92(c)(2)) because they do not affect the manner by which the facility is operated or involve any changes to equipment or features which affect the operational characteristics of the facility. Therefore, no new accident initiator is introduced that could cause a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated. The proposed changes merely involve position title changes to reflect current organization, correct an incorrect reference, and provide clarification with regard to the organizational level for certain approvals.

C. The changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety (10 CFR 50.92(c)(3)) because the proposed changes do not affect the manner by which the facility is operated or involve equipment or features which affect the operational characteristics of the facility.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: Exeter Public Library, Founders Park, Exeter, NH 03833.

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Esquire, Northeast Utilities Service Company, Post Office Box 270, Hartford CT 06141-0270.

NRC Project Director: Patrick D. Milano

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO), et al., Docket No. 50-423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: April 15, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would make changes to Technical Specification Sections 4.3.3.6 and 4.6.4.1, which require that the hydrogen monitors be periodically tested. Specifically, the changes to the surveillances would increase the testing of the monitor's hydrogen sensor, correct inconsistencies between surveillances, and make changes to the Bases of the surveillances.

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:

NNECO [Northeast Nuclear Energy Company] has reviewed the proposed changes in accordance with 10CFR 50.92 and has concluded that the change does not involve a significant hazards consideration (SHC). The bases for this conclusion is that the three criteria of 10CFR 50.92(c) are not satisfied. The proposed changes do not involve [an] SHC because the changes would not:

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

The proposed change to Technical Specification Surveillances 4.3.3.6 and 4.6.4.1 to perform a hydrogen sensor calibration test once per 92 days on a staggered test basis is consistent with the design and operation of the hydrogen monitor system. The hydrogen monitoring system is independent of the reactor coolant system boundary, has no effect on the probability of occurrence of a loss of coolant accident and performing surveillance testing does not significantly increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to Technical Specification Surveillances 4.3.3.6 and 4.6.4.1 to perform a hydrogen sensor calibration test will not require the opening of a containment isolation valve and conducting surveillance testing does not significantly increase the consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to Technical Specification Surveillances 4.3.3.6 and 4.6.4.1 to change the channel check frequency from once per 31 days to once per 12 hours on Table 4.3-7 Item 18, add an analog channel operational test to surveillance 4.3.3.6.2 and make editorial changes to the surveillances and bases sections are considered administrative changes. Administrative changes do not involve a significant increase in the

probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

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

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

The proposed changes to Technical Specification Surveillances 4.3.3.6 and 4.6.4.1 to perform a hydrogen sensor calibration test do not add any new equipment to the plant and do not affect the way any system important to safety is operated either in normal or under accident conditions.

The proposed changes to Technical Specification Surveillances 4.3.3.6 and 4.6.4.1 to change the channel check frequency from once per 31 days to once per 12 hours on Table 4.3-7 Item 18, add an analog channel operational test to surveillance 4.3.3.6.2 and make editorial changes to the surveillances and bases sections are considered administrative changes.

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

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

The proposed changes to Technical Specification Surveillances 4.3.3.6 and 4.6.4.1 to perform a hydrogen sensor calibration test will provide assurance of expected instrument performance under accident conditions and performing surveillance testing do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes to Technical Specification Surveillances 4.3.3.6 and 4.6.4.1 to change the channel check frequency from once per 31 days to once per 12 hours on Table 4.3-7 Item 18, add an analog channel operational test to surveillance 4.3.3.6.2 and make editorial changes to the surveillances and bases sections are considered administrative changes. Administrative changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

In conclusion, based on the information provided, it is determined that the proposed changes do not involve an SHC.

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

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

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

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO), et al., Docket No. 50-423, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: April 17, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specification 3.7.14 by clarifying the actions to be taken when an area temperature exceeds its temperature limit.

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:

NNECO [Northeast Nuclear Energy Company] has reviewed the proposed change in accordance with 10CFR 50.92 and has concluded that the change does not involve a significant hazards consideration (SHC). The bases for this conclusion is that the three criteria of 10CFR 50.92(c) are not satisfied. The proposed change does not involve [an] SHC because the change would not:

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

The proposed change to Technical Specification 3.7.14 will establish allowable tolerances to ensure that the applicable systems, structures and components are operated within their existing design bases.

Technical Specification 3.7.14 specifies the actions to be taken when an area temperature exceeds its temperature limit. The action taken is dependent on the amount and duration by which the area temperature exceeds its limit. Actions are currently specified for exceeding area temperature by less than 20 °F and greater than 20°F for periods less than 8 hours and for periods greater than 8 hours. This change clarifies the actions to be taken when the temperature exceeds its limit by exactly 20 °F or exceed its limit for exactly 8 hours. It is concluded that this change is a clarification only in that it causes the more conservative actions to be taken at greater than or equal to 20 °F, or at greater than or equal to 8 hours.

The proposed change, therefore, does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Establishment of tolerances and clarification of actions at a specific value does not [ ] change the operation of any system, structure or component during normal or accident conditions.

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

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

The change is administrative in nature in that it resolves a discontinuity in the range of temperatures and in the duration period above the applicable limit for which action is required. Establishment of tolerances ensures parameters are set and maintained within allowable design constraints. Clarification of applicability for the required actions ensures that action is proscribed for all possible conditions thereby not permitting operation outside of allowable design.

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

In conclusion, based on the information provided, it is determined that the proposed change does not involve an SHC.

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

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

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

NRC Deputy Director: Phillip F. McKee

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

Date of amendment request: March 31, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change Technical Specification (TS) Sections 3/4.6.5.3.2, ''Filtration, Recirculation, and Ventilation System (FRVS),'' to (1) provide an appropriate Limiting Condition for Operation and ACTION Statement that reflects the design basis for the FRVS, and (2) clarify the manner in which FRVS testing is performed.

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 TS revisions involve: 1) no hardware changes; 2) no significant changes to the operation of any systems or components in normal or accident operating conditions; and 3) no changes to existing structures, systems or components. Therefore these changes will not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated. Since the plant systems associated with these proposed changes will still be capable of: 1) meeting all applicable design basis requirements; and 2) retaining the capability to mitigate the consequences of accidents described in the HC [Hope Creek] UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report], the proposed changes were determined to be justified. As a result, these changes will not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes contained in this submittal will not adversely impact the operation of any safety related component or equipment. Since the proposed changes involve: 1) no hardware changes; 2) no significant changes to the operation of any systems or components; and 3) no changes to existing structures, systems or components, there can be no impact on the potential occurrence of any accident. Furthermore, there is no change in plant testing proposed in this change request which could initiate an event. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes for the TS related to the Filtration Recirculation and Ventilation System (FRVS) Recirculation Subsystem provide consistency between the Hope Creek TS and post-accident descriptions of the FRVS Recirculation Subsystem operation already contained in the UFSAR and reflected in the Hope Creek SER [Safety Evaluation Report] (NUREG-1048). PSE&G [Public Service Electric & Gas] believes that the proposed allowed outage times and ACTION Statements for the FRVS Recirculation Subsystem: 1) will ensure that the required minimum number of FRVS recirculation units will be available to mitigate the consequences of accidents described in the UFSAR; and 2) provide appropriate direction and time requirements for placing the unit in a safe shutdown condition when the system is degraded. Therefore, the changes contained in this request do not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The revisions to Surveillance Requirement 4.6.5.3.2.b provide an accurate and clearly defined basis for performing this surveillance test. The proposed changes implement PSE&G—s existing interpretation of the TS requirements and therefore do not alter the manner in which this surveillance test is currently being performed. PSE&G has concluded that this surveillance test method appropriately tests the FRVS Recirculation Subsystem. Since the FRVS recirculation units will continue to be tested with the heaters: 1) operable; and 2) set at the demand necessary to ''reduce the buildup of moisture,'' PSE&G believes that the proposed changes to clarify the TS are justified. Therefore, the changes contained in this request 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: 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

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

Date of amendment request: March 31, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would provide changes to Technical Specification (TS) 2.1.2, ''THERMAL POWER, High Pressure and High Flow,'' ACTION a.1.c for TS 3.4.1.1, ''Recirculation Loops,'' and the Bases for TS 2.1, ''Safety Limits.'' These changes are being made to implement an appropriately conservative Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (SLMCPR) for all Hope Creek core and fuel designs.

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 derivation of the revised SLMCPRs for Hope Creek for incorporation into the Technical Specifications, and its use to determine cycle—specific thermal limits, have been performed using NRC approved methods. Additionally, interim implementing procedures which incorporate cycle—specific parameters have been used which result in a more restrictive value for SLMCPR. These calculations do not change the method of operating the plant and have no effect on the probability of an accident initiating event or transient.

There are no significant increases in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The basis of the MCPR [Minimum Critical Power Ratio] Safety Limit is to ensure that no mechanistic fuel damage is calculated to occur if the limit is not violated. The new SLMCPRs preserve the existing margin to transition boiling and the probability of fuel damage is not increased. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes contained in this submittal result from an analysis of the Cycle 7 core reload using the same fuel types as previous cycles. These changes do not involve any new method for operating the facility and do not involve any facility modifications. No new initiating events or transients result from these changes. Therefore, the proposed Technical Specification changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident, from any accident previously evaluated.

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

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

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

Local Public Document Room location: Pennsville Public Library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, NJ 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

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 amendment request: April 11, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would change Technical Specification 3.6.2.3, ''Containment Cooling System'' and the

associated bases. The changes would increase the cooling water flow rate for the 31-day and 18-month surveillances and specify that during the 31-day surveillance the fans are started and operated in low speed. The changes are being proposed to ensure that the cooling water flow rate and the fan speed being verified are representative of the Containment Fan Cooling Unit post-accident mode of operation.

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

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

The proposed changes ensure that the fan speed and cooling water flow rate being verified is representative of the fan speed and cooling water flow rate required for the post-accident mode of operation. The proposed changes affect an accident mitigation system and are being made to assure that the system is being tested in its accident mitigation mode. There are no new accident initiators created by the proposed changes. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes provide assurance that the CFCUs will be capable of maintaining peak containment pressure and temperature within design limits by verifying the proper post-accident cooling water flow to the CFCUs. No physical changes to the plant result from the proposed changes to the surveillance requirements. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes for demonstrating operability of the CFCUs in the low speed mode, with the required post-accident cooling water flow rate, are consistent with the existing safety function of the CFCUs following a Design Basis Accident (DBA). The proposed changes to the surveillance requirements do not involve any physical changes to plant components, systems or structures, or the operation of the CFCUs in the post-accident mode. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes to the surveillance requirements provide assurance that the CFCUs will perform their intended design function of maintaining peak containment pressure and temperature consistent with the current design basis following a DBA by verifying the proper post-accident cooling water flow to the CFCUs. Since the high speed and low speed control circuits are independent and there are separate breakers used to energize the CFCU motors in high and low speed, the CFCUs would be capable of starting in the low speed mode following a DBA although the high speed breaker and control circuit may not be available.

Verification of the post-accident flow rate during the 31 day surveillance also ensures that the required supporting system, Service Water, is available for normal operation. To ensure that the containment air temperature is maintained below the initial temperature condition assumed in the accident analysis during normal operation, Technical Specification 3/4.6.1.5 requires verification of the average containment temperature once every 24 hours in Modes 1 through 4.

The proposed changes to the CFCU surveillance requirements do not affect the ability of the CFCUs to perform their normal and post-accident functions. These proposed changes ensure the verification of the proper post-accident service water flow rate to the CFCUs. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Public library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

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

Date of amendment request: March 26, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Technical Specifications to change the definition of ''Core Alteration.'' The proposed definition will not consider movement of components other than fuel, sources, or reactivity control components. These proposed changes are technically consistent with the requirements of NUREG-1431, Revision 1, ''Westinghouse Standard Technical Specifications,'' issued on April 7, 1995.

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

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

The proposed changes revise the definition of Core Alteration to be the movement of fuel, sources, or reactivity control components; and to delete ''or manipulation'' and ''conservative'' from the text. These changes do not affect the probability of an accident previously evaluated. The movement of components other than fuel, sources, and reactivity control components, within the reactor vessel is enveloped by the analyzed event. Deleting the words ''or manipulation'' and ''conservative'' from the definition of Core Alteration are administrative changes and also do not impact initiators of analyzed events. The only component assumed to be an initiator of an analyzed event is dropping an irradiated fuel assembly, however, fuel is still part of the definition. Furthermore, a fuel handling accident is minimized by administrative controls and physical limitations imposed on fuel handling operations. The movement of components other than fuel, sources, and reactivity control components within the reactor vessel will be controlled under plant administrative controls. This change has no effect on the boron dilution event because when boron concentration is below limits, Core Alterations are restricted to maintain the maximum Shutdown Margin. Movement of other components will have a negligible impact on core reactivity.

The changes to the definition of Core Alteration do not increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The accident analysis assumes an irradiated fuel assembly is dropped with the consequences well within the 10 CFR 100 limits. The dropping of other components was not addressed in the plant safety analyses, however, the analysis of the dropped fuel assembly encompasses other components. The consequences of a boron dilution event are not addressed because Core Alterations are not allowed when the boron concentration is below limits. These changes do not affect the mitigation capabilities of any component or system nor do they affect the assumptions relative to the mitigation of accidents or transients. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes revise the definition of Core Alteration to be the movement of fuel, sources, or reactivity control components; and to delete ''or manipulation'' and ''conservative'' from the text. The change does not involve a

significant change in the design or operation of the plant. The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different type of equipment will be installed), or new or unusual operator actions. The changes will not impose any new or different requirements or eliminate any existing requirements. The definition of Core Alteration is being clarified and made consistent with NUREG-1431, Rev. 1. Therefore, the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes revise the definition of Core Alteration to be the movement of fuel, sources, or reactivity control components; and to delete ''or manipulation'' and ''conservative'' from the text. The safety analysis assumes an irradiated fuel assembly is dropped. Controls for handling components other than fuel, sources, or reactivity control components within the reactor vessel are in plant administrative controls. The effect of a boron dilution event on Shutdown Margin is limited due to the requirement to suspend Core Alterations. The movement of other components have a negligible impact on core reactivity. No change is being proposed, in the applicability of the definition, to the movement of components which factor in the design basis analyses (fuel handling accident). Deleting the terms ''or manipulation'' and ''conservative'' from the definition of Core Alteration results in a clarification to the definition that does not technically alter the meaning. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Post Office Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218

NRC Project Director: F. Mark Reinhart, Acting

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

Date of amendment request: March 26, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station Technical Specifications (TS), Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.5.2.a, to add (1) the charging/high head safety injection (HHSI) pump cross connect valves, and (2) the charging pump mini-flow header isolation valve, to the SR valve list. The proposed change is an administrative change to meet the recommendations of NRC Branch Technical Position (BTP) EICSB 18, which establishes the acceptability of disconnecting power to electrical components of fluid systems as one means of designing against a single failure that might cause an undesirable component action. TS SR 4.5.2.a includes a list of the required positions of manually-controlled, electrically-operated valves, and identify those valves to which the requirements for removal of electrical power is applied in order to satisfy the single failure criterion.

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

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

The proposed change adds the charging/HHSI pump cross connect valves and the charging pump mini-flow header isolation valve to the ECCS [Emergency Core Cooling System] Subsystems - T_{avg} (greater than or equal to) 350°F Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement. This Surveillance Requirement will require the valves to be verified open with power to the valve operators removed once per 12 hours. ... The charging/HHSI pump cross connect valves and the charging mini-flow header isolation valve are not initiators of any analyzed event. ... The charging pump/HHSI pump cross connect valves are being modified to meet the recommendations of the BTP (including this Technical Specification change). The charging pump mini-flow header isolation valve meets the requirements of the BTP except it is not located in the Technical Specifications. ... Requiring the valves to be verified open with power removed from the valve operator once per 12 hours does not affect the assumptions relative to the mitigation of accidents or transients. This requirement ensures that the valves are in a position with power removed so that a failure will not occur that will affect the mitigation of an accident. These valves are required to be open during a LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident]. This change will ensure that the valves are open with power removed. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

...This change does not involve a significant change in the design or operation of the plant. This change is a result of BTP EICSB 18. The charging/HHSI pump cross connect valves are being modified to have power lockout capability, redundant indication on the main control board, and be included in the Technical Specifications. This will ensure that a single failure (hot short in the controls of either valve) will not cause spurious actuation of the valves during the injection or recirculation phase of the ECCS. The charging pump mini-flow header isolation valve meets the requirements of the BTP except it is not located in the Technical Specifications. The charging/HHSI pump cross connect valves and charging pump mini-flow header isolation valve are required to remain open during a LOCA. This modification will ensure that the valves will remain open during an accident which requires ECCS operation. The proposed change will not introduce any new accident initiators. Therefore, the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

...The ECCS is required to operate upon receipt of a safety injection signal. The charging/HHSI pump cross connect valves and the charging pump mini-flow header isolation valve are required to remain open during ECCS operation. However, a single failure may cause a spurious actuation (closure) of the valves which could hinder HHSI flow. The modification to the charging/HHSI cross connect valves (the addition of a power lockout feature and redundant position indication) and the added TS Surveillance Requirement will eliminate this failure scenario and ensure the valves remain in their safety function position (open). The charging pump mini-flow header isolation valves already contain a power lockout feature and redundant position indication. These valves are being added to the Technical Specifications to meet the requirements of BTP EICSB 18. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety[.]

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

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

Attorney for licensee: Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, Post Office Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218

NRC Project Director: Mark Reinhart, Acting

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: March 13, 1997 (TS 97-01)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications by raising the allowable U-235 enrichment, as specified in Section 5.6.1.2, of fuel stored in the new fuel pit storage racks from 4.5 to 5.0 weight percent.

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:

Operation of Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN) in accordance with the proposed amendment will not:

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

The proposed change to the allowed enrichment of new fuel stored in the new fuel storage racks does not change the criticality potential with the proposed fuel arrangement requirements for the storage racks. The potential k_{eff} values are maintained the same as the current TS [Technical Specification] requirements. In addition, the storage racks are not modified, other than the locations that cannot be filled with fuel assemblies, and the processes for loading and unloading fuel in these racks and the controls for these racks remain the same. Since the k_{eff} limits and operating processes are unchanged by the proposed revision, there is no increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated. Likewise, there is no impact to the consequences of an accident or increase in offsite dose limits as a result of the proposed TS change because the criticality requirements are unchanged and plant equipment will be utilized and operated without change considering the fuel storage location limits imposed by this request.

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

As stated above, the plant equipment and operating processes will not be altered by the proposed TS change with the exception of allowed fuel storage locations in the new fuel storage racks. The limitations on acceptable fuel storage locations in the racks ensure that the k_{eff} limits are maintained at the same limits as currently required. TVA has not postulated a criticality event at SQN for the spent or new fuel storage locations because the design of the associated storage racks, potential moderation, and TS allowable fuel enrichments do not support the potential for this condition. Considering the physical barriers that will be installed and verified to be in place prior to initial loading of fuel in the new fuel storage racks, the new fuel storage rack physical limitations will continue to ensure that criticality events are not credible for the proposed change. Therefore, this change does not create the potential for a new accident from any previously analyzed.

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

The proposed TS change maintains the existing requirements for criticality by utilizing limited storage locations in the new fuel pit storage racks. There is no change to operating practices associated with the use and control of these racks except for the storage limitations. For these reasons, there will be no reduction in the margin of safety as a result of implementing the proposed TS change.

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon

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

Date of amendment request: April 4, 1997 (TSCR 197)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments revise TS 15.6, ''Administrative Controls,'' and 15.7, ''Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications,'' to change the corporate officer responsible for nuclear operations from ''Vice President-Nuclear Power,'' to ''Chief Nuclear Officer,'' and to require that the position be an officer of the company.

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

1. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are administrative only. There are no physical changes to the facility or its operation. All Limiting Conditions of Operation, Limiting Safety System Settings, and Safety Limits specified in the Technical Specification remain unchanged. Additionally, there are no changes in the Quality Assurance Program, Emergency Plan, Security Plan, and Operator Training and Requalification Program. Therefore, an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated cannot occur.

2. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are administrative only. No changes to the facility structures, systems and components or their operation will result. The design and design basis of the facility remain unchanged. The plant safety analyses remain current and accurate. No new or different failure mechanisms are introduced. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated is not introduced.

3. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed amendments are administrative only. All safety margins established through the design and facility license including the Technical Specifications remain unchanged. In addition, the proposed amendments ensure continued emphasis and assignment of responsibility for overall nuclear safety. Therefore, all margins of safety are maintained.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Joseph P. Mann Library, 1516 Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

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

NRC Project Director: John N. Hannon

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

Date of amendment request: April 14, 1997 (TSCR 198)

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments revise TS 15.3.1, ''Reactor Coolant System,'' to require both reactor coolant pumps to be operable when the reactor is critical and to require that the reactor be placed in hot shutdown within 6 hours if one or both reactor coolant pumps cease operating. This revision eliminates the current provision which allows single pump operation up to 3.5 percent power.

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

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

1. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The amendments proposed eliminate an inconsistency in the Technical Specifications in a conservative manner. The proposed changes ensure that required protection functions remain operable in all required modes of operation. Since the protection functions remain operable in accordance with existing Technical Specification requirements and serve to mitigate analyzed events no increase in the consequences of a previously analyzed accident results. The protective functions are not accident initiators and are maintained and tested in accordance with existing Technical Specification requirements, therefore the probability of a previously analyzed accident cannot increase. Therefore, operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed changes does not result in an increase in probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident.

2. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendments restore consistency within the Technical Specifications thus ensuring the protections functions remain operable as required and the units are operated within the bounds of the existing safety analyses. Therefore, operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments does not result in a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Margins of safety are defined by the bounds of the design and in the safety analyses performed for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant. The proposed amendments eliminate an inconsistency within the Technical Specifications and ensure the plant will respond as analyzed in the Safety Analyses. There is no physical change in the facility or operation. Therefore, operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments does not involve a reduction in 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: Joseph P. Mann Library, 1516 Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241

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

NRC Project Director: John N. Hannon

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

Date of amendment request: March 21, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated April 15, 1997.

Description of amendment request: This amendment request proposes to revise the technical specifications associated with the inspection of the reactor coolant flywheel to provide an exception to the recommendations of Regulatory Guide 1.14, Revision 1, ''Reactor Coolant Pump Flywheel Integrity.'' The proposed exception would allow either an ultrasonic volumetric examination or surface examination to be performed at approximately 10-year intervals. In addition, a correction of the issuance date of a referenced regulatory guide is included.

This amendment would also allow delaying the complete flywheel examination for the ''D'' reactor coolant pump until the Fall 1997 outage.

This supersedes the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination evaluation for the requested changes that was published on January 2, 1997 (62 FR 133).

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

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

The safety function of the RCP [reactor coolant pump] flywheels is to provide a coastdown period during which the RCPs would continue to provide reactor coolant flow to the reactor after loss of power to the RCPs. The maximum loading on the RCP flywheel results from overspeed following a LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident]. The maximum obtainable speed in the event of a LOCA was predicted to be less than 1500 rpm. Therefore, a peak LOCA speed of 1500 rpm is used in the evaluation of RCP flywheel integrity in WCAP-14535. This integrity evaluation shows a very high flaw tolerance for the flywheels. The proposed change does not affect that evaluation. Reduced coastdown times due to a single failed flywheel is bounded by the locked rotor analysis, therefore, it would not place the plant in an unanalyzed condition. Therefore, these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated since the proposed amendments will not change the physical plant or the modes of plant operation defined in the facility operating license. No new failure mode is introduced due to the proposed change, since the proposed change does not involve the addition or modification of equipment, nor do they alter the design or operation of affected plant systems, structures, or components.

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

The operating limits and functional capabilities of the affected systems, structures, and components are basically unchanged by the proposed amendment. The results of the flywheel inspections performed have identified no indications affecting flywheel integrity. As identified in WCAP-14535, detailed stress analysis as well as risk analysis have been completed with the results indicating that there would be no change in the probability of failure for RCP flywheels if all inspections were eliminated.

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

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

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

The following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances. They are repeated here because the biweekly notice lists all amendments issued or proposed to be issued

involving no significant hazards consideration.

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

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, located in Grundy County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: January 24, 1997.

Description of amendment request: The application proposed to change the Technical Specifications to reflect the installation of new reactor water level instrumentation for the Emergency Core Cooling System actuation.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** April 18, 1997 (62 FR 19143).Expiration date of individual notice: May 19, 1997

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

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, located in Grundy County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: March 5, 1997.

Description of amendment request: The application proposed to remove the Main Steam Line Radiation Monitor High scram and the Main Steam Line Tunnel Radiation High input to the Main Steam Line Isolation function requirement from the Technical Specifications (TS). The proposed changes are a result of a Boiling Water Reactor Owners Group initiative to minimize inadvertent scrams and Main Steam Isolation Valve closure due to erroneous radiation monitor actuation.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** April 18, 1997 (62 FR 19141).Expiration date of individual notice: May 19, 1997

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

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: April 21, 1997

Description of amendment request: The amendments would reflect a change in the Quad Cities, Unit 2, Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) Safety Limit and add the Siemens Power Corporation (SPC) methodology for application of the Advanced Nuclear Fuel for Boiling Water Reactors (ANFB) Critical Power Correlation to coresident General Electric fuel for Quad Cities, Unit 2, Cycle 15, to Technical Specification Section 6.9.A.6.b.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** April 30, 1997 (62 FR 23499)

Expiration date of individual notice: May 30, 1997

Local Public Document Room location: Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021

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

Date of application for amendment: March 31, 1997

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would revise the Ginna Station Improved Technical Specifications to reflect a planned modification to the spent fuel pool storage racks.Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** April 30, 1997 (62 FR 23502)

Expiration date of individual notice: May 30, 1997

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

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, et al., Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendments: March 5, 1997, as supplemented May 9, 1997. The May 9, 1997, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments incorporate a new Technical Specification for instrumentation associated with automatic isolation of a pathway for release of non-condensible gases from the main condenser.

Date of issuance: May 9, 1997

Effective date: May 9, 1997

Amendment Nos.: 185 and 216

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62: Amendments change the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** April 9, 1997 (62 FR 17224) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 9, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

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

Date of application for amendment: March 14, 1997

Brief description of amendment: The amendment extends the allowed outage time for its refueling water storage tank

while performing surveillance testing of its reactor coolant system pressure isolation valves (Surveillance 4.4.6.2.2).

Date of issuance: May 6, 1997

Effective date: May 6, 1997

Amendment No. 71

Facility Operating License No. NPF-63. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 26, 1997 (62 FR 14459) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 6, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: April 18, 1997, as supplemented April 29, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment approves the modification to the protection circuitry for emergency diesel generators. The associated Safety Evaluation delineates the staff's review and findings that the modification and related Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) changes are acceptable.

Date of issuance: May 8, 1997

Effective date: May 8, 1997

Amendment No. 72

Facility Operating License No. NPF-63. The amendment approves modification to the protection circuitry for emergency diesel generators and related FSAR changes.

Date of initial notice and proposed no significant hazards consideration in **Federal Register:** (62 FR 19818 dated April 23, 1997). The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. No comments have been received. The notice also provided for an opportunity to request a hearing by May 23, 1997, but indicated that if the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment.The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated

Attorney for licensee: William D. Johnson, Vice President and Senior Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, Post Office Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

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

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

Date of application for amendments: November 4, 1996, as supplemented on December 4, 1996, and March 20, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the technical specifications (TS) to permit the removal of containment tendon sheathing filler grease in up to 35 tendons for Byron, Unit 1, and Braidwood, Unit 1, in advance of the steam generator replacement outages. The grease will be removed approximately 6 months prior to the respective steam generator replacement outages. In addition, in Amendment No. 80 issued on April 16, 1997, the title in Braidwood's TS 6.9.1.7 was unintentionally left uncorrected. The corrected page is included in this amendment.

Date of issuance: May 6, 1997

Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment Nos.: 89, 89 and 81, 81

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-37, NPF-66, NPF-72 and NPF-77: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 15, 1997 (62 FR 2186). The March 20, 1997, submittal provided additional clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 6, 1997No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: February 17, 1997, as supplemented February 27, March 12, March 26, April 2, and April 10, 1997

Brief description of amendments: The amendments evaluate the Unreviewed Safety Question (USQ) associated with the use of containment pressure to compensate for the deficiency in Net Positive Suction Head (NPSH) for the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) pumps following a Design Basis Accident (DBA). In the resolution of the USQ, the licensee changed the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) in the following areas:

1. containment analysis,
2. decay heat model,
3. increase in the suppression pool temperature and the effect on other associated systems following a DBA, and
4. ECCS heat exchanger duty and containment cooling service water (CCSW) system flow.In addition, the proposed amendments would change the Technical Specification (TS) allowable water temperature limits for the suppression chamber and the ultimate heat sink from less than or equal to 75 degrees Fahrenheit to less than or equal to 95 degrees Fahrenheit. The original licensing basis water temperature for both the suppression chamber and ultimate heat sink was 95 degrees Fahrenheit. Both values were changed in the TS in Amendment Nos. 152 and 147 for Dresden, Units 2 and 3, respectively, issued on January 28, 1997. The amendments to lower the ultimate heat sink and suppression pool temperature limits in the TS was in response to the resolution of a USQ associated with the operation of Dresden, Units 2 and 3, following the discovery of a calculational error concerning the head loss across the ECCS suction strainers. The proposed amendments will return both units to normal operating conditions allowing for continued power operations when the ultimate heat sink temperature goes above 75 degrees Fahrenheit during warm weather.

Date of issuance: April 30, 1997

Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment Nos.: 157; 152.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-19 and DPR-25: The amendments revised the licenses, TS and USFAR.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 27, 1997 (62 FR 8998). The February 27, March 12, March 26, April 2 and April 10, 1997, submittals provided additional clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated

April 30, 1997No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendments: February 17, 1997

Brief description of amendments: The amendments would change the Technical Specifications by increasing the load test values of the emergency diesel generators in Surveillance Requirement 4.9.A.8.h from between 2625 kW and 2750 kW to 2730 kW and 2860 kW.

Date of issuance: May 1, 1997

Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment Nos.: 176 and 172

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 26, 1997 (62 FR 14460). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 1, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021.

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Docket No. 50-247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of application for amendment: August 22, 1996, as supplemented March 28, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specification Sections 3.3 and 4.5 to allow the deletion of the requirement to utilize sodium hydroxide (NaOH) as an additive in the post-accident containment spray system.

Date of issuance: April 23, 1997

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

Amendment No.: 191

Facility Operating License No. DPR-26: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 29, 1997 (62 FR 4345) The March 28, 1997, supplemental letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the scope of the amendment request as originally noticed. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 23, 1997No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendments: March 7, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated April 2, 10, 16, 22, and 28, 1997

Brief description of amendments: The amendment revise Section 3/4.7.1.6 of the Technical Specifications to require four instead of three steam generator pressure operated relief valves operable.

Date of issuance: April 29, 1997

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days. Implementation of the amendments include the incorporation in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) of the changes to the description of the facility as set forth in the licensee's application dated March 7, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated April 2, 10, 16, 22, and 28, 1997, as evaluated in the staff's Safety Evaluation dated April 29, 1997.

Amendment Nos.: 159 and 151

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 13, 1997 (62 FR 11931) The April 2, 10, 16, 22, and 28, 1997, letters provided additional and clarifying information that did not change the scope of the March 7, 1997, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 29, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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: September 30, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated September 18, 1995, and March 15, April 29, May 16, September 23, and October 28, 1996, and January 16, April 22, and May 2, 1997

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications related to the replacement of the Westinghouse Model ''D'' type preheat steam generators with feedring steam generators designed by Babcock and Wilcox International.

Date of issuance: May 5, 1997

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days for Unit 1; and effective upon replacement of the steam generators for Unit 2.

Amendment Nos.: 175 and 157

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 8, 1995 (60 FR 56366) The March 15, April 29, May 16, September 23, and October 28, 1996, and January 16, April 22, and May 2, 1997, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the September 30, 1994, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 5, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: J. Murrey Atkins Library, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 9201 University City Boulevard, North Carolina 28223-0001

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

Date of amendment request: November 15, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amemdment revises the technical specifications to allow the performance of the 24-hour emergency diesel generator maintenance run while the unit is in either Mode 1 or Mode 2.

Date of issuance: May 5, 1997

Effective date: May 5, 1997

Amendment No.: 94

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 2, 1997 (62 FR 127) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 5, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents

Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803

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

Date of amendment request: April 11, 1997

Brief description of amendment: The amendment would permit steam generator tubes with intergranular corrosion indications that may exceed through-wall limits to remain in service until the next refueling outage.

Date of issuance: May 7, 1997

Effective date: May 7, 1997

Amendment No.: 189

Facility Operating License No. DPR-51: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC): Yes (62 FR 19628 dated April 22, 1997). The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed NSHC determination. No comments have been received. The notice also provided for an opportunity to request a hearing by May 22, 1997, but indicated that if the Commission makes a final NSHC determination, any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendment. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, and final determination of NSHC are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 7, 1997.

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

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

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

Date of application for amendment: December 19, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The proposed changes revise Technical Specification Table 4.3-1 to change the power calibration requirements for the linear power level, the Core Protection Calculator (CPC) delta T power and the CPC nuclear power signals between 15 and 80 percent power to allow more conservative settings.

Date of issuance May 5, 1997

Effective date: May 5, 1997, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 183

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 29, 1997 (62 FR 4348) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 5, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: November 12, 1996, as supplemented November 27, 1996 (TSCR 224)

Brief description of amendment: The amendment updates the technical specifications to reflect the implementation of the revised 10 CFR Part 20, ''Standards for Protection Against Radiation.''

Date of issuance : May 8, 1997

Date of issuance : May 8, 1997

Effective date: May 8, 1997, with full implementation within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 191

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 18, 1996 (61 FR 66708). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 8, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: February 7, 1997

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises TS 3.12, ''Station Service Power,'' to require both 115 kV power circuits to be operable when the reactor is critical and to limit or restrict the time during which Maine Yankee may continue to operate if one or both of the 115 kV power circuits become inoperable.

Date of issuance May 2, 1997

Effective date: May 2, 1997, to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 157

Facility Operating License No. DPR-36: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications and/or License.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** February 26, 1997 (FR 8799) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 2, 1997No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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 February 24, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated March 13, April 11, 23, and 29, 1997

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specification surveillance requirements for the Control Room Emergency Filtration System, the Penetration Room Filtration System, and the Containment Purge Exhaust Filter System.

Date of issuance May 1, 1997

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

Amendment Nos.: 127 and 121

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 6, 1997 (62 FR 10294) The March 13, April 11, 23, and 29, 1997, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the February 24, 1997, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 1, 1997.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. 50-260, and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 2 and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of application for amendments: June 21, 1996, supplemented February 7, 1997 (TS 377)

Brief description of amendments: The amendments provide a new minimum critical power ratio safety limit to replace a nonconservative value. Technical Specification Bases are also updated to clarify usage of the residual heat removal system supplemental spent fuel pool cooling mode.

Date of issuance : May 7, 1997

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

Amendment Nos.: 247 and 207

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:**

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 7, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Athens Public library, 405 E. South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611

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

Date of application for amendments: September 4, 1996, as supplemented February 3, 1997. The February 3, 1997 submittal provided clarifying information only, and did not change the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the license and technical specifications (TS) to permit the insertion of four demonstration fuel assemblies into the reactor core of either North Anna 1 or North Anna 2, as described in the licensee's submittal. The four lead test assemblies, fabricated by Framatome Cogema Fuels, will incorporate several advanced design features, including: a debris filter bottom nozzle, mid-span mixing grids, a floating top end grid, a quick disconnect top nozzle, and use of advanced zirconium alloys for fuel assembly structural tubing and for fuel rod cladding.

Date of issuance May 9, 1997

Effective date: May 9, 1997

Amendment Nos.: 204 and 185

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7. These amendments revised the License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 4, 1996 (61 FR 64396) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 9, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: July 18, 1996, as supplemented on January 29, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant Technical Specification 3.8, ''Refueling,'' and its associated Basis, by allowing the containment personnel air lock doors to remain open during refueling operations.

Date of issuance May 7, 1997

Effective date: May 7, 1997

Amendment No.: 132

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** August 14, 1996 (61 FR 42285). The January 29, 1997, submittal provided supplemental information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 7, 1997.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

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

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

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

In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant or in prevention of either resumption of operation or of increase in power output up to the plant's licensed power level, the Commission may not have had an opportunity to provide for public comment on its no significant hazards consideration determination. In such case, the license amendment has been issued without opportunity for comment. If there has been some time for public comment but less than 30 days, the Commission may provide an opportunity for public comment. If comments have been requested, it is so stated. In either event, the State has been consulted by telephone whenever possible.

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

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

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment, (2) the amendment to

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

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendment. By June 20, 1997, 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. Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-001, 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 20555-001, 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 the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment: April 29, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment modifies Section 5.3.A, ''Design Features'' of the Technical Specifications (TS) to reflect the ATRIUM-9B fuel design and would include various Siemens Power Corporation (SPC) topical reports in TS Section 6.9.A.6, ''Core Operating Limits Report,'' to reflect mechanical design criteria for this fuel and topical reports required for operation. This change would allow this fuel to be loaded into the core only under Operational Modes 3 (Hot Shutdown), 4 (Cold Shutdown), and 5 (Refueling) and does not permit startup or power operation using the ATRIUM-9B fuel.

Date of issuance May 2, 1997

Effective date: May 2, 1997

Amendment No.: 173

Facility Operating License No. DPR-30: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 2, 1997.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021.

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of amendment request: May 2, 1997, as superseded May 5, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment relocates and revises the requirements for the control of the setpoint for the Standby Liquid Control system relief valves. The requirements would be relocated from Section 4.4.A.2.a and Bases Section 3.4.A of the Cooper Technical Specifications to the Updated Safety Analysis Report and the Inservice Testing Augmented Testing Program.

Date of issuance May 9, 1997

Effective date: May 9, 1997

Amendment No.: 176

Facility Operating License No. DPR-46: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of emergency circumstances and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated May 9, 1997.

Local Public Document Room location: Auburn Memorial Library, 1810 Courthouse Avenue, Auburn, NE 68305.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. John R. McPhail, Nebraska Public Power District, Post Office Box 499, Columbus, NE 68602-0499

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of May, 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Elinor G. Adensam,

Deputy Director, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Reactor Regulation

[Doc. 97-13190 Filed 5-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

The meeting of the Railroad Retirement Board which was to be held at 9:00 a.m. on May 21, 1997, at the Board's meeting room on the 8th floor of its headquarters building, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60611, has been changed to 3:00 p.m. on May 21, 1997. The agenda for this meeting was published at 62 FR 26342 on May 13, 1997.

The entire meeting will be open to the public. The person to contact for more information is Beatrice Ezerski, Secretary to the Board, Phone No. 312–751–4920.

Dated: May 16, 1997.

Beatrice Ezerski,

Secretary to the Board.

[FR Doc. 97–13423 Filed 5–20–97; 10:09 am]

BILLING CODE 7905–01–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Investment Company Act Release No. 22663; 812–9440]

AIM Equity Funds, Inc., et. al.; Notice of Application

May 15, 1997.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'').

ACTION: Notice of application for exemption under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''Act'').

APPLICANTS: AIM Equity Funds, Inc., AIM Funds Group, AIM International Funds, Inc., AIM Investment Securities Funds, AIM Summit Fund, Inc., AIM Tax-Exempt Funds, Inc., AIM Variable Insurance Funds, Inc., Short-Term Investments Co., Short-Term Investments Trust, and Tax-Free Investments Co. (the ''Funds''), AIM Advisors, Inc., and AIM Capital Management, Inc. (the ''Advisers,'' and collectively with the Funds, the ''Applicants'').

RELEVANT ACT SECTIONS: Order requested under sections 6(c) and 17(b) of the Act for an exemption from sections 17(a) and 17(e) of the Act.

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants request an order amending a prior order (the ''Prior Order'') under sections 6(c) and 17(b) of the Act granting an exemption from sections 17(a)(1), 17(a)(2) and 17(e) of the Act.[1] The requested order would let each Fund engage in purchase and sale transactions limited to U.S. government securities, certain other high quality debt securities and reverse repurchase agreements with banks whose affiliated relationship with the Funds arises solely out of their five percent or greater share interest in a Fund, except that no Fund will engage in such transactions with a bank that controls or advises that Fund. Any order also would let each Fund compensate an affiliated bank for acting as agent in executing certain securities transactions.

FILING DATES: The application was filed on January 19, 1995, and amended on July 18, 1995, January 16, 1996, and April 21, 1997. Counsel for applicants has agreed to file another amendment during the notice period, the substance of which is incorporated herein.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the SEC orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary and serving Applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m., on June 9, 1997, and should be accompanied by proof of service on the Applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reasons for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request such notification by writing to the SEC's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, SEC, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549. Applicants, Eleven Greenway Plaza, Suite 1919, Houston, Texas 77046.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: H.R. Hallock, Jr., Special Counsel, at (202) 942–0564 (Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee from the SEC's Public Reference Branch.

Applicants' Representations

1. All of the Funds are registered under the Act as open-end management investment companies. AIM Advisors, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of AIM Management Group Inc., a privately-owned corporation, serves as investment adviser for each Fund. AIM Capital Management, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of AIM Advisors, Inc., serves as sub-adviser to three series (''Portfolios'') of one of the Funds, AIM Equity Inc. Both Advisers are registered investment advisers under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

2. The Prior Order granted the Funds or certain of their predecessors a conditional exemption, pursuant to sections 6(c) and 17(b) of the Act, from the provisions of section 17(a)(1), section 17(a)(2) and section 17(e) thereof. The Prior Order applies to transactions by the Funds with a bank, bank holding company or affiliate thereof which may be deemed to be an

[1] Investment Company Act Release Nos. 14220 (Oct. 31, 1984) (notice) and 14259 (Nov. 30, 1984) (order).