By October 10, 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 located at the Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama. 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 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 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: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to M. Stanford Blanton, Esq., Balch and Bingham, Post Office Box 306, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama 35201, attorney for the licensee.

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

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated September 3, 1997, 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 located at the Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of September 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jacob I. Zimmerman,

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

[FR Doc. 97–23995 Filed 9–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–U

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

I. Background

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

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from August 18, 1997, through August 28, 1997. The last biweekly notice was published on August 27, 1997 (62 FR 45452).

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

By October 10, 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: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. A copy of 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.

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

Date of amendment request: August 15, 1997.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise portions of the facility Technical Specifications regarding facility staffing and training requirements to power operations. By letter dated August 7, 1997, the licensee certified permanent cessation of power operations and permanent removal of fuel from the reactor vessel. By two letters both dated August 15, 1997, the licensee has also submitted a related ''Request for Exemption from Certain Requirements of 10 CFR 50.54, Conditions of License,'' and a ''Request for Approval of the Certified Fuel Handler Training and Retraining Program.''

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

The proposed change does not:

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

The purpose of the proposed change is to eliminate the requirements for licensed operators and a licensed operator training program and to replace those with certified fuel handlers and a certified fuel handler training and retraining program. Since the plant has permanently ceased operation and will be maintained in a defueled condition, the range of accidents for which an operator needs to be trained has significantly diminished such that a training program of the depth and breadth of that required by 10 CFR [Part] 55 is no longer needed. In lieu of a 10 CFR [Part] 55 licensed operator training program, a[n] NRC-approved certified fuel handler training and retraining program will be implemented. Since this training program will adequately equip appropriate operations personnel for fuel handling operations, including responses to abnormal events/accidents, there will be no increase in the probability of these events occurring or in the consequences of these events. The proposed changes do not affect plant equipment or the procedures for equipment operation or response to abnormal events/accidents.

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

The purpose of this proposed change is to eliminate the requirements for licensed operators and a licensed operator training program and to replace those with certified fuel handlers and a certified fuel handler training and retraining program. This change ensures the qualifications of operations personnel are commensurate with the tasks to be performed and the conditions to be responded to. This change does not affect plant equipment or the procedures for operating plant equipment and, therefore, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change is to eliminate the requirements for licensed operators and a licensed operator training program to replace those with certified fuel handlers and a certified fuel handler training and retraining program. This change ensures the qualifications of the operations personnel are commensurate with the tasks to be performed and the conditions to be responded to. The assumptions for a fuel handling accident in the Fuel Building are not affected by the proposed changes. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

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

NRC Acting Project Director: Ronald B. Eaton.

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

Date of amendment request: August 1, 1997.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would change Technical Specification Section 4.2.1 of Appendix B to the licenses. The changes include rewording of the section to generically state that Public Service Gas & Electric (PSE&G) will adhere to the Section 7, Incidental Take Statement, approved by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Removing the specific requirements of this section enables PSE&G to utilize relief granted by the NMFS on a case-by-case basis.

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

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

The changes are administrative in nature and would in no way affect the initial conditions, assumptions, or conclusions of the Salem [Nuclear] Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, accident analyses. In addition, the proposed changes would not affect the operation or performance of any equipment assumed in the accident analyses. Based on the above information, we conclude that the proposed changes would not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The changes are administrative in nature and would in no way impact or alter the configuration or operation of the facilities and would create no new modes of operation. We therefore conclude that the proposed changes would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

As indicated in the discussion of Criterion 1, the changes are administrative in nature and would in no way affect plant or equipment operation or the accident analysis. We therefore conclude that the proposed changes would not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three

standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

Attorney for licensee: Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz.

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

Date of amendments request: July 23, 1997.

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) by relocating the reactor coolant system pressure and temperature limits from the TSs to the proposed Pressure Temperature Limits Report in accordance with the guidance provided by Generic Letter 96–03, ''Relocation of the Pressure Temperature Limit Curves and Low Temperature Overpressure Protection System Limits.''

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

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

The proposed removal of the Reactor Coolant System (RCS) pressure temperature (P/T) limits from the Technical Specifications (TSs) and relocation to the proposed Pressure Temperature Limits Report (PTLR) in accordance with the guidance provided by Generic Letter (GL) 96–03 is administrative in that the requirements for the P/T limits are unchanged. The P/T limits proposed for inclusion in the PTLR are based on the fluence associated with 2775 MW [megawatts] thermal power and operation through 36 effective full power years (EFPY). GL 96–03 requires that the P/T limits be generated in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR [Part] 50, Appendices G and H, documented in an NRC-approved topical report incorporated by reference in the TSs. Accordingly, the proposed curves have been generated using the NRC-approved methods described in WCAP–14040–NP–A, Revision 2, and meet the requirements of 10 CFR [Part] 50, Appendices G and H. TS 3.4.10.1 will continue to require that the RCS pressure and temperature be limited in accordance with the limits specified in the PTLR. The NRC-approved methodology for generating the P/T limit, WCAP–14040–NP–A, Revision 2, will be specified in TS 6.9.1.15 and NRC approval will be required in the form of a TS Amendment prior to changing the methodology. Use of P/T limit curves generated using the NRC-approved methods described in WCAP–14040–NP–A, Revision 2, as specified in TS 6.9.1.15, will provide additional protection for the integrity of the reactor vessel, thereby assuring that the reactor vessel is capable of providing its function as a radiological barrier.

TS 3.4.10.3 for Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP) Unit 1 and Unit 2 provides the operability requirements for RCS low temperature overpressure protection (LTOP). Specifically, TS 3.4.10.3 requires that two residual heat removal (RHR) system suction relief valves (RHRRVs) be operable or that the RCS be vented at RCS cold leg temperatures less than or equal to 310°F. GL 96–03 recognizes that RHRRVs do not have variable pressure lift setpoints and states that those plants that rely on the RHRRVs for LTOP should continue to address the LTOP requirements in the TS. Consistent with GL 96–03, the Farley Unit 1 and Unit 2 requirements for LTOP will be retained in TS 3.4.10.3.

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

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

As stated above, the proposed changes to remove the RCS P/T limits from the TSs and relocate them to the proposed PTLR is an administrative change. Consistent with the guidance provided by GL 96–03, the proposed P/T limits contained in the proposed PTLR meet the requirements of 10 CFR [Part] 50, Appendices G and H, and were generated using the NRC-approved methods described in WCAP–14040–NP–A, Revision 2. The proposed changes do not result in a physical change to the plant or add any new or different operating requirements on plant systems, structures, or components with the exception of limiting the number of operating RCPs [reactor coolant pumps] at RCS temperatures below 110°F. Limiting the number of operating RCPs below 110°F results in a reduction in the [delta]P between the reactor vessel beltline and the RHRRVs, thereby providing additional margin to limits of Appendix G. Provisions are made to allow the start of a second RCP at temperatures below 110°F in order to secure the pump that was originally operating without interrupting RCS flow. The LTOP enable temperature exceeds the minimum LTOP enable temperature determined using the NRC-approved methods described in WCAP–14040–NP–A, Rev. 2, thereby providing additional assurance that the LTOP system will be available to protect the RCS in the event of an overpressure transient at RCS temperatures at or below 310°F. Using the methods contained in WCAP–14040–NP–A, Rev. 2, the minimum boltup temperature for the reactor vessel flange region is 60°F which is less than the design limits of the fuel cladding. Administrative controls require a minimum RCS temperature of 68°F when fuel is loaded in the reactor vessel to protect against brittle failure of the fuel cladding, and also require that the component cooling water (CCW) temperature be maintained between 60°F and 105°F during refueling operations, thus reducing the potential for the RCS temperature to be less than the minimum boltup temperature specified in the proposed PTLRs.

As stated in the above response, implementation of the proposed changes do not result in a significant increase in the probability of a new or different accident (i.e., loss of reactor vessel integrity). The RCS P/T limits will continue to meet the requirements of 10 CFR [Part] 50, Appendices G and H, and will be generated in accordance with the NRC approved methodology described in WCAP–14040–NP–A, Rev. 2. Therefore, the proposed changes do not result in a significant increase in the possibility of a new or different accident from any previously evaluated.

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

The margin of safety is not affected by the removal of the RCS P/T limits from the TSs and relocating them to the proposed PTLR. The RCS P/T limits will continue to meet the requirements of 10 CFR [Part] 50, Appendices G and H. To provide additional assurance that the P/T limits continue to meet the requirements of Appendices G and H, TS 6.9.1.15 will require the use of the NRC-approved methodology described in WCAP–14040–NP–A, Rev. 2, to generate P/T limits. The RCS LTOP requirements will be retained in TS 3.4.10.3 due to use of the RHRRVs for LTOP, consistent with the guidance provided by GL 96–03. The LTOP enable temperature exceeds the LTOP enable temperature determined in accordance with the NRC-approved methodology, thus protecting the RCS in the event of a low temperature overpressure transient over a broader range of temperatures than required by WCAP–14040–NP–A, Rev. 2. Administrative procedures preclude operation of the RCS at temperatures below the minimum boltup temperature for the reactor vessel head, thus precluding the possibility of tensioning the reactor vessel head at RCS temperatures below the minimum boltup temperature. Operation of the plant in accordance with the RCS P/T limits specified in the PTLR and continued operation of the LTOP system in accordance with TS 3.4.10.3 will continue to meet the requirements of 10 CFR [Part] 50, Appendices G and H, and will therefore, assure that a margin of safety is not significantly decreased as the result of the proposed changes.

Based on the preceding analysis, SNC [Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc.] has determined that removal of the RCS P/T limits from the TS and relocation to the proposed PTLR will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. SNC therefore concludes that the proposed change meets the requirements of 10 CFR 50.92(c) and does

not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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:* Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama 36302. *Attorney for licensee:* M. Stanford Blanton, Esq., Balch and Bingham, Post Office Box 306, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama 35201. *NRC Project Director:* Herbert N. Berkow.

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

Date of amendment request: June 20, 1997 (TS–97–004).

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would be an administrative change that would revise the analytical methodology used to determine the low temperature overpressure protection (LTOP) event heatup and cooldown curves. This revised methodology would be incorporated by reference in the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant (WBN), Unit 1 Technical Specification (TS) 5.9, ''Reporting Requirements,'' Section 5.9.6, ''Reactor Coolant System (RCS) Pressure and Temperature Limits Report (PTLR),'' upon approval for use by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The revised methodology extends the current LTOP requirements through the end of 7 effective full power years (EFPY). The only technical change being proposed is the substitution of the 7 EFPY American Society of Mechanical Engineering (ASME), Appendix G, heatup and cooldown curves adjusted by ASME Code Case N–514, ''Low Temperature Overpressure Protection'' in place of the current 1.5 EFPY curves as the bounding curves for the LTOP setpoints. This change will not impact the current 10 CFR 50, Appendix G, pressure/temperature (P/T) limit curves used for heatup and cooldown that are based on 7 EFPY.

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

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if 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. Each standard is discussed below for the proposed amendment.

(1) Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The LTOP setpoints (identified as the cold overpressure mitigation system (COMS) for WBN), adjusted for instrument inaccuracy, pressure differential, and setpoint overshoot by the scaling and setpoint documents (SSDs), ensure that the 10 CFR 50, Appendix G P/T [pressure and temperature] limits based on 7 EFPY are not exceeded by more than the provisions of ASME Code Case N–514, and therefore, ensure that the RCS integrity is maintained.

The change does not modify the RCS pressure boundary, nor make any physical changes to the facility design, material, construction standards, or setpoints. The LTOP enabling temperature based on TS 3.4.12, ''Cold Overpressure Mitigation System (COMS),'' is [less than or equal to] 350 degrees F and is more conservative than a value of 271.1 degrees F (RT_{NDT} + 90 degrees F) based on 7 EFPY. This temperature would be acceptable based on NRC Branch Technical Position-Reactor Systems Branch (BTP–RSB)–5.2, ''Overpressurization Protection of Pressurized Water Reactors While Operating at Low Temperatures.'' The LTOP enabling temperature remains unchanged by this proposed amendment. The probability of a LTOP event occurring is independent of the P/T limits for the RCS pressure boundary; therefore, the probability of an LTOP event occurring remains unchanged.

The calculation of the P/T limits in accordance with approved regulatory methods based on 7 EFPY provides assurance that reactor pressure vessel fracture toughness requirements are met and the integrity of the RCS pressure boundary is maintained. LTOP setpoints based on 1.5 EFPY P/T limits have provided margin such that a pressure excursion exceeding the 7 EFPY limits would not exceed the 1.5 EFPY limits. This margin between the 7 EFPY curves and the LTOP setpoints is maintained by changing the bounding curves for the LTOP setpoints to 7 EFPY curves adjusted by the provisions of ASME Code Case N–514. The only technical change being made is the bounding curves which provide the basis for the current LTOP setpoints.

The use of theoretical fluence for generating the P/T curves to be used for the first 7 EFPY is appropriate and was submitted July 31, 1995, with the WBN Unit 1 PTLR, Revision 4 and WCAP–13829, Revision 2, ''Heatup and Cooldown Limit Curves for Normal Operation for Watts Bar Unit 1.'' The present 7 EFPY curves are generated using a theoretical value for fluence calculated by Westinghouse in accordance with NRC approved methodology since WBN had no surveillance capsule data available at the time of plant startup. This value for fluence is conservative, and the actual fluence to the intermediate shell forging (the controlling beltline material) is expected to be significantly less than the theoretical value used to generate the initial 7 EFPY curves since WBN is transitioning to a low-leakage core. The LTOP bounding curves are based on 7 EFPY curves adjusted in accordance with ASME Code Case N–514 which were generated using the same theoretical fluence as used for the P/T curves. The significance of using the theoretical value of fluence in generating these curves is the additional margin that exists between the 7 EFPY theoretical curves and curves that would be generated using actual fluence values from capsule data. This additional margin reduces the significance of changing the LTOP basis from the 1.5 EFPY curves to the 7 EFPY curves adjusted for ASME Code Case N–514.

This change does not adversely affect the integrity of the RCS such that its function in the control of radiological consequences is affected. In addition, the change does not affect any fission barrier. The change does not degrade or prevent the LTOP power operated relief valves (PORVs) or other safety related systems from responding to accidents described in Chapter 15 of the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR). In addition, the change does not alter any assumptions previously made in the radiological consequences of an accident described in the FSAR. Therefore, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR are not increased. Thus, the operation of WBN Unit 1 in accordance with this proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

(2) Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The Appendix G P/T limitations were prepared using methods derived from the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Section III and the criteria set forth in NRC Regulatory Standard Review Plan 5.3.2, ''Pressure-Temperature Limits.'' The use of ASME Code Case N–514 and the theoretical fluence value for 7 EFPY does not modify the RCS pressure boundary, nor make any physical changes to the LTOP setpoints or system design. The proposed change was prepared in accordance with regulatory requirements and provides evaluation of LTOP events based on 7 EFPY theoretical fluence which is more limiting than actual expected neutron exposure for that same period.

This proposed change is an administrative change which incorporates by reference the use of an NRC approved methodology; therefore, the change does not cause the initiation of any accident nor create any new creditable limiting failure for safety-related

systems and components. The change does not result in an event previously deemed incredible being made credible. As such, it does not create the possibility of an accident different than any evaluated in the FSAR.

The change does not have any effect on the ability of the safety-related systems to perform their intended safety functions. The change does not create failure modes that could adversely impact safety-related equipment. Therefore, it will not create the possibility of a malfunction of equipment important to safety different than previously evaluated in the FSAR. Thus, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

(3) Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in margin of safety.

The 10 CFR 50, Appendix G P/T limitations were prepared using methods derived from ASME Section III and criteria set forth in NRC Regulatory Standard Review Plan 5.3.2. These documents along with the calculational limitations specified in 10 CFR 50.61 are an acceptable method for implementing the requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendices G and H. Inherent conservatisms in the P/T limits resulting from these documents include:

a. An assumed defect in the reactor vessel wall with a depth equal to ¼ of the thickness (T) of the vessel wall and a length equal to 1½ times the thickness of the vessel wall.

b. Assumed reference flaw oriented in both longitudinal and circumferential directions and limiting material property. At WBN, the only weld in the core region is oriented in the circumferential direction.

c. A factor of safety of 2 is applied to the membrane stress intensity factor.

d. The limiting toughness is based upon a reference value (K_{IM}) which is the lower bound of the dynamic crack initiation and arrest toughness.

e. A 2-sigma margin term is applied in determining the adjusted reference temperature (ART) that is used in calculating the limiting toughness.

Beyond the conservatisms described above, WBN has the following additional margin:

a. The value of fluence used in the calculation of the WBN Unit 1 Appendix G P/T limits is a theoretical value calculated by NRC approved methodology.

b. The ART for 7 EFPY is based on the theoretical value for fluence and therefore is conservative. The LTOP enabling temperature of [less than or equal to] 350 degrees F in accordance with TS 3.4.12 is conservative with respect to (RT_{NDT} + 90 degrees F) which based on an ART of 181.1 degrees F would equal 271.1 degrees F. An enabling temperature of (RT_{NDT} + 90 degrees F) is based on NRC BTP–RSB 5.2.

The ASME Working Group for Operating Plant Criteria developed Code Case N–514 as an alternative methodology to the safety margin requirements of Appendix G to 10 CFR 50. The Code Case provides criteria to determine pressure limits during LTOP events that avoid certain operational restrictions, provide adequate margins against failure of the reactor vessel, and reduce the potential for unnecessary activation of the relief valves used for LTOP. Specifically, the N–514 Code Case allows determination of the LTOP setpoints such that for LTOP events the maximum pressure in the reactor vessel would not exceed 110% of the P/T limits of the existing ASME Appendix G curves, and redefines the enabling temperature as a coolant temperature less than 200 degrees F or a reactor vessel metal temperature less than RT_{NDT} + 50 degrees F. Code Case N–514 has been approved by the ASME Code Committee and its content has been incorporated in Appendix G of ASME Section XI and published in the 1993 Addenda and 1995 Edition. Code Case N–514 has not been approved for use in Regulatory Guide 1.147, ''Inservice Inspection Code Case Acceptability, ASME Section XI;'' however, it has been included in the Draft Regulatory Guide 1.147 (Task DG–1050) which is currently out for public review and comment. As stated above, WBN Unit 1 uses Appendix G for the P/T limits for plant operation and an LTOP enabling temperature greater than RT_{NDT} + 90 degrees F which is more conservative than the alternative methodology contained in Code Case N–514.

The need for implementation of Code Case N–514 at WBN involves the avoidance of certain operational restrictions associated with low temperature operation of the plant. Use of Appendix G P/T limits to determine the PORV setpoints would result in pressure setpoints within the operating window; consequently, no margin would be available for normal operating pressure surges. Therefore, operating with these limits could result an unnecessary challenge to the PORVs and cavitation of the reactor coolant pumps (RCP) during normal operation. Additionally, the need to raise the RCS inventory by external heating methods to a temperature high enough to avoid PORV activation when starting a RCP from a RCS cold shutdown condition could result in undesirable thermal transients in the RCS.

Utilizing the methodology set forth in the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Section XI, Appendix G, which includes the provisions of Code Case N–514, NRC Regulatory Standard Review Plan 5.3.2, 10 CFR 50.61, and 10 CFR 50, Appendices G and H with the above additional margins ensures that proper limits and conservative safety factors are maintained. Thus the proposed change does not significantly reduce 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: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, TN 37402.

Attorney for licensee: General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, ET 10H, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

NRC Project Director: Frederick J. Hebdon.

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.

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

Date of application for amendments: March 18, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to increase the High Pressure Coolant Injection (HPCI)

system low pressure isolation setpoint from greater than 80 psig to greater than 100 psig.

Date of issuance: August 21, 1997.

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

Amendment Nos.: 161, 156.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–19 and DPR–25: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: April 9, 1997 (62 FR 17228).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 21, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: June 12, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the name ''Duke Power Company'' to ''Duke Energy Corporation'' in the Catawba operating licenses and appendices as a result of Duke Power Company's recent name change.

Date of issuance: August 22, 1997.

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

Amendment Nos.: 161 and 153.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–35 and NPF–52: Amendments revised the Facility Operating Licenses.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: July 2, 1997 (62 FR 35848).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 22, 1997, and an Environmental Assessment dated July 31, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendments: June 12, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the name ''Duke Power Company'' to ''Duke Energy Corporation'' in the McGuire operating licenses and appendices as a result of Duke Power Company's recent name change.

Date of issuance: August 26, 1997.

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

Amendment Nos.: 176 and 158.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–9 and NPF–17: Amendments revised the Licenses.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: July 2, 1997 (62 FR 35848).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 26, 1997. An Environmental Assessment was issued and dated August 15, 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, Charlotte, North Carolina.

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: October 26, 1995 and supplemented by letters dated April 7 and July 30, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the technical specifications for 16 editorial changes and deletes the reuirement for a program to prevent and detect Asiatic Clams (Corbicula) in the service water system (SWS). The Corbicula program is no longer needed because the facility has been modified and SWS no longer takes water from the Mississippi River; source of the larvae and infestation.

Date of issuance: August 26, 1997.

Effective date: August 26, 1997.

Amendment No.: 95.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: December 6, 1995 (60 FR 62492).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 26, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

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

Date of amendment request: November 15, 1996, as supplemented May 9 and August 15, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the technical specifications to increase the two recirculation loop Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) from 1.07 to 1.10 and the single recirculation loop MCPR limit from 1.08 to 1.12.

Date of issuance: August 26, 1997.

Effective date: August 26, 1997.

Amendment No.: 96.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: January 2, 1997 (62 FR 127).

The May 9 and August 15, 1997, submittal provided clarifying information that did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 26, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received. No.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

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 20, 1997 as supplemented by letter dated July 7, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the technical specifications to allow the use of flow control spectral shift strategies to increase cycle energy. The revision is based on a Maximum Extended Load Line Limit (MELLL) analysis for the River Bend Station.

Date of issuance: August 26, 1997.

Effective date: August 26, 1997.

Amendment No.: 97.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–47: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications/operating license.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: February 26, 1997 (62 CFR 8799).

The July 7, 1997 submittal provided clarifying information and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 26, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

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

Date of amendment request: November 6, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated July 31, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to delete the requirement for the Penetration Valve Leakage Control System. The licensee requested deferal of the proposal to increase the allowed leakage by main steam isolation valves and to delete the requirement for the Main Steam Positive Leakage Control System.

Date of issuance: August 26, 1997.

Effective date: August 26, 1997.

Amendment No.: 98.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: January 2, 1997 (62 FR 125).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 26, 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., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Mississippi Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50–416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: October 22, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated June 26, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Figure 3.4.11–1, ''Minimum Reactor Vessel Metal Temperature vs. Reactor Vessel Pressure,'' in Limiting Condition for Operation 3.4.11, ''RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Pressure and Temperature (P/T) Limits,'' of the Technical Specifications. The previous figure was only up to 10 Effective Full Power Years (EFPYs) and this amendment revises the figure up to 32 EFPYs. There are now five curves of Figure 3.4.11–1 for five different EFPY periods: up to 16, 16 to 20, 20 to 24, 24 to 28, and 28 to 32. The licensee submitted two sets of curves. The first set replaced TS Figure 3.4.11–1. The second set were duplicates of the first set except the second set also contained detailed information used in development of the curves and would be included in the next update of the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. There were also minor additions to Surveillance Requirements (SRs) 3.4.11.1 and 3.4.11.2 to have the SRs reference the ''applicable Figure 3.4.11–1 based on the current effective full power year (EFPY).''

Date of issuance: August 27, 1997.

Effective date: August 27, 1997.

Amendment No: 132.

Facility Operating License No. NPF–29: Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: February 26, 1997 (62 FR 8797).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of amendment request: April 11, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies Technical Specifications 3.3.3.7.3, and Surveillance Requirements (SR) 4.3.3.7.3 for the broad range gas detection system. Also it includes some changes to the Bases in Section 3/4.3.3.7 to incorporate information associated with the proposed modifications. The licensee is planning to replace the existing toxic gas monitors in the system with a new, more advanced gas monitors.

Date of issuance: August 19, 1997.

Effective date: August 19, 1997, to be implemented within 90 days.

Amendment No.: 133.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: May 7, 1997 (62 FR 24987)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 19, 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.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50–321, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Appling County, Georgia

Date of application for amendment: April 29, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated May 28, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Hatch Unit 1 reactor vessel pressure and temperature limits to reflect data collected from the material sample recovered during the March 1996 Unit 1 outage.

Date of issuance: August 19, 1997.

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

Amendment No.: 207.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–57: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: July 16, 1997 (62 FR 38138).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 19, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: October 4, 1996, as supplemented June 10 and August 15, 1997 (TSCR 250).

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio and as a result, the operating Minimum Critical Power Ratio. The amendment also capitalized certain definitions and provided a uniform type font for Sections 2.1 and 3.10.

Date of Issuance: August 26, 1997.

Effective date: August 26, 1997, with full implementation within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 192.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: November 6, 1996 (61 FR 57484).

The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a

Safety Evaluation dated August 26, 1997.

The June 10 and August 15, 1997, submittals provided clarifying information that did not alter the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards considerations determination.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: April 21, 1997, as supplemented July 17, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment reduces the required volume of borated water in each core flood tank from 1040 ft^3 to 940 ft^3, reduces the required high pressure injection pump flowrate from 500 gallons per minute (gpm) to 431 gpm, and deletes the local manual valve operability option for decay heat system valves DH–V–6A and DH–V–6B.

Date of issuance: August 27, 1997.

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

Amendment No.: 203.

Facility Operating License No. DPR–50. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: May 21, 1997 (62 FR 27795).

The July 17, 1997, submittal provided clarifying information that did not alter the initial no significant hazards determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 27, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of amendment request: April 22, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The proposed amendment revised Technical Specifications 5.3.1, Fuel Assemblies, and 6.9.1.6, Core Operating Limits Report, to allow use of an alternate zirconium-based fuel cladding, ZIRLO, and limited substitution of fuel rods by ZIRLO filler rods.

Date of issuance: August 19, 1997.

Effective date: August 19, 1997.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1—Amendment No. 89; Unit 2—Amendment No. 76.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: May 21, 1997 (62 FR 27795).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 19, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

Date of application for amendment: November 20, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications (TSs) by providing clarifications to the applicability and action statements in TS Table 3.3–12 relating to the Steam Generator Blowdown Monitor and the Condensate Polishing Facility Waste Neutralizing Sump radiation monitor.

Date of issuance: August 26, 1997.

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

Amendment No.: 207.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: December 20, 1995 (60 FR 65683).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 26, 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, CT 06360, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, CT 06385.

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

Date of application for amendment: May 1, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: Technical Specifications 3/4.8.2.2 and 3/4.8.3.2 specify which electrical power systems are required to be operable in Modes 5 and 6. The amendment clarifies the requirements by identifying the specific equipment required and their alignments in Modes 5 and 6.

Date of issuance: August 21, 1997.

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

Amendment No.: 146.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: June 4, 1997 (62 FR 30637).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 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: May 5, 1997.

Brief description of amendment: Technical Specification Surveillance 4.5.2.b.1 requires that the emergency core cooling system piping be verified full of water at least once per 31 days. The amendment revises the surveillance to exempt the operating charging pump(s) and associated piping from the requirement to be verified full of water and moves the description of the verification method from the surveillance to the Bases section.

Date of issuance: August 28, 1997.

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

Amendment No.: 147.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: June 4, 1997 (62 FR 30638).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a

Safety Evaluation dated August 28, 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.

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

Date of application for amendments: March 31, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated June 25, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments extend the APRM flow bias instrumentation surveillance interval from 18 months to 24 months. This will eliminate the need to perform on-line APRM surveillance testing, which requires plant operators to place an operating unit in a half scram configuration.

Date of issuance: August 19, 1997.

Effective date: Units 2 and 3 effective as of date of issuance.

Amendments Nos.: 219 and 222.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–44 and DPR–56: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: May 7, 1997 (62 FR 24988).

The supplemental letter 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 August 19, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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.

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

Date of application for amendments: June 13, 1997, as supplemented by letter dated July 18, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the pressurizer safety relief valve setpoint specified in Technical Specification 3.4.10.

Date of issuance: August 26, 1997.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented for Unit 1 prior to or after initial entry into Mode 3 (in accordance with the provisions of the note to the Applicability for LCO 3.4.10) following the fall 1997 refueling outage; for Unit 2 prior to or after initial entry into Mode 3 (in accordance with the provisions of the note to the Applicability for LCO 3.4.10) following the spring 1998 refueling outage.

Amendment Nos.: 98 and 76.

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

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: July 16, 1997 (62 FR 38139).

The supplemental material did not change the no significant hazards finding or expand the scope of the **Federal Register** notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 26, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

TU Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50–445 and 50–446, Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Somervell County, Texas

Date of amendment request: December 7, 1994 (TXX–94326), as supplemented by letter dated June 21, 1996 (TXX–96384).

Brief description of amendments: These changes revised Section 3.7.1.5 of the Technical Specification to increase the Allowed Outage Time for one inoperable Main Steam Isolation Valve (MSIV) while in Mode 1, and to clarify requirements related to inoperable MSIVs while in Modes 2 and 3.

Date of issuance: August 18, 1997.

Effective date: August 18, 1997, to be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment Nos.: 54 and 40.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–87 and NPF–89: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: February 1, 1995 (60 FR 6312).

The additional information contained in the supplemental letter dated June 21, 1996, was clarifying in nature and thus, within the scope of the initial notice and did not affect the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 18, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019.

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

Date of application for amendments: April 14, 1997 (TSCR 197), as supplemented on August 11, 1997.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise Technical Specifications (TS) Sections 15.6.2, ''Organization,'' TS 15.6.5.1, ''Manager's Supervisory Staff,'' TS 15.6.6, ''Reportable Event Action,'' TS 15.6.7, ''Actions To Be Taken If A Safety Limit Is Exceeded,'' and TS 15.7.8, ''Administrative Controls,'' by changing the title of the corporate officer responsible for nuclear operations from the ''Vice President-Nuclear Power,'' to the ''Chief Nuclear Officer.''

Date of issuance: August 25, 1997.

Effective date: August 25, 1997, with full implementation within 45 days.

Amendment Nos.: 177 and 181.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–24 and DPR–27: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register**: May 21, 1997 (62 FR 27802), as corrected May 29, 1997 (62 FR 29163) The August 11, 1997, submittal provided a corrected TS page. This information was within the scope of the action noticed and did not change the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards considerations determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 25, 1997.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: The Lester Public Library, 1001 Adams Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of September 1997.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Bruce E. Boger,

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

[FR Doc. 97–23820 Filed 9–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P