

that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated May 11, 1999, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Oconee County Library, 501 West South Street, Walhalla, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 23rd day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Richard L. Emch, Jr.,**

*Section Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 99-19256 Filed 7-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Sunshine Meeting Notice

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Thursday, July 29, 1999.

**PLACE:** Commissioner's Conference Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

**STATUS:** Public.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

*Thursday, July 29*

2:00 p.m.

Briefing on Implementation of the License Termination Rule and Program on Complex Decommissioning Cases (Public Meeting)

(Contact: Larry Camper, 301-415-7231)

4:00 p.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)  
\*(PLEASE NOTE: This item will be affirmed immediately following the conclusion of the preceding meeting.)

a: Final Rule: Certification Renewal and Amendment Processes, 10 CFR Part 76

\* \* \* \* \*

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no

longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, DC 20555 (301-415-1969).

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

Dated: July 22, 1999.

**William M. Hill, Jr.,**

*SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-19361 Filed 7-26-99; 10:30 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Sunshine Meeting Notice

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**DATE:** Weeks of July 26, August 2, 9, and 16, 1999.

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

**STATUS:** Public and closed.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

### Week of July 26

*Thursday, July 29*

2:00 p.m.

Briefing on Implementation of the License Termination Rule and Program on Complex Decommissioning Cases (Public Meeting)

Contact: Larry Camper, 301-415-7231)

4:00 p.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)  
\* PLEASE NOTE: This item will be affirmed immediately following the conclusion of the preceding meeting.)

a: Final Rule: Certification Renewal and Amendment Processes, 10 CFR Part 76

*Friday, July 30*

9:30 a.m.

Briefing on Performance Assessment Progress in LLW, HLW, and SDMP (Public Meeting) (Contact: Norman Eisenberg, 301-415-7285)

### Week of August 2—Tentative

*Thursday, August 5*

10:00 a.m.

Briefing on EEO Program (Public

Meeting)

(Contact: Irene Little, 301-415-7380)

3:30 p.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)  
(If needed)

### Week of August 9—Tentative

*Thursday, August 12*

11:30 a.m.

Affirmation Session (Public Meeting)  
(If needed)

### Week of August 16—Tentative

There are no meetings scheduled for the Week of August 16.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

\* \* \* \* \*

This notice is distributed by mail to several hundred subscribers; if you no longer wish to receive it, or would like to be added to it, please contact the Office of the Secretary, Attn: Operations Branch, Washington, D.C. 20555 (301-415-1661). In addition, distribution of this meeting notice over the Internet system is available. If you are interested in receiving this Commission meeting schedule electronically, please send an electronic message to [wmh@nrc.gov](mailto:wmh@nrc.gov) or [dkw@nrc.gov](mailto:dkw@nrc.gov).

Dated: July 23, 1999.

**William M. Hill, Jr.,**

*SECY Tracking Officer, Office of the Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 99-19362 Filed 7-26-99; 10:31 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

#### I. Background

Pursuant to Pub. L. 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any

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

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 July 3, 1999, through July 16, 1999. The last biweekly notice was published on July 14, 1999 (64 FR 38022).

**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 August 27, 1999, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating 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.

*Carolina Power & Light Company,  
Docket No. 50-261, H.B. Robinson  
Stream Electric Plant, Unit No. 2,  
Darlington County, South Carolina*

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

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed change provides a Required Action and Completion Time for the Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS) in the event that service water temperature exceeds the current 95°F surveillance limit. It involves an allowance to continue operation for a period of 8 hours with the UHS at a temperature greater than the temperature limits provided in Technical Specification (TS) Limiting Condition of Operation 3.7.8, "Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS)" and provides an upper UHS temperature limit beyond which plant shutdown is required.

*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:

Carolina Power & Light (CP&L) Company has evaluated the proposed Technical Specification change and has concluded that it does not involve a significant hazards consideration. The conclusion is in accordance with the criteria set forth in 10 CFR 50.92. The bases for the conclusion that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration are discussed below.

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

The proposed change does not involve any physical alteration of plant systems, structures or components. The proposed change will allow plant operation for a short period of time when the service water temperature exceeds 95°F. If the service water temperature is restored within the allowed time, a plant shutdown is not required. This minimizes plant transients, which reduces the probability of a reactor trip and the resulting challenges to mitigating systems. A service water temperature of up to 99°F does not increase the failure rate of systems, structures or components because the systems, structures, and components are designed for higher temperatures than at which they operate.

The Service Water (SW) System temperature is not assumed to be an initiating condition of any accident evaluated in the safety analysis report. Therefore, the allowance of a limited time for service water temperature to be in excess of 95°F does not involve an increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated in the safety analysis report (SAR). The SW System supports operability of safety related systems used to mitigate the consequences of an accident. The service water temperature is not expected to increase significantly beyond 95°F due to the limited time allowed by the proposed change in conjunction with the generally slow rate of temperature increase experienced from thermal changes in Lake Robinson. The capability of components to perform their safety related function is not affected up to a service water temperature of 99°F with the exception of the Containment Air Recirculation Fan Coolers. The heat removal capacity of the Containment Air Recirculation Fan Coolers is not expected to be significantly reduced by a small increase in service water temperature. If heat removal is not significantly reduced, containment pressure and leakage will not be significantly increased, and the doses from containment leakage will not be significantly increased. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the SAR.

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

The proposed change does not involve any physical alteration of plant systems, structures or components. A service water temperature of up to 99°F does not introduce new failure mechanisms of systems, structures or components not already considered in the SAR because the systems,

structures, and components are designed for higher temperatures than at which they operate. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated is not created.

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

The proposed change will allow a small increase in service water temperature above the design basis limit for the SW System and delay by 8 hours the requirement to shutdown the plant when the service water system design limit is exceeded. There are design margins associated with systems, structures and components that are cooled by the service water system that are affected. The capability of components to perform their safety related function is not affected up to a service water temperature 99°F with the exception of the Containment Air Recirculation Fan Coolers. The Containment Air Recirculation Fan Coolers remove heat from containment to mitigate containment pressure and temperature following a MSLB (main streamline break) inside containment or a Large Break LOCA (loss-of-coolant accident) inside containment. An increase in service water temperature in excess of the design limit due to hot weather conditions is expected to be small due to the limited time allowed by the proposed change in conjunction with the generally slow rate of temperature increase experienced from thermal changes in Lake Robinson. Therefore, the effect on the Containment Air Recirculation Fan Coolers' heat removal capacity and the resulting containment pressure and temperature is expected to be small. Therefore, there is no significant reduction in margin of safety associated with this change.

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:* Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College Avenue, Hartsville, South Carolina 29550.

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

*NRC Section Chief:* Sheri R. Peterson.

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

*Date of amendment request:* June 29, 1999.

*Description of amendment request:* This amendment request proposes to increase the notch testing surveillance interval of partially withdrawn control rods in Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 3/4.3.C,

"Reactivity Control—Control Rod Operability," from an interval of once in 7 days to once in 31 days.

**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:

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

The proposed change extends the Surveillance Frequency for partially withdrawn control rods. The change does not affect equipment design or operation. The affected Surveillance is not considered to be an accident initiator. Therefore, this change will not significantly increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated. Furthermore, extension of the Surveillance Frequency will not impact the ability to perform its function following an accident.

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

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

The extension of the Surveillance Frequency does not involve physical modification to the plant and does not introduce a new mode of operation.

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

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

The change in the Surveillance Frequency only provides a minor reduction in the probability of finding an inoperable control rod. Most of the control rods will continue to be tested on the current Frequency. However, if one stuck rod is identified, all rods must be checked promptly.

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

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

**Local Public Document Room**

**location:** Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021.

**Attorney for licensee:** Ms. Pamela B. Stroebel, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, Commonwealth Edison Company, P.O. Box 767, Chicago, Illinois 60690-0767.

**NRC Section Chief:** Anthony J. Mendiola.

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

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

**Description of amendment request:**

The proposed license amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TSs) to incorporate certain improvements from the Revised Standard Technical Specifications for B&W Plants (NUREG-1430) that would add limiting conditions for operation action statements, make surveillance requirements more consistent with the revised standard TSs, correct conflicts or inconsistencies from earlier TS revisions, correct administrative errors, and revise the spent fuel pool sampling from monthly and after adding chemicals to weekly.

The staff's proposed no significant hazards determination below does not address the licensee's proposed changes with respect to a high pressure injection system operation in a low temperature overpressure environment.

**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 of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed amendment makes administrative corrections, adds conditions to the limiting conditions of operation [LCOs], revises selected time clocks and surveillance requirements consistent with NUREG 1430, and adds a time clock to a unique LCO. These changes have no effect on the plant design or operation. The reliability of systems and components relied upon to prevent or mitigate the consequences of accidents previously evaluated is not degraded by proposed changes. Therefore, operation in accordance with the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated, because no new accident initiators would be created.

3. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because no changes to plant operating limits or limiting safety system settings are proposed.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and based on the 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 22037.

**NRC Section Chief:** S. Singh Bajwa.

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

**Date of amendment request:** June 4, 1999.

**Description of amendment request:**

This application for amendment to the Indian Point 3 Technical Specifications (TSS) proposes to revise the definition of operating personnel in section 6.2.2.g to make it consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications and to remove a footnote.

**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 proposed license amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No, these TS changes are administrative in nature. Removing the statement in section 6.2.2.g that defines on shift operating personnel and adding a new paragraph consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications is an administrative line item change that follows NRC guidance. The current statement is not needed because TS Table 6.2.1 defines the minimum operations shift crew composition and commitments to Table B-1 of NUREG-0654 defines the minimum staffing requirements for each function area.

The change to TS 6.2.2.i is administrative in nature. The statement that reads, "For the period ending three years after restart from the 1993/1994 Performance Improvement Outage, the Operations Manager will be permitted to have held a SRO [senior reactor operator] license at a Pressurized Water Reactor other than Indian Point Unit 3", was a relaxation of the requirements of 6.2.2i.

Therefore, these changes will not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, because they are administrative and affect neither accident initiation or mitigation.

2. Does the proposed license amendment create the possibility of a new or different

kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No, these TS changes are administrative in nature. Removing the statement in section 6.2.2.g that defines on shift operating personnel and adding a new paragraph consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications is an administrative line item change that follows NRC guidance. The current statement is not needed because TS Table 6.2-1 defines the minimum operations shift crew composition and commitments to Table B-1 of NUREG-0654 defines the minimum staffing requirements for each function area.

The change to TS 6.2.2.i is administrative in nature. The statement that reads, "For the period ending three years after restart from the 1993/1994 Performance Improvement Outage, the Operations Manager will be permitted to have held a SRO license at a Pressurized Water Reactor other than Indian Point Unit 3", was a relaxation of the requirements of 6.2.2.i.

These changes are administrative, and do not affect how the plant is operated. They also follow the guidance of the Standard Technical Specifications. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

No, these TS change is administrative in nature. Removing the statement in section 6.2.2.g that defines on shift operating personnel and adding a new paragraph consistent with the Standard Technical Specification is an administrative line item change that follows NRC guidance. The current statement is not needed because TS Table 6.2-1 defines the minimum operations shift new composition and commitments to Table B-1 of NUREG-0654 defines the minimum staffing requirements for each function area.

The change to TS 6.2.2.i is administrative in nature. The statement that reads, "For the period ending three years after restart from the 1993/1994 Performance Improvement Outage, the Operations Manager will be permitted to have held a SRO license at a Pressurized Water Reactor other than Indian Point Unit 3", was a relaxation of the requirements of 6.2.2.i.

These changes are administrative, and do not affect how the plant is operated. They also follow the guidance of the Standard Technical Specifications. Therefore, these 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 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposed to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

**Local Public Document Room**  
location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601.

**Attorney for Licensee:** Mr. David E. Blabey, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

**NRC Section Chief:** S. Singh Bajwa.

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

**Description of amendment requests:**  
The licensee proposed changes to Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.5 "ESFAS Instrumentation" to include restrictions on operation with a channel of the refueling water storage tank level-low input to the recirculation actuation signal (RAS) and the steam generator pressure-low input or steam generator pressure difference-high input to the emergency feedwater actuation signal (EFAS) in the tripped condition. The current TS allows plant operation in this condition indefinitely. The licensee has determined that unacceptable consequences could result from a spurious trip of RAS or EFAS due to operation with a channel in trip condition. The licensee states that the proposed TS changes would improve plant operational safety and, thereby, reduce plant risk.

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

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

**Response:** No.

This change provides limits for operating with a channel of the Refueling Water Storage Tank (RWST) Level-Low input in the Recirculation Actuation Signal (RAS) or the Steam Generator (SG) Pressure-Low or SG Pressure Difference (SGPD)-High input to the Emergency Feedwater Actuation Signal (EFAS) in trip.

As a result of this change, the potential for an inadvertent actuation of either of these two signals is reduced. The proposed Completion Times are based on Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) considerations, and are conservative compared to the current unlimited Completion Times.

The consequences of an inadvertent actuation of EFAS or RAS are unaffected by this change.

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

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

**Response:** No.

This proposed change provides additional time limits on operation with a channel of the RWST Level-Low input to RAS or the SG Pressure-Lower SGPD-High inputs to EFAS

in trip. Operation in this condition is currently allowed indefinitely. The proposed restrictions reduce the possibility of an inadvertent actuation of RAS or EFAS, and do not allow operation in any configuration not currently allowed by the Technical Specifications (TSs).

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

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

**Response:** No.

The proposed change provides additional time limits on operation with a channel of the RWST Level-Low input to RAS or the SG Pressure-Low or SGPD-High inputs to RAS or EFAS in trip. The proposed limits are conservative compared to the current requirements, where the time limit is unrestricted. The overall impact of the change will be [an] increase in the margin of safety.

Therefore, there will be no significant reduction in a margin of safety as a result of this change.

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, Irvine, California 92713.

**Attorney for licensee:** Douglas K. Porter, Esquire, Southern California Edison Company, 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Rosemead, California 91770.

**NRC Section Chief:** Stephen Dembek.

**Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee**

**Date of application for amendments:** June 7, 1999 (TS 99-09).

**Brief description of amendments:** The proposed amendment would change the Sequoyah Unit 2 Technical Specification (TS) requirements by adding a new temporary Figure 3.4-1a and temporary footnotes to TS 3.4.8, "Specific Activity," Table 4.4-4, and to corresponding Bases in order to raise the reactor coolant specific activity limit to 1.0 microcurie per milligram Dose Equivalent iodine-131 for the remainder of Unit 2 Cycle 10 operation.

**Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:**  
As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), Tennessee Valley Authority, 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 TS change increases the allowed reactor coolant specific activity for iodine-131 and decreases the leakage quantity that would be postulated to occur at the faulted steam generator (SG) during a main steam line break (MSLB) accident. The described changes will return these parameters to the same values under which the plant operated prior to the implementation of TS Change 98-02 submitted on June 26, 1998. The June 26, 1998 submittal was a voluntary change that allowed for a greater leakage quantity during an MSLB accident as described in Generic Letter 95-05. Returning these parameters to their previous values does not affect or increase the probability of any accidents previously evaluated.

An increase in the consequences of an accident would not occur because the proportional increase in reactor coolant specific activity, while proportionally decreasing the allowable primary-to-secondary leakage during a postulated MSLB accident to values under which the plant was previously operated, was evaluated in [Topical Report No.] WCAP-13990 during the establishment of the original primary-to-secondary leak limits. No changes to the physical plant, to the plant operation, or maintenance practices have been implemented that would invalidate the limits defined in WCAP-13990.

The control room dose, the low population zone dose, and the dose at the exclusion area boundary remain bounded by the acceptance criteria of the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report. Therefore, the proposed TS change does not result in an increase in the consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

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

The proposed TS change does not alter the configuration of the plant. The changes do not directly affect plant operation. The change will not result in the installation of any new equipment or systems or the modification of any existing equipment or systems. No new operating procedures, conditions, or modes will be created by this proposed change. SG tube structural integrity, as defined in draft Regulatory Guide 1.121, remains unchanged. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated is not created.

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

Raising the allowed reactor coolant specific activity, while decreasing the allowed primary-to-secondary leakage during a postulated MSLB accident, keeps the amount of activity released to the environment unchanged. Design basis and offsite dose calculation assumptions remain satisfied. Therefore, the proposed change does not

result in a significant reduction in the 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 Section Chief:* Sheri R. Peterson.

*TU Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446, Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Units 1 and 2, Somervell County, Texas*

*Date of amendment request:* May 24, 1999, as supplemented by letter dated July 9, 1999.

*Brief description of amendments:* The proposed license amendments would remove several cycle-specific parameter limits from the Technical Specifications (TSs). These parameter limits would be added to the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR). Appropriate references to the COLR would be inserted in the affected TSs. In addition, the core safety limit curves would be replaced with safety limits more directly applicable to the fuel and fuel cladding fission product barriers. The affected Technical Specifications are: (1) TS 2.0, "Safety Limits (SLs)," (2) TS 3.3.1, "Reactor Trip System Instrumentation Setpoints," (3) TS 3.4.1, "RCS pressure temperature and flow from Nucleate Boiling (DNB) Limits," and (4) TS 5.6.5, "Core Operating Limits Report." The May 24, 1999, application was previously noticed and published in the **Federal Register** on June 30, 1999 (64 FR 53213).

The July 9, 1999, supplement provided proposed additional information that would: (a) Add the Reactor Core Safety Limit figures to the COLR, (b) clarify that the overpower N-16 setpoint remains in the TSs, and (c) reflect NRC approval of the topical reports used to determine the core operating limits presented in the COLR. The supplemental information is being noticed herein to address the issue of no significant hazards consideration.

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

The proposed changes remove cycle-specific parameter limits from the Technical Specifications, add them to the list of limits contained in the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR), and revise the Administrative Controls section of the Technical Specifications. The proposed changes also insert the original minimum RCS flow limits into the Technical Specifications. The changes do not, by themselves, alter any of the parameter limits. The changes are administrative in nature and have no adverse effect on the probability of an accident or on the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The removal of parameter limits from the Technical Specifications does not eliminate the requirement to comply with the parameter limits.

The parameter limits in the COLR may be revised without prior NRC approval. However, [Technical] Specification 5.6.5c continues to ensure that the parameter limits are developed using NRC-approved methodologies and that applicable limits of the safety analyses are met. While future changes to the COLR parameter limits could result in event consequences which are either slightly less or slightly more severe than the consequences for the same event using the present parameter limits, the differences would not be significant and would be bounded by the requirement of specification 5.6.5c to meet the applicable limits of the safety analysis.

Based on the above, addition of the minimum RCS flow limit into the Technical Specifications, removal of the parameter limits the Technical Specifications and the addition of the described limits in the COLR, thus allowing revision of the parameter limits without prior NRC approval, has no significant effect on 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 accident previously evaluated?

The proposed changes add the minimum RCS flow limit into the Technical Specifications, remove certain parameter limits from the Technical Specifications and add these limits to the list of limits in the COLR, thus removing the requirements for prior NRC approval of revisions to those parameters. The changes do not add new hardware or change plant operations and therefore cannot initiate an event nor cause an analyzed event to progress differently. Thus, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident is not created.

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

The margin of safety is the difference between the acceptance criteria and the associated failure values. The proposed changes do not affect the failure values for any parameter. Though the accident analyses, all applicable limits (i.e., relevant event acceptance criteria as described in the NRC-approved analysis methodologies) are shown to be satisfied; therefore, there is no impact

on event acceptance criteria. Because neither the failure values nor the acceptance criteria are affected, the proposed change has no effect on the margin of safety.

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

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

**Attorney for licensee:** George L. Edgar, Esq., Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

**NRC Section Chief:** Robert A. Gramm.

**Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont.**

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

**Description of amendment request:** The licensee proposed revising the suppression pool water temperature surveillance requirements to specify monitoring the temperature every 5 minutes when performing testing that adds to the suppression pool. In addition, the licensee proposed revising the requirement to check the suppression chamber water level and temperature from "once per shift" to "daily" and specify that it is the average temperature that is checked.

**Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:** As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided the NRC its analysis of the issue of no significant hazard 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. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Vermont Yankee has determined that the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed change revises the surveillance frequency for "once per shift" suppression pool water level and temperature monitoring. Additionally, the surveillance requirement for suppression pool water temperature monitoring when there are indications of relief valve operation that add heat to the suppression pool is also revised.

The proposed change will revise the surveillance wording such that routine suppression pool monitoring will be "daily" and an operator will verify pool temperature every 5 minutes only during testing that adds heat to the suppression pool. Also clarified, is that the parameter being monitored is "average" suppression pool water temperature.

The consequence of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased since the initial suppression pool water temperature limit, which is an input value for accident analyses, is not changed.

The proposed change affects only surveillance requirements and does not require any hardware or equipment modification. Equipment operation, plant limiting conditions for operation, and accident analyses will be unchanged. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents.

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

Vermont Yankee has determined that the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change involves revision of Technical Specification surveillance requirements. There are no hardware modifications or equipment changes involved and operation of plant equipment will be unchanged. Thus, no new or different accident precursors will be created by this change.

3. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant reduction in a margin or safety. VY has determined that the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed change involves revision of Technical Specification surveillance requirements. There are no hardware modifications or equipment changes involved and plant operation and accident analyses are unchanged. The initial suppression pool water temperature limit, which is an input value for accident analyses, is not changed. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant reduction in the 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: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, VT 05301.

**Attorney for licensee:** Mr. David R. Lewis, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037-1128.

**NRC Section Chief:** James W. Clifford.

**Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont**

**Date of amendment request:** June 29, 1999.

**Description of amendment request:** The licensee proposed revising the leak rate requirements of Technical Specifications 3.7.A.4 and 4.7.A.4 for the main steam line isolation valves. Specifically, a total leakage rate allowable value for the sum of the four main steam lines is proposed that is equal to four times the current individual main steam line isolation valve leakage rate allowable value. The individual main steam line isolation valve leakage rate allowable value is proposed to be one half of the total leakage rate allowable value.

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

1. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not involve a change to the plant design or operation. As a result, the proposed change does not affect any of the parameters or conditions that contribute to the initiation of any accidents previously evaluated. Thus, the proposed change cannot increase the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not affect the leak-tight integrity of the containment structure that is designed to mitigate the consequences of a loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA). The primary containment must maintain functional integrity during and following the peak transient pressures and temperatures that result from any LOCA, thereby limiting fission product leakage following the accident. Because the proposed change does not alter any of the fission product lead rate assumptions used in the design basis LOCA analysis, the analyzed consequences of the Loss of Coolant Accident are not changed.

The control room radiological habitability analysis uses as an input assumption main steam line leakage rate at four times the current Technical Specifications limit. An allowable value for total main steam line



leakage rate equivalent to four times the current Technical Specifications limit for a single main steam line isolation valve is being added by this change. Thus, there is no effect on the main control room radiological habitability calculation.

Based on the above VY [Vermont Yankee] has concluded that the proposed change will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change does not involve a change to the plant design or operation. As a result, the proposed change does not affect any parameters or conditions that could contribute to the initiation of any accident. The methods of performing the tests are not changed. No new accident modes are created. No safety-related equipment or safety functions are altered as a result of this change. Restating the acceptance criteria while maintaining the assumptions of all affected calculations has no influence over nor does it contribute to, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident or malfunction from those previously evaluated.

Based on the above VY has concluded that the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated.

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

Restating the acceptance criteria for the main steam line isolation valve leakage rate while maintaining the assumptions of all affected calculations does not impact the margin of safety. The 0.6L<sub>a</sub> maximum and minimum pathway leakage rate acceptance criteria provide the previously analyzed margin of safety. The testing method for determining the leak-tightness of the main steam line isolation valves has not changed. The leak rate test results are presently added to the Types B and C tests summation. The 0.6L<sub>a</sub> maximum and minimum pathway leak rate acceptance criteria and the proposed Technical Specifications requirements provide assurance that component degradation does not impact the assumptions used to determine, nor provide a reduction in, and the analyzed margin of safety.

Based on the above VY has concluded that the proposed change will not cause 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: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, VT 05301.

**Attorney for licensee:** Mr. David R. Lewis, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and

Trobridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037-1128.  
**NRC Section Chief:** James W. Clifford.

**Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont.**

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

**Description of amendment request:** The amendment would revise the value for the Safety Limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (SLMCPR) and delete the wording specifying these as Cycle 20 values.

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

1. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The basis of the SLMCPR is to ensure no mechanistic fuel damages is calculated to occur if the limit is not violated. The new SLMCPR values preserve the existing margin to transition boiling and probability of fuel damage is not increased. The derivation of the revised SLMCPR for Vermont Yankee for incorporation into the Technical Specifications, and its use to determine plant and cycle-specific thermal limits, have been performed using NRC approved methods. These plant-specific calculations are performing each operating cycle and if necessary, will require future changes to these values based upon revised core designs. The revised SLMCPR values do not change the method of operating the plant and have no effect on the probability of an accident initiating event or transient.

Based on the above, Vermont Yankee has concluded that the proposed change will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes result only from a specific analysis for the Vermont Yankee core reload design and deletion of a cycle specific reference for the values. These changes do not involve any new or different method for operating the facility and do not involve any facility modifications. No new initiating events or transients result from these changes.

Based on the above, Vermont Yankee has concluded that the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those previously evaluated.

3. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with

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

The new SLMCPR is calculated using NRC approved methods with plant and cycle specific parameters for the current core design. The SLMCPR value remains high enough to ensure that greater than 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core will avoid transition boiling if the limit is not violated, thereby preserving the fuel cladding integrity. The operating MCPR limit is set appropriately above the safety limit value to ensure margin when the cycle specific transients are evaluated.

As a result, Vermont Yankee has determined that the proposed change will not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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

**Local Public Document Room**  
location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, VT 05301.

**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 amendment request:** June 22, 1999 (TSCR 210).

**Description of amendment request:** The proposed amendments reflect changes to the Point Beach Nuclear Plant (PBNP) Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications (TSS) in order to incorporate the Westinghouse 422V+ fuel assemblies into the PBNP reactor cores. Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration which is presented below:

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

The accidents which are potentially affected by the parameters and assumptions associated with this amendment have been evaluated/analyzed and all design standards and applicable safety criteria are met. The consideration of these changes does not result in a situation where the design and construction standards that were applicable prior to the change are altered. Therefore, the changed occurring with this amendment will not result in any additional challenges to plant equipment that could increase the probability of any previously evaluated accident.

The proposed changes associated with this amendment do not affect plant systems such that their function in the control of



radiological consequences is adversely affected. The safety evaluation (included in Attachment 2 of this submittal) documents that the design standards and applicable safety criteria limits continue to be met and therefore fission barrier integrity is not challenged. The proposed changes have been shown not to adversely affect the response of the plant to postulated accident scenarios. Existing system and component redundancy and operation is not being changed by these proposed changes. These changes will therefore not affect the mitigation of the radiological consequences of any accident described in the FSAR [final safety analysis report].

In some cases, the results of the revised radiological analyses are greater than those of the current FSAR analysis. In other cases, the new and old analyses are not directly comparable because the radiological bases for the new analyses have been upgraded to meet more current NRC requirements. However, in all cases, the calculated doses are well within the regulatory acceptance criteria and do not constitute an unacceptable significant increase in consequences. Since the actual plant configuration, performance of systems, and initiating event mechanisms are not being changed as a result of this evaluation, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased.

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

The possibility for a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated is not created as a result of this amendment. The changes described in the amendment are supported by the analyses and evaluations described in Attachment 2 (safety evaluation). The evaluation of the effects of the proposed changes indicate that all design standards and applicable safety criteria limits are met. These changes therefore do not cause the initiation of any new or different accident nor create any new failure mechanisms.

All equipment important to safety will continue to operate as designed. Component integrity is not challenged. The changes do not result in any event previously deemed incredible being made credible. The changes do not result in more adverse conditions or result in any increase in the challenges to safety systems. Therefore, operation of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in accordance with the proposed amendments will not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. Existing component redundancy is not being changed by these proposed changes. There are no new or significant changes to the initial conditions contributing to accident severity or consequences. The margin of safety is maintained by assuring compliance

with acceptance limits reviewed and approved by the NRC. Since all of the appropriate acceptance criteria for the various analyses and evaluations have been met as discussed in Attachment 2 (Safety Evaluation) of this submittal and provided for information in Attachment 4 (PBNP FSAR Chapter 14 "Safety Analysis" changes required as a result of the analyses performed for the upgraded fuel) of this submittal, by definition there has not been a significant reduction of any 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:* The Lester Public Library, 1001 Adams Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin 54241.

*Attorney for licensee:* John H. O'Neill, Jr., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Section Chief:* Claudia M. Craig, 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 amendment request:* July 1, 1999 (TSCR 214).

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments reflect a change to Point Beach Nuclear Plant (PBNP) Units 1 and 2 Technical Specification (TS) Section 15.5.4. The amendment request proposes to remove one of the two separate methods for verifying the acceptability of reactor fuel for placement and storage in the spent fuel pool.

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

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

The proposed changes are administrative only in that they remove the ability to use the reference  $K_{\infty}$  method for determining the acceptability of fuel for placement and storage in the spent fuel pool and new fuel storage vault at the Point Beach Nuclear Plant. Use of the remaining approved method and requirements ensure that fuel placed or stored in the spent fuel pool and new fuel storage vault continues to be in accordance with their respective design and licensing basis. That is, fuel in the storage array will continue to meet the design basis

requirement that  $K_{\text{eff}}$  remain less than 0.95. No modifications are being made to the spent fuel pool and its cooling system or to the new or spent fuel storage racks. Since the design basis of the fuel and storage racks continue to be met, operation in accordance with the proposed amendments cannot create a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

No physical modifications are being made to the spent fuel pool and cooling system or to the new or spent fuel storage racks. All design basis requirements for ensuring the safe storage of fuel in the spent fuel pool continue to be met. Therefore, operation in accordance with the proposed amendments cannot create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Technical Specification requirements for placing and storing fuel in the spent fuel pool continue to ensure that the design basis requirement,  $K_{\text{eff}}$  for the fuel array in the spent fuel pool and new fuel storage remains less than 0.95, is maintained. The existing margin of safety established by this design requirement is maintained. Therefore, operation in accordance with the proposed amendments cannot create a reduction in a margin of safety.

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

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

*Attorney for licensee:* John H. O'Neill, Jr., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Section Chief:* Claudia M. Craig.

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

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

*Date of amendment request:* May 27, 1999, as supplemented by letter dated May 28, 1999

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would add a footnote to Technical Specification (TS) 4.8.2.1e, "D.C. Sources-Operating," which would, on a one-time basis for Unit 1 Battery BT1ED2, allow the licensee to substitute a performance discharge test "\* \* \* in lieu of the battery service test required by Specification 4.8.2.1d, twice within a 60 month interval."

*Date of publication of individual notice in Federal Register:* June 14, 1999. (64 FR 31881).

*Expiration date of individual notice:* July 14, 1999.

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

#### **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 1, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

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

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document

Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved.

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

*Date of application for amendment:* December 21, 1998, as supplemented on January 28, February 18, April 2, April 15, and April 16, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* This amendment makes changes to Facility Operating License No. DPR-35, the Technical Specifications, and Materials License No. 20-07626-04 to reflect the transfer of the licenses from Boston Edison Company to Entergy Nuclear Generation Company.

*Date of issuance:* July 13, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 181.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 26, 1999 (64 FR 3984). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 29, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* March 3, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment modified Technical Specification Table 4.6-3, "Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program Withdrawal Schedule." The amendment changed the withdrawal schedule for the upcoming reactor vessel surveillance capsule pull from approximately 15 effective full power years to approximately 18 effective full power years.

*Date of issuance:* July 15, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 182.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* May 19, 1999 (64 FR 27316). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 15, 1999.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

*Florida Power and Light Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389, St. Lucie Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, St Lucie County, Florida*

*Date of application for amendments:* December 1, 1997, supplemented August 26, 1998.

*Brief description of amendments:* Revised the Technical Specifications (TS), Appendix B, Environmental Protection Plan (Non-Radiological), to implement the terms and conditions of the incidental Take Statement included in the Biological Opinion issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service, regarding endangered sea turtles.

*Date of Issuance:* July 2, 1999.

*Effective Date:* July 2, 1999.

*Amendment Nos.:* 162 and 103.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16:* Amendments revised the TS.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* December 31, 1997 (62 FR 68305). The supplemental letter dated August 26, 1998, provided clarifying information that did not change the original no significant hazards consideration determination.

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendment:* June 5, 1998, as supplemented January 13, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* The proposed revision to the Millstone Unit 3 licensing basis would address a recent steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) analysis that was determined to be an unreviewed safety question. The SGTR analyses described in the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) include an offsite dose analysis and a margin to overfill analysis. Both of the analyses have been updated. The offsite dose analysis was updated to reflect a larger capacity for the steam generator atmospheric dump valve (ADV) and a decrease in the operator response time to close the ADV block valve. The

margin to overfill analysis was updated to reflect a new single failure.

*Date of issuance:* July 2, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 172.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-49:* Amendments authorizes revisions to the FSAR,

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* July 1, 1998 (63 FR 35992).

The January 13, 1999, supplemental letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 2, 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. 50-335, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, New Location County, Connecticut*

*Date of application for amendment:* March 19, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* The amendment relocated Technical Specifications Sections 3.3.3.2, "Instrumentation, Incore Detectors," 3.3.3.3, "Instrumentation, Seismic Instrumentation," and 3.3.3.4, "Instrumentation, Meteorological Instrumentation," to the Millstone, Unit No. 2, Technical Requirements Manual. Index page V and TS Bases have been revised to reflect the above relocations.

*Dated of issuance:* July 13, 1999.

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

*Amendment No.:* 237.

*Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-65:* Amendment Revised the Technical Specifications.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* April 21, 1998 (64 FR 19560).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 13, 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 Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of application for amendment:* November 26, 1999, which was superseded by letter dated June 1, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated October 30, 1998, March 29, 1999, April 20, 1999, and May 28, 1999.

*Brief description of amendment:* These amendment would replace the current ultimate heat sink average water temperature limit for all combination of plant operations.

*Dated of issuance:* July 6, 1999.

*Effective date:* Both units, effective as of date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 182 and 156.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* May 20, 1998 (63 FR 27764). The October 30, 1998, March 29, 1999, April 20, 1999, and May 28, 1999, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 6, 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.

*PP&L, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of application for amendment:* November 23, 1999.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendments modified the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specifications limiting condition for operation, 3.8.3, and surveillance requirements, 3.8.3.1, to increase the minimum fuel oil storage tank volume ranges.

*Dated of issuance:* July 7, 1999.

*Effective date:* Units 1 and 2, as of date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days.

*Amendment Nos.:* 183 and 157.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 27, 1999 (64 FR 4160).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 7, 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.

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

*Date of application for amendments:* October 17, 1997, as supplemented March 2 and November 28, 1998.

*Brief description of amendments:* These amendments authorize changes to the updated Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) to permit installation of digital radiation monitors for both the containment purge isolation and the control room isolation signals.

*Date of issuance:* July 12, 1999.

*Effective date:* July 12, 1999; implementation shall include submission by the licensee of the revised description authorized by these amendments with the next update of the FSAR in accordance with 10 CFR 50.71(e).

*Amendment Nos.:* Unit 2-154; Unit 3-145.

*Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15:* The amendments revised the FSAR.

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* January 28, 1998 (63 FR 4324).

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

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

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

*Date of application for amendments:* January 12, 1999, as supplemented by letters dated May 11, and June 30, 1999.

*Brief description of amendments:* The amendment revised Technical Specification 3/4.7.5, Ultimate Heat Sink, by adding a new action statement to be used in the event the plant inlet water temperature exceeds 90° F. The amendment is effective only through September 30, 1999, and is only for the current TSs. The amendment is also limited to a maximum plant inlet water temperature of 94° F. The proposal to raise this temperature to 95° F will be addressed in a future letter.

*Date of issuance:* July 8, 1999.

*Effective date:* July 8, 1999, shall be implemented within 30 days of the date of issuance.

*Amendment No.:* 125.

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

*Date of initial notice in Federal Register:* February 24, 1999 (64 FR 9203). The May 11 and June 30, 1999, supplemental letters provided additional clarifying information, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, except that the licensee proposed a maximum plant inlet water temperature of 95° F. where the letters of January and May 11, 1999, proposed only 94° F. The amendment is limited to a maximum temperature of 94° F.

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

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

*Local Public Document Room*

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**John A. Zwolinski,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-19133 Filed 7-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

On July 14, 1999 (64 FR 38040), the **Federal Register** published the

Biweekly Notice of Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses. On page 38040, the line that reads "Amendment No.: 179." should read "Amendment No.: 180."

Dated at Rockville, Md., this 22nd day of July 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

**John A. Zwolinski,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-19257 Filed 7-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

### Comments Are Invited On

(a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

### Title and Purpose of Information Collection

*Application for Survivor Death Benefits:* OMB 3220-0031.

Under Section 6 of the Railroad Retirement Act (RRA), lump-sum death benefits are payable to surviving widow

and widowers, children and certain other dependents. Lump-sum death benefits are payable after the death of a railroad employee *only* if there are no qualified survivors of the employee immediately eligible for annuities. With the exception of the residual death benefit, eligibility for survivor benefits depend on whether the employee was "insured" under the RRA at the time of death. If a deceased employee was not so insured, jurisdiction of any survivor benefits payable is transferred to the Social Security Administration and survivor benefits are paid by that agency instead of the RRB. The collection obtains the information required by the RRB to determine entitlement to and amount of the survivor death benefits applied for.

The RRB currently utilizes Form(s) AA-11a (Designation for Change of Beneficiary for Residual Lump-Sum), AA-21 (Application for Lump-Sum Death Payment and Annuities Unpaid at Death), G-131 (Authorization of Payment and Release of All Claims to a Death Benefit or Accrued Annuity Payment), and G-273a (Funeral Director's Statement of Burial Charges), to obtain the necessary information. One response is requested of each respondent. Completion is required to obtain benefits.

The RRB is proposing the addition of an electronic version of Form AA-21 to the collection. The information collected will mirror that obtained on the manual Form AA-21. Upon completion of the electronic AA-21, the applicant will receive Form AA-21cert for review and signature. The AA-21cert will summarize information provided by/or verified by the applicant. In addition, the RRB is proposing editorial and formatting changes to Form AA-11a, manual Form AA-21, G-131, and G-273a.

### Estimate of Annual Respondent Burden

The estimated annual respondent burden is as follows:

Form #(s)	Annual responses	Time (min)	Burden (hrs)
AA-11A .....	400	10	67
Electronic AA-21 (with assistance) .....	9,700	20	3,230
Manual AA-21 (without assistance) .....	300	40	200
G-131 .....	600	5	50
G-273A .....	9,600	10	1,600
Total .....	20,600	.....	5,147