

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ronald B. Eaton,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate I-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-11856 Filed 5-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

DATE: Weeks of May 5, 12, 19, and 26, 1997.

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

STATUS: Public and Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Week of May 5

Tuesday, May 6

2:00 p.m. Briefing on PRA Implementation Plan (Public Meeting) (Contact: Gary Holahan, 301-415-2884)

Wednesday, May 7

2:00 p.m. Briefing on IPE Insight Report (Public Meeting)

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

Thursday, May 8

9:00 a.m. Meeting with Advisory Committee on Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI) (Public Meeting) (Contact: Larry Camper, 301-415-7231)

Week of May 12—Tentative

Tuesday, May 13

2:00 p.m. Briefing by National and Wyoming Mining Associations (Public Meeting)

Wednesday, May 14

2:00 p.m. Briefing on Status of Activities with CNWRA and HLW Program (Public Meeting)

Thursday, May 15

9:30 a.m. Briefing on Status of HLW Program (Public Meeting)

2:00 p.m. Briefing on Performance Assessment Progress in HLW, LLW, and SDMP (Public Meeting)

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

Week of May 19—Tentative

Tuesday, May 20

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

2:00 p.m. Meeting with Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste

(ACNW) (Public Meeting) (Contact: John Larkins, 301-415-7360)

Wednesday, May 21

10:00 a.m. Briefing on Program to Improve Regulatory Effectiveness (Public Meeting)

Week of May 26—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the week of May 26.

Note: The schedule for Commission Meetings is subject to change on short notice. To verify the status of meetings call (recording)—(301) 415-1292. Contact person for more information: Bill Hill (301) 415-1661.

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

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

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

Dated: May 2, 1997.

William M. Hill, Jr.,

Secy Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-11969 Filed 5-5-97; 11:04 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Biweekly Notice

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

I. Background

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

pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from April 12, 1997, through April 25, 1997. The last biweekly notice was published on April 23, 1997 (62 FR 19825).

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 6, 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.

Duquesne Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50-334, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: March 10, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TSs) by reducing the reactor coolant system (RCS) specific activity limits in accordance with Generic Letter 95-05. The definition of DOSE EQUIVALENT I-131 would be replaced with the Improved Standard TS definition wording in the first sentence and an

equation added based on dose conversion factors derived from International Commission on Radiation Protection (ICRP) ICRP-30. TS 3.4.8, Specific Activity, would be revised by reducing the DOSE EQUIVALENT I-131 limit from 1.0 [micro]Ci[curies]/gram to 0.35 [micro]Ci[curies]/gram. Item 4.a in TS Table 4.4-12, Primary Coolant Specific Activity Sample and Analysis Program, TS Figure 3.4-1, and the Bases for TS 3/4.4.8 would be modified to reflect the reduced DOSE EQUIVALENT I-131 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:

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

The proposed change reduces the reactor coolant system (RCS) specific activity limits of Specification 3.4.8 from 1.0 [micro]Ci/gram to 0.35 [micro]Ci/gram and lowers the graph in Figure 3.4-1 by 39 [micro]Ci/gram following the guidance provided in Generic Letter (GL) 95-05. This reduces the RCS activity allowed to leak to the secondary side when the plant is operating so that additional margin is available to support a higher allowable accident-induced leakage value as justified by analysis.

The proposed changes to Specification 3.4.8 and the definition of DOSE EQUIVALENT I-131 ensure these requirements are consistent the latest analyses.

These changes implement the more restrictive RCS activity limits in accordance with applicable analyses and GL 95-05 to ensure the regulations are satisfied. Therefore, these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change does not alter the configuration of the plant or affect the operation with the reduced specific activity limit. By reducing the specific activity limit, the limit would be reached sooner to initiate evaluation of the out of limit condition. The proposed changes will not result in any additional challenges to the main steam system or the reactor coolant system pressure boundary. Consequently, no new failure modes are introduced as a result of the proposed changes. As a result, the main steam line break, steam generator tube rupture and loss of coolant accident analyses remain bounding. Therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change reduces the RCS specific activity limit to 0.35 [micro]Ci/gram

along with lowering the Figure 3.4-1 limits by 39 [micro]Ci/gram. Reduction of the RCS specific activity limits allows an increase in the limit for the projected SG [steam generator] leakage following SG tube inspection and repair in accordance with the voltage-based SG tube alternate repair criteria (ARC) incorporated by Amendment No. 198. This follows the guidance provided in GL 95-05 and effectively takes margin available in the specific activity limits and applies it to the projected SG leakage for the ARC. This has been determined to be an acceptable means for accepting higher projected leakage rates while still meeting the applicable limits of 10 CFR [Part] 100 and GDC [General Design Criterion] 19 with respect to offsite and control room doses.

The capability for monitoring the specific activity and complying with the required actions remains unchanged. In addition, there is no resultant change in dose consequences. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Duquesne Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: March 14, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would relocate the following administrative control technical specifications (TSs) from the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (BVPS-1 and BVPS-2) TSs to the quality assurance program description, which is presented in Section 17.2 of the BVPS-2 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). Section 17.2 of the BVPS-2 UFSAR contains the quality assurance program description for both BVPS-1 and BVPS-2. The licensee stated that the proposed changes are based on NRC Administrative Letter 95-06, "Relocation of Technical Specification Administrative Controls Related to Quality Assurance."

BVPS-2 TS 6.2.3 (Independent Safety Evaluation Group)

BVPS-1 and BVPS-2 TS 6.5.1 (Onsite Safety Committee)

BVPS-1 and BVPS-2 TS 6.5.2 (Offsite Review Committee)

BVPS-1 and BVPS-2 TS 6.8.2

(Procedures, Review and Approval)

BVPS-1 and BVPS-2 TS 6.8.3

(Temporary Procedure Changes, Review and Approval)

BVPS-1 and BVPS-2 TS 6.10.1

(Records Retention, At least 5 years)

BVPS-1 and BVPS-2 TS 6.10.2

(Records Retention, Duration of Operating License)

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?

This proposed change would relocate technical specification administrative controls to the quality assurance program description. Adequate controls are provided by the established quality assurance program change process in 10 CFR 50.54(a).

The provisions of Technical Specification 6.2.3.2 which states that: "The ISEG [Independent Safety Evaluation Group] shall be composed of at least five, dedicated, full-time engineers located on site," would be omitted from the provisions relocated to the quality assurance program description. Since no system, component or operational procedure changes are involved, and the ISEG function will continue to be implemented, the change can have no effect on safe operation of the plant.

The likelihood that an accident will occur is not increased by this proposed technical specification change which involves administrative controls. No systems, equipment, or components are affected by the proposed change. Thus, the consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) are not increased by this change.

Relocation of technical specification provisions and related changes do not affect possible initiating events for accidents previously evaluated or any system functional requirement. The proposed changes have no impact on accident initiators or plant equipment, and do not affect the probabilities or consequences of an accident.

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

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

The proposed relocation of technical specification provisions to the quality assurance program description and related changes do not involve changes to the physical plant or operations. Since the proposed changes to administrative controls do not affect equipment or its operation, they cannot contribute to accident initiation and

cannot produce a new accident scenario or a new type of equipment malfunction.

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

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

The proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not directly affect plant equipment or operation. Safety limits and limiting safety system settings are not affected by this proposed change. The proposed changes do not affect the UFSAR design bases, accident assumptions, or technical specification bases. In addition, the proposed changes do not affect release limits, monitoring equipment or practices.

Therefore, the proposed changes would 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: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 15001

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Entergy Operations Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: April 11, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment modifies Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.3.7.3 and Surveillance Requirement 4.3.3.7.3 for the broad range gas detection system at Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3. The proposed change also includes changes in TS Basis 3/4.3.3.7.3 to support the changes.

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

1. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The broad range gas detection system has no effect on the accidents analyzed in chapter 15 of the Final Safety Analysis Report. Its only effect is on habitability of the control room, which will be enhanced by installation of the new monitoring system

and this change to the Technical Specifications. Analysis has shown that the impact on operator incapacitation and subsequent core damage risk of this background check is negligible.

Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

2. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed Technical Specification change in itself does not change the design or configuration of the plant. The new system for broad range toxic gas monitoring performs the same function as the old system, but it accomplishes this with a more sophisticated system that increases reliability.

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

3. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The broad range gas detection system has no effect on a margin of safety as defined by Section 2 of the Technical Specifications. Its only effect is on habitability of the control room, which will be enhanced by installation of the new monitoring system and this change to the Technical Specifications.

Therefore, the proposed change will 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: University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70122

Attorney for licensee: N.S. Reynolds, Esq., Winston & Strawn 1400 L Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

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

Date of amendment request: April 10, 1997

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes would modify the Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Enclosure Building. The Enclosure Building is a limited-leakage, steel-framed structure that completely surrounds the containment. It is designed and constructed to ensure that

any leakage of radioactive materials to the environment would not exceed an acceptable upper limit in the event of a design basis loss-of-coolant accident or movement of loads over the spent fuel pool. A slight negative pressure is maintained by the Enclosure Building Filtration System and the system exhausts the filtered air through charcoal and high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters.

Specifically, the proposed changes would relocate the surveillance requirement for attaining a negative pressure in the Enclosure Building from TS 3.6.5.1 "Enclosure Building Filtration System," to TS 3.6.5.2, "Enclosure Building Integrity." TS 3.6.5.2 would also be changed to address operability, which includes integrity requirements, and the Definition 1.25, "Enclosure Building Integrity," would be deleted. TS 4.6.5.2, "Surveillance Requirements," would be modified to require each access opening in the Enclosure Building to be closed instead of the current requirement to close each door (some access openings have two doors in series) in each access opening. This TS would also be renumbered as 4.6.5.2.1.

In addition, editorial changes are proposed for consistency and the index pages would be updated to reflect the proposed changes. The TS Bases would also be updated to reflect the proposed changes including the need to maintain the integrity of the Enclosure Building and to support previously approved laboratory testing requirements for charcoal filter sample testing.

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

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

The proposed changes to Technical Specifications 3.6.5.1 and 3.6.5.2, relocation of Surveillance Requirement 4.6.5.1.d.3 to Specification 3.6.5.2, changes to Bases Sections 3.6.5.1 and 3.6.5.2, and deletion of Definition 1.25 will resolve the conflict that currently exists between Specifications 3.6.5.1 and 3.6.5.2. Specifically, the requirement to establish and maintain a negative pressure in the Enclosure Building boundary included in Specification 3.6.5.1 belongs in Specification 3.6.5.2. In the event Enclosure Building operability is not maintained in Modes 1-4, the Action Statement for LCO [limiting condition for operation] 3.6.5.2 requires that Enclosure Building operability must be restored within 24 hours. Twenty-four hours is a reasonable completion time considering the limited leakage design of containment and the low

probability of a DBA [design-basis accident] occurring during this time period. Therefore, it is considered that there exists no loss of safety function. The

proposed changes do not modify the LCO or surveillance acceptance criterion, nor do they change the frequency of the surveillances. The proposed changes do not involve any physical changes to the plant, do not alter the way any structure, system, or component functions. Therefore, the structures, systems, or components will perform their intended function when called upon. (The redundancy of the double doors has not been credited in the radiological dose calculations for any Design Basis Accident.) Additionally, the proposed changes are consistent with the new, improved Standard Technical Specifications for Combustion Engineering plants (NUREG-1432).

The editorial changes to Technical Specifications 3.6.5.1, 3.6.5.2, and 3.9.15 do not change any technical aspect of these specifications. Therefore the proposed changes do not affect the probability of any previously evaluated accident.

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

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

The proposed changes do not make any physical or operational changes to existing plant structures, systems, or components. The proposed changes do not introduce any new failure modes. The proposed changes simply resolve a conflict which currently exists between Specifications 3.6.5.1 and 3.6.5.2. Thus, 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 do not have any adverse impact on the accident analyses. Also, the proposed changes resolve a conflict which currently exists between Specifications 3.6.5.1 and 3.6.5.2. The structures, systems, or components covered under Specifications 3.6.5.1 and 3.6.5.2 will perform their intended safety function when called upon.

Based on the above, 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: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, CT 06385

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

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

Date of application for amendments: March 31, 1997

Description of amendment request:
The proposed change revises the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3 technical specifications to extend the surveillance interval for calibration of Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) flow bias instrumentation from 18 months to 24 months.

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

1. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the accidents previously evaluated take credit only for the clamped 120% high neutron flux scram setpoint. Credit is not taken for the flow biased APRM scram setpoint. Failure or inaccuracy of the flow biased feature of the APRM scram setpoint will in no way affect the clamped high flux scram setpoint. The 120% high flux scram setpoint is derived internal to the APRM circuitry and calibrated separately as part of the APRM trip circuitry. The APRM clamped high flux scram setpoint is not being impacted by the proposed changes and will be automatically enforced regardless of the status or accuracy of the APRM flow bias circuitry.

Because there is no impact on the clamped 120% high neutron flux scram setpoint which is the only APRM scram setpoint with any analytical safety basis, the proposed changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes do not allow plant operation in any mode that is not already evaluated. The APRM system provides monitoring and accident mitigation functions to limit peak flux in the core during Modes 1 and 2. No pressure boundary interfaces or process control parameters will be challenged in any way as to create the possibility of a new or different type of accident than any previously evaluated. Also, failure of the sensing line associated with flow transmitters to measure recirculation drive flow has already been accounted for in the initial plant design by including excess

flow check valves for sensing line break isolation. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the APRM flow biased high flux scram is not credited in the PBAPS safety analysis. Because the proposed changes do not impact safety analysis assumptions, these proposed changes will 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: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105.

Attorney for licensee: J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire, Sr. V. P. and General Counsel, PECO Energy Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19101
NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

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

Date of amendment request: April 22, 1997

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would revise Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) Technical Specification (TS) Section 4.2.b, "Steam Generator Tubes," to allow a laser-welded repair of Westinghouse hybrid expansion joint (HEJ) sleeved steam generator (SG) tubes. The proposed repair process would fuse the tube to the sleeve in the upper joint of the existing HEJ sleeved tubes. The repair weld would be made in either the hardroll (HR) expansion or the upper hydraulic expansion (HE) region of the HEJ. By fusing the tube to the sleeve, parent tube degradation below the weld would be isolated and a new pressure boundary would be formed. The new pressure boundary would satisfy both the structural and leakage integrity requirements of the sleeved tube assembly with no change in the flow or heat transfer characteristics of the sleeved tube. The proposed amendment supersedes in its entirety a previously submitted proposed amendment dated September 6, 1996, which was noticed in the Federal Register on October 15, 1996 (61 FR 53769).

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 KNPP in accordance with the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The laser-weld repair of HEJ sleeved tubes in either the HR or HE location will not affect the tube, sleeve, or weld stress conditions or fatigue usage factors such that the limits of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code are exceeded. Accelerated corrosion testing performed on prototypic HR welds, and a corrosion assessment performed for the HE welds concluded that the repair welds will not result in aggravated stress corrosion cracking at the weld-repair location. Any postulated sleeve joint degradation would occur at a relatively slow rate and would be detectable by routine non-destructive examination (NDE) inspection prior to reaching any applicable safety margins. Therefore, use of the laser-weld repair process will not result in an increased probability of an accident previously evaluated.

A post-weld stress relief ultrasonic test inspection is required to verify minimum acceptable weld thickness to ensure that the weld stresses do not exceed ASME Code limits for both stress intensity and fatigue usage. Leakage testing of laser-welded sleeve joints, and in-situ leakage testing of the laser-welded repairs (LWR) at KNPP, demonstrate a leak-tight joint at pressures up to main steam line break. Mechanical testing of 7/8 inch laser-welded tubesheet sleeves installed in roll-expanded tubes has shown that the individual joint structural strength of Alloy 690 laser-welded sleeves under normal, upset, and faulted conditions provides margin to acceptable limits. These acceptable limits bound the most limiting (3 times normal operating pressure differential) recommended by Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.121.

The HEJ sleeve plugging limit currently defined in the TS is reduced from 31% to 24% throughwall due to the use of ASME code minimum material properties values for the sleeve material. Minimum wall thickness requirements (used for developing the depth-based plugging limit for the sleeve) are determined using the guidance of RG 1.121 and the pressure stress equation of Section 3 of the ASME Code.

The hypothetical consequences of failure of the laser-welded repaired HEJ would be bounded by the current SG tube rupture (SGTR) analysis covered in the KNPP Updated Safety Analysis Report. Due to the slight reduction in diameter caused by the sleeve wall thickness, primary coolant release rates would be slightly less than assumed for the SGTR, and, therefore, would result in lower primary fluid mass release to the secondary system. The laser-weld repair process does not change the existing reactor coolant system flow conditions; therefore,

existing loss of coolant accident (LOCA) and non-LOCA analysis results will be unaffected. Plant response to design basis accidents for the current tube plugging and flow conditions are not affected by the repair process; no new tube diameter restrictions are introduced. Therefore, the application of the repair weld will not increase the consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

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

Application of laser-welded repair for the HEJ sleeved tubes will not introduce significant or adverse changes to the plant design basis. The general configuration of the HEJ sleeve is unaffected by the repair process. The repair process also does not represent a potential to affect any other plant component. Stress and fatigue analysis of the repair has shown that the ASME Code and RG 1.121 criteria are not exceeded. Application of the laser-weld repair to the HEJ sleeved tubes maintains overall tube bundle structural and leakage integrity. Extensive testing and evaluation including examination of actual pulled tube samples verified adequate structural and leakage integrity of repair HEJs, which had acceptable NDE.

Any hypothetical accident as a result of potential tube or sleeve degradation in the repaired portion of the joint is bounded by the existing tube rupture accident analysis. Therefore, use of the laser-welded repair process will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The laser-weld repair of the HEJ sleeved tubes has been shown to restore integrity of the tube bundle consistent with its original design basis conditions; i.e., tube/sleeve operational and faulted load stresses and cumulative fatigue usage factors are bounded by ASME Code requirements and the tubes are leak tight under all plant conditions. Based on the results of the structural and leakage testing performed on LWR joints pulled from the KNPP SGs and supporting analytical evaluations, application of laser-welded repair will not result in 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: University of Wisconsin, Cofrin Library, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-7001.

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

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

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

Date of amendment request: April 24, 1997

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendment would revise Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) Technical Specification (TS) Section 4.2.b, "Steam Generator Tubes," to allow repair of steam generator (SG) tubes with Combustion Engineering (CE) leak-tight sleeves in accordance with CE generic topical report CEN-629-P, Revision 2, "Repair of Westinghouse Series 44 and 51 Steam Generator Tubes Using Leak-Tight Sleeves." The TS would also be revised to allow re-sleeving of tubes with existing sleeve joints in accordance with KNPP specific topical report CEN-632-P, "Repair of Kewaunee Steam Generator Tubes Using a Re-Sleeving Technique."

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 KNPP in accordance with the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The supporting technical evaluation and safety evaluation for the CE leak-tight sleeves demonstrates that the sleeve configuration will provide SG tube structural and leakage integrity under normal operating and accident conditions. The sleeve configurations have been designed and analyzed in accordance with the requirements of the ASME Code. Mechanical testing has shown that the sleeve and sleeve joints provide margin above acceptance limits. Ultrasonic testing is used to verify the leak tightness of the weld above the tubesheet. Testing has demonstrated the leak tightness of the hardroll joint as well as the structural integrity of the hardroll joint. Tube rupture cannot occur at the hardroll joint due to the reinforcing effect of the tubesheet. Tests have demonstrated that tube collapse will not occur due to postulated loss of coolant accident loadings.

The existing TS leak-rate requirements and accident analysis assumptions remain unchanged in the event that significant leakage does occur from the sleeve joint or the sleeve assembly ruptures. Any leakage through the sleeve assembly is fully bounded by the existing SG tube rupture analysis included in the KNPP Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. The proposed sleeving and re-sleeve repair processes do not adversely impact any other previously evaluated design basis accidents.

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

Installation of the sleeves or re-sleeves does not introduce any significant changes to the plant design basis. The use of a sleeve to span the area of degradation of the SG tube restores the structural and leakage integrity of the tubing to meet the original design basis. Stress and fatigue analysis of the sleeve assembly shows that the requirements of the ASME Code are met. Mechanical testing has demonstrated that margin exists above the design criteria. Any hypothetical accident as a result of any degradation in the sleeved tube would be bounded by the existing tube rupture accident analysis.

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

The use of sleeves to repair degraded SG tubing has been demonstrated to maintain the integrity of the tube bundle commensurate with the requirements of the ASME Code and draft Regulatory Guide 1.121, and to maintain the primary to secondary pressure boundary under normal and postulated accident conditions. The safety factors used in the verification of the strength of the sleeve assembly are consistent with the safety factors in the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code used in SG design. The operational and faulted condition stresses and cumulative usage factors are bounded by the ASME Code requirements. The sleeve assembly has been verified by testing to prevent both tube pullout and significant leakage during normal and postulated accident conditions. A test program was conducted to ensure the lower hardrolled joint design was leak tight and capable of withstanding the design loads. The primary coolant pressure boundary of the sleeve assembly will be periodically inspected by non-destructive examination to identify sleeve degradation due to operation.

Installation of the sleeves and re-sleeves will decrease the number of tubes that must be taken out-of-service due to plugging. There is a small amount of primary coolant flow reduction due to the sleeve for which an equivalent plugging sleeve to plug ratio is assigned based on sleeve length. The ratio is used to assess the final equivalent plugging percentage as an input to other safety analyses. Because the sleeve maintains the design basis requirements for the SG tubing, it is concluded that the proposed change does not result in 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: University of Wisconsin, Cofrin Library, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-7001.

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

NRC Project Director: Gail H. Marcus

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

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

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

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 amendments request: March 27, 1997

Brief description of amendments: The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Units 1 and 2 to eliminate certain instrumentation response time testing requirements in accordance with NRC-approved BWR Owners Group Topical Report NEDO-32291-A, "System Analysis for the Elimination of Selected Response Time Testing Requirements."

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: April 1, 1997 (62 FR 15542)

Expiration date of individual notice: May 1, 1997

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

Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota, and Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

Date of amendment requests: December 6, 1996

Description of amendment requests: The licensee requests amendments to the Prairie Island and Monticello operating licenses to reflect the Commission's approval of the transfer of

control over the subject NRC licenses held by Northern States Power Company (NSP). On October 20, 1995, as supplemented August 28, 1996, NSP requested NRC approval for the transfer of control of licenses. The Commission is considering the issuance of amendments to the licenses to reflect the above transfer approved by the Commission on April 1, 1997 (62 FR 17882, dated April 11, 1997).

Date of individual notice in the Federal Register: April 11, 1997 (62 FR 17882)

Expiration date of individual notice: May 12, 1997

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

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

Date of amendment request: April 4, 1997

Brief description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would clarify the scope of the surveillance requirements for response time testing of instrumentation in the reactor protection system, isolation actuation system, and emergency core cooling system in the Technical Specifications for each unit (Sections 4.3.1.3, 4.3.2.3, and 4.3.3.3).

Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register: April 17, 1997 (62 FR 17885)

Expiration date of individual notice: May 19, 1997

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

Notice Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses

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

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant

Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved. Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Date of application for amendment: January 24, 1997, as supplemented March 27, 1997

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment will update the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (SLMCPR) in Technical Specification 2.1.2 and the associated Bases section to reflect the results of the latest cycle-specific calculation performed for the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Operating Cycle 12. In addition, the values provided in Note 5 of Table 3.2.C.1, which are based on the SLMCPR values, have been revised as a result of the changes to the SLMCPR value.

Date of issuance: April 7, 1997

Effective date: April 7, 1997

Amendment No.: 171

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 12, 1997 (62 FR 6568) The March 27, 1997, supplemental letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 7, 1997 No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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 amendment: March 27, 1997, as supplemented April 11, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications relating to response time testing requirements associated with the reactor protection system, isolation system, and emergency core cooling system.

Date of issuance: April 18, 1997

Effective date: April 18, 1997

Amendment Nos.: 184 and 215

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications. Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC): Yes (62 FR 15542 dated April 1, 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 1, 1997, but indicated that if the Commission makes a final NSHC determination, any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendments. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, and final determination of NSHC are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 18, 1997.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: December 21, 1995, as supplemented on October 24, 1996, and March 24, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments relocate certain cycle-

specific parameter limits from the Technical Specifications (TS) to the Operating Limits Report. The cycle-specific parameter limits to be relocated are for Shutdown Rod Insertion Limit, Control Rod Insertion Limits, Axial Flux Difference Target Band, Heat Flux Hot Channel Factor [$F_Q(z)$], and Nuclear Enthalpy Rise Hot Channel Factor (F_N delta H). In addition, your March 24, 1997, submittal contained supplementary revisions to the Bases section associated with the above TS change. The supplementary Bases pages will be reviewed and transmitted to you under separate cover. Finally, Braidwood's TS 6.9.1.7 title was corrected.

Date of issuance: April 16, 1997

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

Amendment Nos.: 88, 88, 80, 80

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: February 20, 1997 (62 FR 7804). The March 24, 1997, submittal provided 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 16, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendments: April 29, 1996, as supplemented on January 21 and March 25, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments would: (1) revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.1.1, Action a., to require the unit to be in hot shutdown, rather than cold shutdown, for consistency with NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Plants," and add a new Action b. to clarify the shutdown requirements when there are more than three inoperable main steam line American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) safety valves on any

one steam generator; (2) revise TS Surveillance Requirement 4.7.1.1 to clarify that Specification 4.0.4 does not apply for entry into Mode 3 for Byron and Braidwood and for Braidwood only, delete the one-time requirements for Unit 1, Cycle 5 and Unit 2 after outage A2F27; (3) revise the maximum allowable power range neutron flux high trip setpoints in Table 3.7-1; (4) revise Table 3.7-2 to increase the as-found main steam safety valve (MSSV) lift setpoint tolerance to plus or minus 3 percent, provide an as-left setpoint tolerance of plus or minus 1 percent, and change a table notation; (5) delete the orifice size column from Table 3.7-2; and (6) revise the Bases for TS 3.7.1.1 to be consistent with the proposed changes to TS 3.7.1.1.

Date of issuance: April 15, 1997

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

Amendment Nos.: 87, 87, 79, and 79

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: March 12, 1997 (62 FR 11486). The March 25, 1997, submittal provided additional 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 15, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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 7, 1996, as supplemented March 12, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specifications to allow the use of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Option B, "Performance-Based Containment Leak Rate Testing."

Date of issuance: April 10, 1997

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

Amendment No.: 190

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: September 11, 1996 (61 FR 47976) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 10, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

Date of application for amendment: March 27, 1997, as supplemented on April 4, 1997

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises technical specification surveillance requirement (SR) 4.3.1.3 for the Reactor Protection System Instrumentation to indicate that certain sensors are exempt from response time testing. A similar revision is made to SR 4.3.2.3 for the Isolation Actuation Instrumentation. Finally, SR 4.3.3.3 for the Emergency Core Cooling System Actuation Instrumentation is revised to indicate that the emergency core cooling system actuation instrumentation is exempt from response time testing.

Date of issuance: April 18, 1997

Effective date: April 18, 1997, with full implementation prior to entry into Operation Condition 2 or 3

Amendment No.: 111

Facility Operating License No. NPF-43. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards considerations (NSHC): Yes (62 FR 15731 dated April 2, 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 2, 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 April 18, 1997.

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

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

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: January 6, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated April 10 and 15, 1997

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise portions of the Technical Specifications to permit a one-time operation of the Containment Purge Ventilation System during Modes 3 and 4 after the current and forthcoming steam generator replacement outages.

Date of issuance: April 24, 1997

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

Amendment Nos.: 174 and 156

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 12, 1997 (62 FR 6574) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 24, 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

Duquesne Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: September 9, 1996

Brief description of amendments: These amendments modify the design features section (Section 5.0) of the Technical Specifications (TSs) to make the design features section consistent with the intent of 10 CFR 50.36 and with the guidance provided in the NRC's Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants (NUREG-1431, Revision 1).

Date of issuance: April 14, 1997

Effective date: Both units, as of date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment Nos.: 202 and 83

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: December 4, 1996 (61 FR 64384) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library,

663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 15001

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 amendment deletes the specific value for the total reactor coolant system volume from the Design Features section of the Technical Specifications.

Date of issuance: April 16, 1997

Effective date: April 16, 1997

Amendment No.: 181

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 April 16, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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: Request to add CENTS code as a Reference to the Technical Manual used for determining Core Operating Limits Report in the Technical Specifications.

Date of issuance: April 24, 1997

Effective date: April 24, 1997

Amendment No.: 182

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 29, 1997 (62 FR 4347) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 24, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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: January 10, 1997

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the technical specifications for reactor pressure vessel pressure and temperature limits by providing new limits that are valid to 12 effective full power years.

Date of issuance: April 14, 1997

Effective date: April 14, 1997

Amendment No.: 93

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 26, 1997 (62 FR 8798) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 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. 50-382, Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: November 7, 1995, as supplemented by letters dated July 17, and December 26, 1996, and February 27, March 14, April 7, and April 17, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Appendix A Technical Specifications by revising TS 3/4.8.1, "Electrical Power Systems - A.C. Sources," to incorporate recommendations and suggestions from (1) Generic Letter (GL) 93-05, "Line-Item Technical Specifications Improvements to Reduce Surveillance Requirements for Testing During Power Operations;" (2) GL 94-01, "Removal of Accelerated Testing and Special Reporting Requirements for Emergency Diesel Generators from Plant Technical Specifications;" and (3) NUREG-1432, "Standard Technical Specifications Combustion Engineering Plants."

Date of issuance: April 21, 1997

Effective date: April 21, 1997, to be implemented within 60-days.

Amendment No.: 126

Facility Operating License No. NPF-38: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 3, 1996 (61 FR 180) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 21, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70122

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

Date of application for amendment: October 10, 1996 (TSCR 243)

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the Technical Specifications (TS) by replacing the description of the existing permissive interlock from AC Voltage to Core Spray Booster Pump d/p Permissive: ≤ 21.2 psid for initiation of the automatic depressurization system, adds corresponding surveillance requirements, and adds notes clarifying functional requirements.

Date of Issuance: April 14, 1997

Effective date: April 14, 1997, with full implementation within 60 days

Amendment No.: 190

Facility Operating License No. DPR-16.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: November 6, 1996 (61 FR 57485). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 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.

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

Date of application for amendment: September 5, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deletes License Condition 2.C.(5), "Integrated Implementation Schedule" from the Millstone Unit 1 Operating License.

Date of issuance: April 15, 1997

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

Amendment No.: 100

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 23, 1996 (61 FR 55036) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 15, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No. *Local Public Document Room location:* Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, Connecticut 06360 and at the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut 06385

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

Date of application for amendment: February 5, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deletes a clause from Technical Specification 4.0.5.a. Specifically, this change deletes the clause "(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.55a(g)(6)(i)." The amendment also makes the appropriate changes to the Bases section.

Date of issuance: April 21, 1997

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

Amendment No.: 138

Facility Operating License No. NPF-49: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 26, 1997 (62 FR 8800) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 21, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

Date of application for amendment: March 4, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies Surveillance Requirements 4.8.1.1.2.a.6, 4.8.1.1.2.b, and 4.8.1.1.2.g.7 by specifying load bands in loading the diesel generator (DG) in lieu of the present requirement to load the DG greater than or equal to a given value. A footnote is being added to the three surveillance requirements to indicate that a momentary transient outside the load range shall not invalidate the test. The associated Bases sections have been revised to reflect the above changes.

Date of issuance: April 15, 1997

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

Amendment No.: 137

Facility Operating License No. NPF-49: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 12, 1997 (62 FR 11496) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 15, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room

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

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

Date of application for amendments: February 14, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated February 24, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to revise 30 TS and add two new TS surveillance requirements to support implementation of extended fuel cycles at DCPP Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The specific TS changes include those for 9 trip actuating device tests, 12 fluid system actuation tests, and 11 miscellaneous tests. Two of the fluid system actuation tests are new TS surveillance requirements. The TS changes also involve adding a new frequency notation, "R24, REFUELING INTERVAL," to Table 1.1 of the TS. Also, a revision that applies to all subsequent TS changes involves revising the Bases Section of TS 4.0.2 to change the surveillance frequency from an 18-month surveillance interval to at least once each refueling interval.

Date of issuance: April 14, 1997

Effective date: April 14, 1997, to be implemented within 90 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - 118; Unit 2 - 116

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 19, 1996 (61 FR 31183) The February 24, 1997, supplemental letter provided additional clarifying information and did not change the staff's initial no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

Date of application for amendments: May 31, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated December 16, 1996.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit Nos. 1 and 2 to revise 23 TS surveillance frequencies from at least once every 18 months to at least once per refueling outage (nominally 24 months) and to make administrative changes for 6 other TS to maintain consistency for TS that are not proposed for surveillance extension. The specific TS changes proposed include those for 2 response time tests, 3 containment spray system tests, and 24 ventilation system tests.

Date of issuance: April 14, 1997

Effective date: April 14, 1997, to be implemented within 90 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - 119; Unit 2 - Amendment No. 117

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 9, 1996 (61 FR 52966) The December 16, 1996, supplemental letter provided additional clarifying information and did not change the staff's initial no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

Date of application for amendment: November 22, 1996

Brief description of amendment: The amendment allows an increase in the U-235 enrichment of fuel stored in the fresh fuel storage racks or the spent fuel storage racks from 4.5 weight percent (w/o) U-235 to 5.0 w/o U-235.

Date of issuance: April 15, 1997

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

Amendment No.: 173

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 15, 1997 (62 FR 2182) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in the Safety Evaluation dated April 15, 1997, and an Environmental Assessment dated March 25, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: Yes

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

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of application for amendments: December 3, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated January 27 and April 4, 1997

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Technical Specification 2.1.1.2 to change the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio based on the cycle-specific analyses of Cycle 13 of a non-equilibrium core of all General Electric (GE) 9 fuel with varying enrichments and Cycle 14 of a non-equilibrium mixed core of GE13 and GE9 fuel.

Date of issuance: April 17, 1997

Effective date: For Cycle 13, as of the date of issuance; For Cycle 14, effective upon startup.

Amendment Nos.: 148 for Cycle 13; 149 for Cycle 14

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

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: January 29, 1997 (62 FR 4349) The January 27 and April 4, 1997, letters provided additional information that did not change the scope of the December 3, 1996, 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 17, 1997. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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: April 4, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated January 10, February 7, February 13, March 17, March 19, March 20, March 25, April 1, April 6, April 10, April 11, and April 18, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Sequoyah Technical Specifications (TSs) and associated Bases to allow for the conversion from Westinghouse fuel to Framatome Cogema Fuel, designated Mark-BW. The planned fuel conversion begin with fuel cycle 9 for each unit. The amendments would revise the TSs to reflect the fuel design and vendor change. The licensee's evaluation was contained in Topical Report BAW-10220P, "Mark-BW Fuel Assembly Application for Sequoyah Nuclear Units 1 and 2."

Date of issuance: April 21, 1997

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented no later than 45 days of its issuance for Unit 1, and implemented upon installation of Framatome Cogema Fuel in the Unit 2 reactor vessel for Unit 2.

Amendment Nos.: 223 and 214

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79: Amendments revise the Technical Specifications and License Conditions.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 8, 1996 (61 FR 20856) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 21, 1997 No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

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

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

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

by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

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

For exigent circumstances, the Commission has either issued a **Federal Register** notice providing opportunity for public comment or has used local media to provide notice to the public in the area surrounding a licensee's 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 6, 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 Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: April 14, 1997, as supplemented on April 17, April 22, and April 24, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The proposed amendments requested (1) review and approval of an Unreviewed Safety Question (USQ) involving the control room operator dose resulting from an error in the secondary containment volume, (2) a change in Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirements (SR) 4.7. P.2.b and 4.7. P.3 values for the allowed methyl iodide penetration for the standby gas treatment charcoal adsorbers, and (3) change of TS 5.2.C to

reflect the new calculated free volume of the secondary containment. The April 17, April 22 and April 24, 1997, submittals provided additional clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

Date of Issuance: April 25, 1997

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

Amendment Nos.: 158 and 153

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-19 and DPR-25: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications. Press release issued requesting comments as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes. April 22, 1997. Joliet Herald News. Comments received: No. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments, finding of exigent circumstances, consultation with the State of Illinois and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 25, 1997.

Attorney for licensee: Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60690

Local Public Document Room

location: Morris Area Public Library District, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450

NRC Project Director: Robert A. Capra

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

Date of application for amendment: April 16, 1997, and as supplemented by a letter dated April 18, 1997

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changes the footnote in the Design Features Section 5.3.1 of the Technical Specifications to allow the use of ATRIUM-10 fuel in Operational Conditions 3 and 4.

Date of issuance: April 25, 1997

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented upon receipt.

Amendment No.: 138

Facility Operating License No. NPF-22: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications. Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes. The NRC published a public notice of the proposed amendment, issued a proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration and requested that any comments on the proposed no significant hazards consideration be provided to the staff by the close of business on April 24, 1997. The notice was published in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader and the Berwick Press

Enterprise on April 22-24, 1997. Public comments were received and have been addressed in the staff's safety evaluation.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment, finding of exigent circumstances, consultation with the State of Pennsylvania and final no significant hazards consideration determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 25, 1997.

Local Public Document Room

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

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

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz
Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of April 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Elinor G. Adensam,

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

[Doc. 97-11725 Filed 5-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

NUREG-1606, Proposed Regulatory Guidance Related to Implementation of 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests or Experiments)

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued for public comment NUREG-1606, a document that presents proposed regulatory guidance and staff interpretations regarding implementation of 10 CFR 50.59. Section 50.59 defines the conditions under which reactor licensees may make changes to the facility or procedures as described in the safety analysis report (SAR) and the conduct of tests or experiments not described in the SAR without prior NRC approval. Changes (including tests or experiments) involving a change to the technical specifications or an unreviewed safety question require NRC approval by a license amendment before implementation. The NRC has been evaluating the need to develop or clarify guidance on aspects related to 10 CFR 50.59 over the last several months. This draft NUREG issued for comment, entitled "Proposed Regulatory Guidance Related to Implementation of 10 CFR 50.59 (Changes, Tests or Experiments)" presents the results of the NRC's review.

The draft report was forwarded to the Commission in SECY-97-035, dated February 12, 1997. The proposed regulatory guidance reaffirms existing regulatory practice in many areas; clarifies the NRC's expectations and positions in areas where industry practice or position differs from the NRC's expectations for implementation of 10 CFR 50.59; and establishes guidance in areas where previous guidance did not exist. The NUREG also briefly discusses some policy issues related to potential rulemaking for 10 CFR 50.59. This document is being issued to seek comment on whether the proposed regulatory guidance is clear and whether there are other areas in which guidance or changes to the rule would be useful.

Draft NUREG-1606 is available for inspection and copying for a fee at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW (Lower Level), Washington D.C. 20555-0001. A free single copy of draft NUREG-1606, to the extent of supply, may be requested by writing to Distribution Services, Printing, Graphics and Distribution Branch, Office of Information Resources Management, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington D.C. 20555-0001.

DATES: The comment period ends July 7, 1997. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practical. Following review of public comments, NRC will determine whether to issue a regulatory guide or to take other action. Any changes in industry guidance or requirements will be subject to 10 CFR 50.109 backfit review before issuance.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments on the NRC document (NUREG-1606) to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington D.C. 20555-0001. Comments may be hand-delivered to 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville Maryland, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays. Copies of comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW, Washington DC.

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

If using a personal computer and modem, the NRC subsystem on