the possibility of a new overpressurization event during cold shutdown. The proposed change to list the lift settings for the individual primary and secondary safety valves will have no effect on the safety function of the valves. Therefore, the proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a

margin of safety.

The proposed changes to Technical Specifications do not affect the DNB analyses that have been previously performed. The most limiting overpressurization event, loss of external load, has been conservatively analyzed accounting for the proposed changes and demonstrated that the primary and secondary system pressures remain within 110% of the design pressures. Overpressurization during cold shutdown is addressed by Technical Specification 3.1.8. 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: Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

*NRČ Project Director:* John N. Hannon.

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50–255, Palisades Plant, Van Buren County, Michigan.

Date of amendment request: February 10, 1995.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications to allow a one time deferral of several 18-month interval surveillance tests until the upcoming scheduled refueling outage to avoid the necessity of imposing a plant shutdown solely for the sake of their performance.

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 following evaluation supports the finding that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed Technical Specifications (TS) would not:

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

Deferring surveillance testing will introduce no new operating conditions, change no equipment operating procedures, and change no plant systems or equipment. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed TS would not result in a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

Deferring surveillance testing of snubbers and instrument channels could allow minor degradations of snubber condition or small changes in instrument setpoints or calibration to progress some amount beyond that point which would occur with a shorter surveillance interval. A review of the recent test history for the subject surveillance indicates that no significant snubber degradation or instrument drift was found. It is not expected that, even with the proposed surveillance deferral, snubber conditions or instrument settings will be found to exceed conditions allowable by the Technical Specifications. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed TS would not result in a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Deferring surveillance testing will introduce no new operating conditions, change no equipment operating procedures, and change no plant systems or equipment. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed TS would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

A review of past performance of the subject surveillance tests indicate that the requested deferral of testing would not have a significant effect on the results of the tests when they are performed prior to the startup for cycle 12. Most of the affected instrumentation is monitored each shift by channel checks, which would disclose major failures or significant drift. Therefore, operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed TS would 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: Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

*NRC Project Director:* John N. Hannon.

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

Date of amendment request: November 2, 1994.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would delete the content of the Appendix B,
Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) and modify License Conditions 2.C.(2) to delete that portion which refers to the EPP. Specifically, the requirements for non-radiological environmental monitoring have been completed. The radiological environmental monitoring requirements have been incorporated into Appendix A (the Technical Specifications). There would be no impact on the continued safety of the McGuire station by deleting Appendix B.

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:

Deletion of the Environmental Protection Plan and modifying License Condition 2.C.(2) will have no impact on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the changes will not have any impact upon the design or operation of any plant systems or components.

The proposed revision will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because the revision is administrative in nature and will not change the types and amounts of effluent that will be released.

The proposed revision will not reduce a margin of safety because it is administrative in nature and will not effect the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any Technical Specifications.

Accordingly, this proposed changes does not involve a significant hazard.

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: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

*NRC Project Director:* Herbert N. Berkow.