review to assure that operation of the units within the cycle specific limits will not involve a reduction in a margin of safety. 10 CFR [Section] 50.59 (2) states that a proposed change involves an unreviewed safety question (iii) if the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any technical specification is reduced. Consequently, since any change to the reload core design analysis must be evaluated relative to the more restrictive evaluation criterion of 10 CFR [Section] 50.59, then operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments 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 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. The NRC staff, however, considers that the licensee's statements relative to 10 CFR Section 50.59 evaluations to be performed in the future are not relevant to the proposed no significant hazards determination.

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

Attorney for licensee: Harold F. Reis, Esquire, Newman and Holtzer, P.C., 1615 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews.

IES Utilities Inc., Docket No. 50–331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

*Date of amendment request:* October 28, 1994.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment revises the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) Operating License by deleting a condition of the license that requires a "Plan for Integrating Scheduling of Plant Modifications for the Duane Arnold Energy Center" (the Plan).

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 provided below:

(1) The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. No physical changes to the facility will occur as a result of this amendment. Work activities will continue to receive the appropriate level of review in accordance with DAEC procedures and practices. The organizational structure that controls and manages these activities remains unchanged and will assure that activities are prioritized and performed in a manner consistent with plant safety. The proposed amendment removes an administrative burden that is no longer required.

(2) The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. No changes to the physical design and/or operation of the plant will occur as a result of this amendment. The processes by which activities are planned, prioritized, and controlled are not affected. The appropriate level of technical review and management oversight continue to be performed in accordance with existing procedures and practices to assure that activities are performed in a manner consistent with plant safety.

(3) The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As stated earlier, no changes to the physical design and/or operation of any plant systems will occur as a result of this amendment. Work activities will continue to receive the appropriate technical review and management oversight to assure that activities are prioritized and performed in a manner consistent with plant safety. The amendment removes an administrative burden that is no longer required.

Based on the above, we have determined that the proposed amendment will not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 500 First Street, S.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Attorney for licensee: Jack Newman, Kathleen H. Shea, Morgan, Lewis & Bouckins, 1800 M Street NW., Washington, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: Leif J. Norrholm.

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, Docket No. 50–220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1, Oswego County, New York

*Date of amendment request:* January 24, 1995.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification 3.4.1, "Leakage Rate," to reduce the allowable leakage rate of the reactor building from 2000 cubic feet per minute (cfm) to 1600 cfm.

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 operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1, in accordance with the proposed

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

Secondary containment and RBEVS [Reactor Building Emergency Ventilation System] are not initiators or precursors to an accident. Secondary containment provides a pressure boundary, with limited in-leakage, for the purpose of preventing a ground level unfiltered release of radioactivity. RBEVS responds to accidents involving release of radioactivity to the secondary containment by maintaining a negative pressure inside secondary containment and by providing an elevated release. Therefore, a change to the Reactor Building leakage rate cannot affect the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

Although the proposed change reduces the Reactor Building leakage rate from 2000 cfm to 1600 cfm consistent with system design, there is no effect on the radiological consequences of any previously analyzed accident since the radiological analysis does not assume exfiltration. Therefore, the Technical Specification change does not significantly increase the consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1, 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 to the Reactor Building leakage rate from 2000 cfm to 1600 cfm does not involve any accident precursors or initiators. During an accident involving a release of radioactivity to the secondary containment, the RBEVS would be operable and provide filtration of containment atmosphere prior to release to the environment. This change does not involve any physical modifications to the system, thus the system will operate as designed. Therefore, the proposed Technical Specification change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 1, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change in Reactor Building in-leakage from 2000 cfm to 1600 cfm in Specification 3.4.1 and the associated basis is to be consistent with system design and reflect the leakage rate associated with approximately one building air volume change per day. The resulting accident analysis remains unchanged since the radiological analysis does not assume any exfiltration. Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification.

Therefore, as determined by the above analysis, this proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request