

### Finding of no Significant Impact

The environmental impacts of the proposed action have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR Part 51. Based upon the foregoing EA, the Commission finds that the proposed action of granting an exemption from 10 CFR 72.72(d), so that Virginia Power may store spent fuel records at the ISFSI in a single record storage facility which meets the requirements of ANSI N45.2.9-1974, will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined that an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption is not necessary.

The request for exemption was docketed under 10 CFR Part 72, Docket 72-2. For further details with respect to this action, see the application for an ISFSI license dated October 8, 1982, and the request for exemption dated September 10, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555 and the Local Public Document Room at the College of William and Mary, Swem Library, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of March 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**E. William Brach,**

*Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 99-7166 Filed 3-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

#### I. Background

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

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

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from March 1, 1999, through March 12, 1999. The last biweekly notice was published on March 10, 1999 (64 FR 11958).

#### 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 Administration 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 April 23, 1999, 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.

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

*Date of amendments request:* December 16, 1998.

*Description of amendments request:* The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.1, "AC Sources—Operating," and TS 3.3.7, "Diesel Generator (DG)—Loss of Voltage Start (LOVS)." The proposed amendment will (1) change Condition G of TS 3.8.1 to ensure that the appropriate actions will be taken to prevent double sequencing of safety-related loads, and (2) change TS 3.3.7 to ensure that the setpoint allowable values for the degraded voltage and the loss of voltage relays reflect the required function of the relays. *Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or

consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment will change Condition G of Technical Specification 3.8.1. These changes will ensure that the appropriate actions will be taken to prevent double sequencing of safety-related loads. This change is required to assure the capability of the offsite circuits "to effect a safe shutdown and to mitigate the effects of an accident" in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.93. The proposed amendment will also change the setpoint allowable values for the degraded voltage and the loss of voltage relays in Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.3.7.3. The proposed changes do not involve any physical changes to plant equipment. The actions required by the TS amendment will identify when an offsite circuit does not meet its required capability and provides actions to restore the required capability. The proposed changes are intended to identify and correct the conditions (voltage and/or loading) required to prevent the possibility of a double sequencing event. Therefore, this change ensures that power will be supplied to the ESF [engineered safety feature] loads following a loss of offsite power event described in UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report] 15.2.6.1. For other events discussed in the UFSAR, the electrical distribution system is an event mitigator. This change will ensure that the electrical distribution system will continue to meet this requirement. The proposed changes will not effect the function of the DG loss of voltage start as required by the design basis and safety analysis. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not involve any physical changes to plant equipment. The proposed changes ensure that appropriate controls are in place to prevent a double sequencing event. The proposed changes consider the factors in preventing a double sequencing event such as pretrip voltage, load, number of units on line, and number of transmission lines in service. These are factors which could affect post trip voltage. The actions associated with this change will identify and mitigate the condition where an offsite circuit does not meet its required capability and, as such, do not result in new or revised accident sequences. The proposed changes will not effect the function of the DG loss of voltage start as required by the design basis and safety analysis. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed amendment will change Condition G of Technical Specification 3.8.1. These changes will ensure that the appropriate actions will be taken to prevent double sequencing of safety-related loads. This change is required to assure the capability of the offsite circuits "to effect a safe shutdown and to mitigate the effects of an accident" in accordance with Regulatory

Guide 1.93. The proposed amendment will also clarify the setpoint allowable values for the degraded voltage and the loss of voltage relays in Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.3.7.3. The proposed changes do not change the operation of any system or equipment, nor do they create a new type of malfunction. The proposed changes prevent double sequencing and do not create the possibility of any other malfunction. The actions associated with this change will identify and mitigate the condition where an offsite circuit does not meet its required capability. The proposed changes will not effect the function of the DG loss of voltage start as required by the design basis and safety analysis. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed amendment will change Condition G of Technical Specification 3.8.1. These changes will ensure that the appropriate actions will be taken to prevent double sequencing of safety-related loads. This change is required to assure the capability of the offsite circuits "to effect a safe shutdown and to mitigate the effects of an accident" in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.93. The proposed amendment will also change the setpoint allowable values for the degraded voltage and the loss of voltage relays in Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.3.7.3. The proposed changes ensure that the units will be in conformance with GDC 17, Electric Power Systems (basis for TS 3.8.1). The required actions of the proposed change will ensure that the single failure analyses and safety analysis are maintained. The actions associated with this change will identify and mitigate the condition where an offsite circuit does not meet its required capability. The proposed changes ensure that the bases for the current TS are maintained. The proposed changes will not effect the function of the DG loss of voltage start as required by the design basis and safety analysis. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

**Local Public Document Room**  
location: Phoenix Public Library, 1221 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.

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

**NRC Project Director:** William H. Bateman.

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

**Date of amendment request:** February 26, 1999.

**Description of amendment request:** The proposed amendment would revise the Table Notations for Technical Specification (TS) Table 3.3-4, "Engineered Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation Trip Setpoints." Specifically, the time constants used in the lead-lag controller for Steam Line Pressure—Low (Table item 1.e.) are  $t_1$  greater than or equal to 50 seconds and  $t_2$  greater than or equal to 5 seconds. The proposed amendment would revise  $t_2$  to less than or equal to 5 seconds. Also, the time constant used in the rate-lag controller for Negative Steam Line Pressure Rate—High (Table item 4.e.) is less than or equal to 50 seconds. The proposed amendment would revise this time constant to greater than or equal to 50 seconds.

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

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

Correcting the time constants will ensure conservative calibration of the Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System instrumentation. The proposed amendment will not introduce any new equipment or require existing equipment to function different from that previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) or TS. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Correcting the time constants will ensure conservative calibration of the Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System instrumentation. The proposed amendment will not introduce any new equipment or require existing equipment to function different from that previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) or TS. The proposed amendment will not create any new accident scenarios, because the change does not introduce any new single failures, adverse equipment or material interactions, or release paths. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Correcting the time constants will ensure conservative calibration of the Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System instrumentation. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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

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

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

**NRC Project Director:** Cecil Thomas.

*Consumers Energy Company, Docket No. 50-255, Palisades Plant, Van Buren County, Michigan*

**Date of application for amendment:** March 26, 1997.

**Brief description of amendment:** The amendment revises modifies Technical Specification sections 3.6 and 4.5 by removing the list of containment isolation valves in accordance with Generic Letter 91-08, "Removal of Components Lists from Technical Specifications," dated May 6, 1991, and by revising requirements related to containment pressure and containment temperature. Additionally, several editorial changes are made to emulate the format and content of NUREG-1432, "Standard Technical Specifications, Combustion Engineering Plants."

**Date of issuance:** February 22, 1999.

**Effective date:** February 22, 1999.

**Amendment No.:** 184.

**Facility Operating License No. DPR-20.** Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

**Date of initial notice in Federal Register:** December 17, 1997 (62 FR 66136)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

**Local Public Document Room**  
location: Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

*Consumers Energy Company, Docket No. 50-255, Palisades Plant, Van Buren County, Michigan*

*Date of amendment request:* September 3, 1997.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment includes the following changes to the station technical specification (TS):

(a) TS Action Statement 3.14a is replaced by a revised condition description for TS Action Statement 3.17.1.6 in the instrumentation systems section. Also, the maximum control room temperature at which a shutdown must be initiated is revised from 120 °F [degrees Fahrenheit] to 90 °F, and a time limit for reaching the hot shutdown condition is specified;

(b) TS 3.14b is replaced with two limiting conditions for operation (LCOs), 3.14.1 and 3.14.2, addressing, respectively, the filtration and cooling functions of the CRHVAC [control room heating, ventilation, and air conditioning] system. These proposed LCOs emulate the standard TS (NUREG 1432) for control room ventilation;

(c) TS Table 4.2.3 surveillance requirement (SR) number 3, verification of control room temperature, is moved to SR Table 4.17.1, for the reactor protection system (RPS); and

(d) other administrative changes.

The licensee classified each change as either administrative or more restrictive. An administrative change is editorial in nature, involves only movement of requirements within the TS without affecting their technical content, or clarifies existing TS requirements. A more restrictive change adds new requirements, or revises existing requirements resulting in more conservative or additional operational restrictions.

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

1. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The proposed changes to TS 3.14a and TS 3.14b constitute either new, or more restrictive requirements that provide additional assurance that equipment conforms to the plant design basis and will operate reliably when called upon. These changes represent additional restrictions on plant operation that enhance safety and are

consistent with the standard TS. The proposed change to TS Table 4.2.3 of moving SR item number 3 to TS Table 4.17.1, and other administrative changes are editorial in nature or involve the reorganization or reformatting of TS requirements without affecting technical content or operational restrictions. The proposed changes do not result in any substantive change in operating requirements or the intent of these requirements, and are consistent with the Commission's regulations. Therefore, these changes cannot involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated?

The proposed changes to TS 3.14a and TS 3.14b constitute either new, or more restrictive requirements that provide additional assurance that equipment conforms to the plant design basis and will operate reliably when called upon. These changes represent additional restrictions on plant operation that enhance safety and are consistent with the standard TS. The proposed change to TS Table 4.2.3 of moving SR number 3 to TS Table 4.17.1, and other administrative changes are editorial in nature or involve the reorganization or reformatting of TS requirements without affecting technical content or operational restrictions. The proposed changes do not result in any substantive change in operating requirements or the intent of these requirements, and are consistent with the Commission's regulations. Therefore, these changes cannot create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

The proposed changes to TS 3.14a and TS 3.14b constitute either new, or more restrictive requirements that provide additional assurance that equipment conforms to the plant design basis and will operate reliably when called upon. These changes represent additional restrictions on plant operation that enhance safety and are consistent with the standard TS. The proposed change to TS Table 4.2.3 of moving SR number 3 to TS Table 4.17.1, and other administrative changes are editorial in nature or involve the reorganization or reformatting of TS requirements without affecting technical content or operational restrictions. The proposed changes do not result in any substantive change in operating requirements or the intent of these

requirements, and are consistent with the Commission's regulations. Therefore, these changes cannot involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

*Local Public Document Room location:* Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423-3698.

*Attorney for licensee:* Arunas T. Udrys, Esquire, Consumers Energy Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

*NRC Project Director:* Cynthia A. Carpenter.

*Duke Energy Corporation, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina*

*Date of amendment request:* March 1, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would revise Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3 Improved Technical Specification (ITS) 3.3.8 to only require two channels for the reactor coolant system hot leg temperature function. The current TSs require two channels per loop. This requirement was incorrectly specified during the ITS conversion.

*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 change modifies ITS Table 3.3.8-1 to only require two channels for RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Hot Leg Temperature Function. These instruments provide indication only and are not considered as initiators of any analyzed event. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant. No new or different equipment is being installed, and no installed equipment is being operated in a new or different manner. No set points for parameters which initiate protective or mitigative action are being changed. Therefore, 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 kind of accident previously evaluated:

The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant. No new or different equipment is being installed, and no

installed equipment is being operated in a new or different manner. No set points for parameters which initiate protective or mitigative action are being changed. As a result, no new failure modes are being introduced. Therefore, this proposed amendment will not create the possibility of any new or different kind of accident.

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

The margin of safety for PAM [post accident monitoring] instrumentation is based on the availability and capability of the instrumentation to provide the required operator information. The proposed change maintains requirements within the safety analyses and licensing basis and has no effect on the availability and capability of the PAM function. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Ann W. Cottingham, Winston and Strawn, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC.  
*NRC Project Director:* Herbert N. Berkow.

*Duke Energy Corporation, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270, and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2, and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina*

*Date of amendment request:* March 1, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments to Improved Technical Specification (ITS) 3.9, "Refueling Operations," Subsection 3.9.3, "Containment Penetrations," Limiting Condition for Operation 3.9.3.b would add a Note to state that the emergency air lock door is not required to be closed when it is sealed with a temporary cover plate. The temporary cover plate contains penetrations that are used for such refueling outage services as cables, pneumatic tubing, and hoses.

*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:

This proposed change has been evaluated against the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 and has been determined to involve no significant hazards, in 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?

The proposed change allows the use of a temporary cover plate as a seal for the emergency air lock during refueling operations in lieu of an air lock door. Duke [Duke Energy Corporation] analyses for Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS) does not credit containment closure. Therefore, use of the temporary cover plate does not affect offsite doses, which were previously calculated to be well within 10 CFR 100 limits. As such, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident.

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

The fuel handling accident inside containment analyses discussed in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report section 15.11 bound the proposed change. No new or different type of accident will occur because of the temporary cover plate placement.

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

Placing the temporary cover plate in the emergency air lock will still meet the intent of containment closure. The building pressure does not increase during a fuel handling accident and fission products will be contained. The fuel handling accident inside containment analyses does not credit containment closure for reducing offsite dose. As such, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Anne W. Cottingham, Winston and Strawn, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC.  
*NRC Project Director:* Herbert N. Berkow.

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 24, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would change Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.7.4 to remove the restriction to monitor the Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS) temperature only in the Intake Cooling Water (ICW) bay and prior to the ICW pumps. This change would permit the

option of monitoring the UHS temperature after the ICW pumps but prior to the component cooling water heat exchangers, which is considered to be equivalent to temperature monitoring before the ICW pumps.

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

The method of monitoring the Ultimate Heat Sink temperature is not considered in, and has no effect on, the probability of any type of accident initiating sequence. The proposed changes will permit other means of monitoring the Ultimate Heat Sink that have been evaluated to be equivalent to the current method permitted. As the monitoring will continue to be performed by equal means, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated will not be affected.

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 proposed change will permit other means of monitoring the Ultimate Heat Sink temperature, which will be equal to the methods currently employed. The continued monitoring of this variable by equivalent means cannot create the possibility of a new or different type of accident.

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

The Ultimate Heat Sink temperature is an input assumption used in the accident analysis and in evaluation of component design. This temperature limit is not being altered by this change, only the permissible means of monitoring this variable. As any new methods employed are expected to be equivalent to those currently used, no reduction in any margin of safety will result.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* M.S. Ross, Attorney, Florida Power & Light, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420.

*NRC Project Director:* Cecil O. Thomas.

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 2, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment revises the Technical Specifications (TS) to expand the scope of systems and test requirements considered under TS 4.5.4 "Engineered Safeguards Feature (ESF) Systems Leakage," and increases the maximum allowable leakage for those portions of the ESF system outside containment. The proposed amendment also includes revised the Bases for TS 3.15.3, "Auxiliary and Fuel Handling Building Air Treatment System," to clarify system design requirements and accident analysis considerations.

*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 facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. No physical modifications which would change structures, systems or components are proposed by this TSCR [technical specification change request] for surveillance changes in Technical Specification 4.5.4 and its Bases. The proposed increase in the ESF Systems leakage rate acceptance limit has no effect on the performance of ESF systems during a DBA [design basis accident]. The proposed changes are supported by a revised MHA [maximum hypothetical accident] dose calculation using updated X/Q values and calculation assumptions. The MHA dose consequence analysis yields dose results that are below the 10 CFR 100 guidelines for both the EAB [exclusion area boundary] and LPZ [low population zone]. The calculated Control Room Habitability Evaluation does not exceed the permissible annual occupational exposure limit of 50 Rem to the thyroid as specified in 10 CFR 20.1201(a)(ii). In addition, the potential thyroid exposure can be mitigated by the availability of self-contained breathing apparatus and potassium iodide. Therefore, the changes would not involve a significant increase in the consequences of accidents 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 previously evaluated. This TSCR does not involve any physical modifications that would affect structures, systems, or components, nor does it involve any changes in plant operation.

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

safety. This TSCR does not involve changes to the Technical Specification defined Safety Limits, Limiting Conditions for Operation, and does not involve any change to safety system setpoints for operation. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

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

*NRC Project Director:* Elinor G. Adensam.

*Northern States Power Company, Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota*

*Date of amendment request:* February 12, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TS) to (1) allow reactor vessel hydrostatic and leakage tests without maintaining primary containment integrity, (2) establish a limit and a surveillance requirement on reactor coolant activity when reactor coolant temperature is above 212°F, the reactor is not critical, and primary containment has not been established, and (3) correct a punctuation error.

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

The proposed changes do not increase the probability of an accident since reactor vessel hydrostatic and leakage tests would be performed with the reactor vessel nearly water solid, at nominal operating pressure, not critical and at low decay heat values which minimizes the energy stored in the reactor vessel. Under this proposed change a limit on reactor coolant activity is established that provides adequate assurance that the consequences of a large primary system break during reactor vessel hydrostatic and leakage

test conditions will be conservatively bounded by the consequences of a postulated main steam line break outside of primary containment. Low pressure emergency core cooling systems are required to be operable during reactor vessel hydrostatic and leakage test providing assurance that adequate core cooling can be achieved to preclude fuel failures and subsequent increases in reactor coolant activity in the event of a large primary system break. The reduced stored energy in the reactor vessel and proposed limit on reactor coolant activity ensures there is no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

The proposed changes do not introduce any new accident initiators or failure mechanisms since the changes do not involve any changes to the structures, systems, or components. They also do not involve any change to the operation of systems, and alter procedures only to the extent that 212°F may be exceeded during reactor vessel hydrostatic and leakage testing without maintaining primary containment integrity. Without maintaining primary containment integrity, a large primary system break during a reactor vessel hydrostatic or leakage test would result in the same kind of accident as would a main steam line break outside primary containment during normal operation. Therefore, the proposed TS change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident, from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Since reactor vessel hydrostatic and leakage tests are performed nearly water solid, at nominal operating pressure, not critical and at low decay heat values, the stored energy in the reactor vessel during testing will be low. Under these conditions, the potential for failed fuel and a subsequent increase in coolant activity is minimized. Therefore, the proposed Technical Specification change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. In addition, correction to the punctuation error is strictly a grammatical change and has no effect on the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and



Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW,  
Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Project Director:* Cynthia A. Carpenter.

*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:* February 8, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification 4.5.3.2.b to allow the option of using closed and disabled automatic valves to provide the necessary isolation function when performing safety injection and charging pump testing in Modes 4, 5, and 6 (hot shutdown, cold shutdown, and refueling) for low temperature over pressurization protection.

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

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

In Mode 4 with the RCS [reactor coolant system] coolant temperature less than 312 °F or in Modes 5 and 6 there is a potential risk of low temperature overpressurization. Mass additions of coolant by the safety injection and charging pumps could cause such an event to the extent that these pump flows exceed the ability of a single over pressure protection relief valve to protect the system. In order to eliminate this potentiality provisions are made to allow a maximum of one pump to be in service with the other pumps disabled except for testing. Further provisions are made to assure that a pump being tested can not inject into the vessel. The proposed change merely adds an alternate method of providing this assurance in addition to that currently provided by closing the manual discharge valves. The proposed change offers an equivalent means of affording the required protection.

Based upon the above, the proposed change will not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

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

The proposed changes do not require any change in the operation of the plant. A minor configuration change is involved in that a [ ] disabled automatic valve in the flow path will be used in lieu of the manual valve to provide protection. Specifically, no new hardware is being added to the plant as part of the proposed change, no existing equipment is being modified, and no significant changes in operations are being introduced. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different

kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change will not alter any assumptions, initial conditions, or results of any accident analyses. The proposed change maintains the level of protection. The change will, therefore, not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

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

*NRC Project Director:* Elinor G. Adensam.

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

*Date of amendment request:* March 1, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the Ginna Station Improved Technical Specifications battery cell parameters limit for specific gravity Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.8.6.3 and SR 3.8.6.6.

*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 Ginna Station in accordance with the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The change is only to correct an error in the determination of the minimum limiting value for specific gravity of the station batteries. This does not increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated since the battery specific gravity is only a measure of the state of charge of the battery and the batteries themselves are not an accident initiator. The proposed minimum value for specific gravity, based on the NUREG-1431 guidance, gives a higher assurance that the battery has sufficient capacity. Therefore, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased.

(2) Operation of Ginna Station in accordance with the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the

plant (i.e. no new or different type of equipment will be added) or changes in the methods governing normal plant operation. The change only involves implementing a more conservative minimum limiting value for the battery cell parameter of specific gravity. Therefore, the possibility for a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated is not created.

(3) Operation of Ginna Station in accordance with the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed change only corrects an error in the determination of the limiting value for specific gravity. The error is being corrected by using a more conservative value as determined by the guidance of NUREG-1431. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

*Local Public Document Room*

*Location:* Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610.

*Attorney for licensee:* Nicholas S. Reynolds, Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005.

*NRC Project Director:* S. Singh Bajwa.

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

*Date of amendment request:* February 18, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station (VCSNS) Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.4.9 Reactor Coolant System Pressure/Temperature Limits to incorporate the new Pressure/Temperature (PT) Limits curves consistent with reactor vessel specimen analysis results. Additionally, the proposed amendment would revise the Pressure/Temperature Limits Bases section to accurately reflect current industry standards and regulations.

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

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

The proposed changes revise the Pressure/Temperature Limits Curves to provide curves that reflect the results of the analysis performed on reactor vessel surveillance

specimen W. This analysis was performed using NRC approved methodology as documented in WCAP 14040-NP-A, dated January, 1996. These curves provide the limits for operation of the Reactor Coolant System during heat up, cool down, criticality, and hydrotesting. The limits protect the reactor vessel from brittle fracture by separating the region of acceptable operation from the region where brittle fracture is postulated to occur. Failure of the reactor vessel is not a VCSNS design basis accident, and, in general, reactor vessel failure has a low probability of occurrence and is not considered in the safety analysis.

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

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

The proposed changes revise the Pressure/Temperature Limits Curves, Section 3/4.4.9, to incorporate the results of the analysis performed on reactor vessel specimen W. There are no plant design changes or significant changes in any operating procedures. This change adjusts the heat up and cool down curves to reflect the shift in nil-ductility reference temperature of the reactor vessel as a result of neutron embrittlement. Therefore, the change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does this change involve a significant reduction in margin of safety? The proposed changes revise the Pressure/Temperature Limits Curves, Section 3/4.4.9, to incorporate the results of the analysis performed on reactor vessel specimen W. The new PT curves ensure that the 10 CFR 50 Appendix G, requirements are not exceeded during normal operation including Reactor Coolant System transients during heat up, cool down, criticality, and hydrotesting. The new PT curves were prepared, using approved NRC methodology, for a projected reactor vessel neutron exposure of 32 EFPY [effective full power years].

The new curves shift to more conservative operating limitations, thus providing increased margin against non-ductile fractures. Since administrative limits remain in place to ensure that 10 CFR 50 Appendix G limits are not challenged, the margin of safety described in the TS Bases is not reduced by the proposed change. Therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* Randolph R. Mahan, South Carolina Electric & Gas

Company, Post Office Box 764, Columbia, South Carolina 29218.

*NRC Project Director:* Herbert N. Berkow.

*Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, San Diego County, California*

*Date of amendment requests:* May 8, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated January 13, 1999.

*Description of amendment requests:* The January 13, 1999, supplemental letter added an additional change to the technical specifications (TS) to incorporate an additional restriction to the time required to close containment when reactor coolant system (RCS) water level is reduced during a refueling outage. This additional restriction adds a limitation that containment must be able to be closed within the calculated time to boil, if it is less than the current four hour requirement. The January 13, 1999, letter supplements the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination evaluation that was published on September 11, 1996 (61 FR 47978).

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

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

Item 6 conservatively restricts the completion time to ensure containment closure is achieved prior to the water in the cavity boiling, in the event of a Loss of Shutdown Cooling. This restriction is already a self imposed requirement at San Onofre Units 2 and 3. Incorporating it in the Technical Specification only serves to highlight the importance of this requirement.

This change captures all periods of time when the time to boil following a Loss of Shutdown Cooling is less than 4 hours. Having this requirement cannot initiate an accident. However, this requirement reduces the consequences of a Loss of Shutdown Cooling Accident when the time to boil is less than 4 hours.

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

Item 6 conservatively restricts the completion time to ensure containment closure is achieved prior to the water in the cavity boiling, in the event of a Loss of Shutdown Cooling. This restriction is already a self imposed requirement at San Onofre

Units 2 and 3. Incorporating it in the Technical Specification only serves to highlight the importance of this requirement.

This restriction cannot initiate an accident. 3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Item 6 conservatively restricts the completion time to ensure containment closure is achieved prior to the water in the cavity boiling, in the event of a Loss of Shutdown Cooling. This restriction is already a self imposed requirement at San Onofre Units 2 and 3. Incorporating it in the Technical Specification only serves to highlight the importance of this requirement.

This change increases the margin of safety provided by the Technical Specification by specifying that the containment must be closed within 4 hours or within the calculated time to boil, whichever is less. This change revises the Technical Specification to specifically recognize the importance of ensuring containment closure is achieved prior to boiling in the reactor vessel, upon a loss of shutdown cooling.

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

*Local Public Document Room location:* Main Library, University of California, P.O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713.

*Attorney for licensee:* Douglas K. Porter, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, P. O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770.

*NRC Project Director:* William H. Bateman.

*Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, San Diego County, California*

*Date of amendment requests:* December 22, 1998.

*Description of amendment requests:* The proposed amendment would modify the technical specifications (TS) to add a reference to allow use of Westinghouse laser-welded steam generator (SG) tube sleeving. The proposed amendment also provides typographical and editorial corrections.

*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.

Steam generator tubes, tube plugging, and tube failures are considered in the analysis of



accidents in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The steam generator tube rupture accident analysis considered the failure of a steam generator tube. Also, inadvertent opening of a steam generator dump valve (IOSGDV), loss of condenser vacuum (LOCV), loss of coolant accidents (LOCAs), and feed water line break (FWLB) accident analyses carry assumptions regarding steam generator tube plugging. In each case, the addition of steam generator tube sleeves to repair defective tubes will not change the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

The sleeve configurations have been designed, analyzed, and tested in accordance with the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) code requirements, and mechanical testing has shown that the sleeve and sleeve joints provide margin above acceptance limits. Ultrasonic testing (UT) and eddy current testing (ECT) are used to verify the adequacy of welds. Tests have demonstrated that tube collapse will not occur due to postulated LOCA loadings.

The probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated is not increased because any leakage through the sleeve assembly is fully bounded by the existing steam generator tube rupture analysis included in the San Onofre Unit 2 and 3 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. Additionally, any reactor coolant flow restriction from sleeving is addressed by a ratio of number of sleeved tubes to be equal to a plugged tube.

Therefore, the proposed sleeving repair process will not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of any previously evaluated accident.

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

The sleeves are captured within the steam generator tubes by hard rolling and welding and as such are not able to physically affect other parts of the system. The failure of a sleeve is identical to the failure of the parent tube which has been previously analyzed.

The use of a sleeve to span the area of degradation of the steam generator tube restores the structural and leakage integrity of the tubing to meet the original design requirements. Structural analysis of the sleeve assembly shows that the requirements of the ASME code are met. Mechanical testing has demonstrated that margin exists above the original tube design criteria. Any hypothetical accident as a result of any degradation in a sleeved tube would be bounded by the existing steam generator tube rupture accident analysis.

Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with proposed changes does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The use of sleeves to repair degraded steam generator tubing will maintain the integrity of the tube bundle commensurate with the ASME Code and draft Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.121 margin requirements for original tubing. Sleeves are components which are

part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary and meet the requirements for Class 1 components in Section III of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code. The primary to secondary pressure boundary will be maintained to the same margins as the original tubes under normal and postulated accident conditions. The safety margins 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 steam generator design. Further, a test program has been conducted by Westinghouse which demonstrated the integrity of the lower hard rolled joint design and its capability to withstand the design loads.

Therefore, operation of the facility with the 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 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Main Library, University of California, P.O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713.

*Attorney for licensee:* Douglas K. Porter, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, P. O. Box 800, Rosemead, California 91770.

*NRC Project Director:* William H. Bateman.

*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:* February 26, 1999 (TS 98-08).

*Brief description of amendments:* The proposed amendments would change the Sequoyah (SQN) Technical Specifications (TS) by relocating TS 3.7.6, "Flood Protection Plan," and the associated bases to the SQN Technical Requirements Manual (TRM). This change does not alter the current requirements for implementation or surveillance testing of the Flood Protection Plan and future revisions of this plan will require an evaluation in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59.

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

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

The proposed revision to the TS relocates the requirements for SQN flood protection without changing the current requirements. This administrative relocation of the requirements will not increase the possibility of an accident.

The capability of the Flood Protection Plan will continue to provide the same function. Changes to the relocated requirements will be processed, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59, to ensure the Flood Protection Plan will be properly maintained. Therefore, the proposed relocation of the flood protection requirements will not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The SQN Flood Protection Plan is used to mitigate the effects of a flooding event at SQN. This plan would not be the initiator of any new or different kind of accident. The capability of the Flood Protection Plan will continue to provide the same function. Changes to the relocated requirements will be processed, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59, to ensure the Flood Protection Plan will be properly maintained. The proposed change does not alter the current functions of SQN's Flood Protection Plan; therefore, this proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The requirements for SQN's flood protection are unchanged by the proposed relocation of the requirements to the SQN TRM. The function of the Flood Protection Plan and surveillance requirements to ensure implementation of the plan remains unchanged. Any future changes to these requirements will be evaluated, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59, to ensure acceptability and NRC review as required. Accordingly, the proposed change will not result in a reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC 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, Tennessee 37402.

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

*NRC Project Director:* Cecil O. Thomas.

*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:** February 26, 1999 (TS 99-02).

**Brief description of amendments:** The proposed amendments would change the Sequoyah (SQN) Technical Specifications (TS) to provide for consistency when exiting the action statements associated with the Emergency Diesel Generators (D/Gs). The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) inadvertently omitted revising Action Statements c, d, and e associated with TS 3.8.1.1 in Revision 1 to TS Change 96-08, addressing the D/G allowed outage time, submitted to the NRC staff on October 8, 1998.

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

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

This proposed revision provides for consistency and removes contradictions within the action statements associated with TS 3.8.1.1. Additionally, the proposed revision will not result in any change in the design, maintenance or operation of the associated plant equipment nor will it result in deviation from the actions presently approved by the staff for SQN's response to the associated LCOs [Limiting Conditions for Operation]. The deletion of the defined portion of the requirements associated with the restoration of offsite power sources in Action Statements c and d does not result in any change to SQN's response to the stated condition since this requirement remains unchanged in Action Statement a.

The deletion of the requirements associated with the restoration of 4 diesel generator (D/G) sets within 72 hours from Action Statements c and e provides for a consistent allowed outage time of 7 days for the loss of a D/G set as previously approved by the staff in a safety evaluation issued on December 16, 1998. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change provides for consistency and removes contradictions within the action statements associated with TS 3.8.1.1. Additionally, the proposed revision will not result in any change in the design, maintenance or operation of the associated plant equipment nor will it result in deviation from the actions presently approved by the staff for SQN's response to the associated LCOs. Therefore, the proposed

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

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

The proposed change provides for consistency and removes contradictions within the action statements associated with TS 3.8.1.1. Additionally, the proposed revision will not result in any change in the design, maintenance or operation of the associated plant equipment nor will it result in deviation from the actions presently approved by the staff for SQN's response to the associated LCOs. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC 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, Tennessee 37402.

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

**NRC Project Director:** Cecil O. Thomas.

**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.

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

**Date of application of amendment:** December 4, 1998, January 18, and January 19, 1999.

**Brief description of amendment:** The proposed amendment would modify the staffing and training requirements to

allow the use of Certified Fuel Handlers to meet plant staffing requirements.

**Date of publication individual notice in Federal Register:** December 29, 1998 (63 FR 71657).

**Expiration date of individual notice:** January 28, 1999.

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

**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.

*Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Docket No. 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 2, Calvert County, Maryland*

*Date of application for amendment:* July 20, 1998, as supplemented December 4, 1998, and December 23, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment permits a one-time change to the Technical Specification (TS) Bases for TS 3.8.2 for Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 2 and provides approval of the licensee's analysis of unreviewed safety questions as described in 10 CFR 50.59. The change allows Baltimore Gas and Electric Company to provide alternate cooling to the Unit 2 emergency diesel generators (EDGs) during their replacement of the Unit 2 service water (SRW) heat exchangers in the 1999 refueling outage since the normal SRW cooling would be unavailable. The licensee proposes to provide the 2A EDG with cooling water from the Unit 1 SRW system and to provide the 2B EDG with cooling water from an independent external cooling system during the replacement work.

*Date of issuance:* March 8, 1999.

*Effective date:* As of the date of its issuance to be implemented during the Calvert Cliffs Unit No. 2 spring 1999 refueling outage.

*Amendment No.:* 205.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-69:* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications Bases.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 26, 1998 (63 FR 45523) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 8, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

*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:* October 9, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revised Section 6.0 to Technical Specifications to change the membership of the Nuclear Facility Safety Committee and corrected other typographical errors.

*Date of issuance:* March 8, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 199.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 16, 1998 (63 FR 69337).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 8, 1999.

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:* April 9, 1998 (NRC-98-0071).

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.1.2, "Emergency Equipment Cooling Water System," Action a, and TS 3.8.1.1, "A.C. Sources—Operating," Action c, to be consistent with the actions required for inoperable oxygen monitoring instrumentation in TS 3.3.7.5, "Accident Monitoring Instrumentation." The existing "\*\*\*" footnote to TS 3.7.1.2, Action a, is modified and a "\*" footnote is added to TS 3.8.1.1, Action c.

*Date of issuance:* March 3, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 3, 1999, with full implementation within 30 days.

*Amendment No.:* 132.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* September 23, 1998 (63 FR 50937).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 3, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Monroe County Library System, Ellis Reference and Information Center, 3700 South Custer Road, Monroe, Michigan 48161.

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

*Date of amendment request:* September 23, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment changes Division III battery specific gravity acceptance criteria outlined in River Bend Station (RBS) Technical Specifications (TS). The change is required as a result of Division III battery system modifications scheduled to be implemented during

refueling outage RF-8, beginning April 3, 1999. During this time, the current Division III battery will be replaced with a new battery having a greater capacity rating. The new battery has a nominal specific gravity of 1.215 at 77°F in contrast to the existing Division III battery supplied with a nominal specific gravity of 1.210 at 77°F. Since TS Section 3.8.6, Table 3.8.6-1 values for specific gravity are based upon the manufacturer's nominal specific gravity, these values were updated to reflect the changes.

*Date of issuance:* March 3, 1999.

*Effective date:* The license amendment is effective upon the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days.

*Amendment No.:* 103.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 18, 1998 (63 FR 64111).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 3, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-440, Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Lake County, Ohio*

*Date of application for amendment:* August 31, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revised Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 3.6.1.3.4 to permit removal of the inclined fuel transfer system primary containment blind flange while primary containment integrity is required.

*Date of issuance:* February 24, 1999.

*Effective date:* February 24, 1999.

*Amendment No.:* 100.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-58:* This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 21, 1998 (63 FR 56260).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 24, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, OH 44081.

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-440 Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Lake County, Ohio*

*Date of application for amendment:* July 13, 1998, and as supplemented by submittal dated November 23, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revised Technical Specification 3.4.4," Safety/Relief Valves (SRVs)," by increasing the present plus or minus 1% tolerance on the safety mode lift setpoint for the safety relief valves to plus or minus 3%.

*Date of issuance:* March 3, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 3, 1999.

*Amendment No.:* 101.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-58:* This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 12, 1998 (63 FR 43214).

The supplemental information contained clarifying information and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination and did not expand the scope of the original application.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 3, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, OH 44081.

*Illinois Power Company, Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power Station, Unit 1, DeWitt County, Illinois*

*Date of application for amendment:* October 5, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment allows deferral of the next scheduled local leak rate test for valve 1MC-042 until the seventh refueling outage.

*Date of issuance:* March 8, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 8, 1999, and shall be implemented within 45 days.

*Amendment No.:* 121.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 23, 1998 (63 FR 56949).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 8, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* December 4, 1998, and January 18 and 19, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* The proposed amendment would modify the staffing and training requirements to allow the use of Certified Fuel Handlers to meet plant staffing requirements.

*Date of issuance:* March 5, 1999.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 45 days from the date of issuance.

*Amendment No.:* 104.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 29, 1998 (63 FR 71657).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 5, 1999.

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, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

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

*Date of applications for amendment:* August 12, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated October 30, 1998; and application dated September 28, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated January 7 and 20, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment allows implementation of a revised main steamline break analysis and revised control room habitability analyses.

*Date of issuance:* March 10, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 228.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-65:* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications and authorized changes to the Final Safety Analysis Report.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 7, 1998 (63 FR 53951) and December 2, 1998 (63 FR 66597).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 10, 1999.

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, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

*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:* December 10, 1998, as supplemented February 19, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment allows the licensee to implement changes to the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) regarding a revised method for ensuring boron precipitation can be prevented (post-loss-of-coolant accident).

*Date of issuance:* March 10, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 229.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-65:* Amendment authorizes changes to the Final Safety Analysis Report.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 13, 1999 (64 FR 2249).

The February 19, 1999, supplemental letter provided additional information that did not change the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 10, 1999.

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, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* June 10, 1998, as supplemented October 30, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment revises the Millstone Unit 3 licensing basis associated with post-accident mitigation activities, vital area access travel routes, and the associated action completion times. Northeast Nuclear Energy Company determined that the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) description of post-accident vital area routing was out of date

because the radiological control area boundary fence created an access problem on the designated routes to the hydrogen recombiner and fuel building. The revised licensing basis will be incorporated into the FSAR and will revise the routes to accommodate the fence location and allow for the time to unlock gates.

*Date of issuance:* March 1, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 166.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-49:* Amendment authorized revision to the FSAR.

**Date of initial notice in Federal Register:** July 15, 1998 (63 FR 38202).

The October 30, 1998, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the scope of the June 10, 1998, application, and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1999.

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, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

*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:* December 4, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment eliminates the need to cycle the plant and its components through a shutdown-startup cycle by allowing the next snubber surveillance interval to be deferred until the end of refueling outage 6 or September 10, 1999, whichever date is earlier.

*Date of issuance:* March 3, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 167.

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

**Date of initial notice in Federal Register:** December 30, 1998 (63 FR 71971).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 3, 1999.

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, and the Waterford Library, ATTN: Vince Juliano, 49 Rope Ferry Road, Waterford, Connecticut.

*PP&L, Inc., Docket No. 50-388,*

*Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of application for amendment:* August 5, 1998, as supplemented by letter dated November 23, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment would change the allowable values for both the core spray system and the low-pressure-coolant injection system reactor steam dome pressure-low functions.

*Date of issuance:* March 4, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 155.

*Facility Operating License No. NPF-22:* This amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

**Date of initial notice in Federal Register:** February 1, 1999 (64 FR 4904).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 4, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* August 25, 1998, as supplemented January 27, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revised Technical Specification (TS) 2.1.2, "THERMAL POWER, High Pressure and High Flow," and the Bases for TS 2.1, "Safety Limits." These changes were made to implement appropriately conservative Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio values for the Hope Creek Generating Station Cycle 9 core and fuel designs. An administrative revision has also been made to TS 6.9.1.9 to reflect these changes for Cycle 9.

*Date of issuance:* March 9, 1999.

*Effective date:* As of the date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days after the completion of Cycle 8.

*Amendment No.:* 117.

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

**Date of initial notice in Federal**

**Register:** September 23, 1998 (63 FR 50938).

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 amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 9, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Pennsville Public Library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, NJ 08070.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* September 29, 1998.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.9.4, "Refueling Operations—Containment Building Penetrations," to allow the use of an equivalent closure device to satisfy the closure requirements of the containment equipment hatch during core alterations or movement of irradiated fuel in containment. The amendment also revises TS 3/4.9.4 to allow the use of an equivalent closure method to satisfy the closure requirements of containment penetrations (in addition to an isolation valve, blind flange or manual valve) during core alterations or movement of irradiated fuel in containment.

*Date of issuance:* February 26, 1999.

*Effective date:* Effective as of its date of issuance, to be implemented within 60 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 217 and 199.

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

**Date of initial notice in Federal Register:** October 21, 1998 (63 FR 56258).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 26, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, NJ 08079.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* November 24, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment revises the Ginna Station Improved Technical Specifications

description of the fuel cladding material (TS 4.2.1) and updates the list of references provided in Specification 5.6.5 for the Core Operating Limits Report.

*Date of issuance:* March 3, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 73.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-18:* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 30, 1998 (63 FR 71972).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 3, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610.

*STP Nuclear Operating Company, Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499, South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, Matagorda County, Texas*

*Date of amendment request:* July 7, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated October 15 and October 26, 1998, and February 16, 1999. The supplements provided clarifying information and corrected administrative errors within the scope of the amendment request and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revised the spent fuel pool criticality analysis and rack utilization schemes by allowing credit for spent fuel pool soluble boron.

*Date of issuance:* March 3, 1999.

*Effective date:* This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days of issuance.

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 1—Amendment No. 104; Unit 2—Amendment No. 91.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* August 26, 1998 (63 FR 45530).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 3, 1999.

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.

*Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-260, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, Limestone County, Alabama*

*Date of application for amendment:* September 8, 1998 (TS-354), as supplemented by letter dated February 22, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* Revises the Appendix A Technical Specifications (TS) to include provisions for enabling the Oscillation Power Range Monitor Upscale trip function in the Average Power Range Monitor.

*Date of issuance:* As of date of issuance to be implemented at the end of the Unit 2 Cycle 10 outage scheduled to begin on April 11, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 5, 1999.

*Amendment No.:* 258.

*Facility Operating License No. DPR-52:* Amendment revises the TS.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* October 7, 1998 (63 FR 53958). The supplemented letter dated February 22, 1999, did not change the original no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 5, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Athens Public Library, South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* November 10, 1998.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise the Technical Specifications Sections 3.4.4 and 3.4.4.a for Unit 1, and 3.4.4 and 3.4.4.a for Unit 2, providing a clarification on the operability requirements for pressurizer heaters and the emergency power source for the pressurizer heaters.

*Date of issuance:* March 1, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 1, 1999.

*Amendment Nos.:* 217 and 198.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7:* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 2, 1998 (63 FR 66605).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* The Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of

Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-2498.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 25, 1995, as supplemented February 5, 1999. The February 5, 1999, supplemental letter contained clarifying information only, and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the scope of the original **Federal Register** Notice.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments revise the Technical Specifications (TS) Sections 3.4.3.2, 4.4.3.2.1.b, 4.4.3.2.1.c, 4.4.3.2.2, 4.4.9.3.d, 4.4.9.3.e, 3/4.4.2, 3/4.4.3, 3/4.4.4 and 6.8.4.g for Unit 1, and 3.4.3.2, 4.4.3.2.1.c, 4.4.3.2.2, 4.4.9.3.d, 4.4.9.3.e, 3/4.4.2, 3/4.4.3, 3/4.4.4 and 6.8.4.g for Unit 2, providing an allowed outage time of 14 days for the pressurizer power operated relief valve (PORV) nitrogen accumulators, as well as provide separate action statements for the PORV depending on the reason for the PORV inoperability.

*Date of issuance:* March 2, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 2, 1999.

*Amendment Nos.:* 218 and 199.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7:* Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* June 5, 1996 (61 FR 28620).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 2, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* The Alderman Library, Special Collections Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-2498.

*Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia*

*Date of application for amendments:* September 24, 1998.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments revise the Technical Specifications to allow the reactor trip bypass breakers to be tested immediately after being placed in service, but prior to commencing Reactor Protection System testing or maintenance.

*Date of issuance:* March 12, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 12, 1999.

*Amendment Nos.:* 219 and 219.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-32 and DPR-37:* Amendments change the Technical Specifications.



*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* February 10, 1999 (64 FR 6715).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 12, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* September 28, 1998 (TSCR 208).

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments clarify the notation definition of refueling interval "R" in TS Table 15.4.1-1 and add a new annual (12-month) interval "A".

*Date of issuance:* March 1, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 1, 1999, with full implementation within 45 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 186 and 191.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 27, 1999 (64 FR 4162).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 5, 1998 (TSCR 200).

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments modify TS Section 15.4.1, "Operational Safety Review," by removing the requirement to check certain environmental monitors on a monthly basis.

*Date of issuance:* March 2, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 2, 1999, with full implementation within 45 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 187 and 192.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 27, 1999 (64 FR 4163).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 2, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 7, 1998 (TSCR 207).

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments incorporate changes to the Technical Specifications to ensure the 4 kV bus undervoltage input to the reactor trip protective function is controlled in accordance with the design and licensing basis for the facility. An additional administrative change removes the footnote related to the definition of Rated Power in TS 15.1.j.

*Date of issuance:* March 2, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 2, 1999, with full implementation within 45 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 188 and 193.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 30, 1998 (63 FR 71978).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 2, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

*Yankee Atomic Electric Company, Docket No. 50-29, Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Franklin County, Massachusetts*

*Date of application for amendment:* October 15, 1998.

*Brief description of amendment:* Revises the Possession Only License by changing the submittal interval for the Radioactive Effluent Reports from semiannual to annual.

*Date of issuance:* March 5, 1999.

*Effective date:* March 5, 1999.

*Amendment No.:* 151.

*Possession Only License No. DPR-3:* Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* November 18, 1998 (63 FR 64128). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Greenfield Community College, 1 College Drive, Greenfield, Massachusetts 01301.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of March 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**John A. Zwolinski,**

*Director, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-7032 Filed 3-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application To Withdraw From Listing and Registration; (Innovative Medical Services, Common Stock, and Class A Common Stock Purchase Warrants) File No. 1-14468

March 18, 1999.

Innovative Medical Services ("Company") has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act") and Rule 12d2-2(d) promulgated thereunder, to withdraw the above specified securities ("Securities") from listing and registration on the Boston Stock Exchange, Inc. ("BSE" or "Exchange").<sup>1</sup>

The reasons cited in the application for withdrawing the Securities from listing and registration include the following:

The Securities of the Company have been listed for trading on the BSE and the Nasdaq SmallCap Market since August 8, 1996, pursuant to a Registration Statement on Form 8-A which became effective on said date.

The Company has complied with the rules of the BSE by filing with the Exchange a certified copy of the preambles and resolution adopted by the Company's Board of Directors authorizing the withdrawal of its Securities from listing on the BSE and by setting forth in detail to the Exchange the reasons for the proposed withdrawal and the facts in support thereof. In making the decision to withdraw its Securities from listing on the BSE, the Company considered the direct and indirect costs of maintaining dual listings of its Securities on the BSE and the Nasdaq SmallCap Market. The

<sup>1</sup> Notice of this application was previously issued by the Commission as Release No. 34-41114 on February 25, 1999. Such notice, however, failed to appear in the **Federal Register**, as required, and so is being reissued.