effectiveness of equipment relied upon to mitigate the previously evaluated accidents.

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

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

The modification is considered an enhancement to the TIP system and does not serve as an initiator or contributor to any of the accidents previously evaluated. The proposed changes do not introduce a new mode of plant operation. The new system, like the old one, is designed to keep the ball valves closed upon reset of the Primary Containment Isolation System (PCIS) logic. The new TIP control console will respond to a PCIS isolation signal in the same manner as the old system.

Implementation of the proposed changes will not affect the design function or configuration of any component or introduce any new operating scenarios or failure modes or accident initiation.

Modification P00068 will not impair or prevent safety systems from performing their safety function. It will not make any changes to the design function of the TIP system. The classification of the TIP ball and shear valves and their control circuitry will not change as a result of this modification.

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

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The TIP system does not serve as an initiator or contributor to any accidents evaluated in the SAR [safety analysis report]. Modification P00068 is considered an enhancement to the existing TIP system and does not change its design function. The reduction in the number of containment penetrations from five to three does not represent a reduction in a margin of safety because of additional indexers in the new system. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the assumptions or sequence of events used in any accident analysis.

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

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

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

Attorney for Licensee: J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire, Sr. V.P. and General Counsel, PECO Energy Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50–333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: June 13, 1994.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed change would remove license condition 2.E from the Facility Operating License. License Condition 2.E incorporated the requirements of U.S. Department of Interior publication "Environmental Criteria for Electric Transmission Systems"—1970, which applies to the construction cleanup, restoration, and maintenance of transmission lines.

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:

Operation of the FitzPatrick plant in accordance with the proposed Amendment would not involve a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10 CFR 50.92, since it would not:

(1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change will remove a license condition unrelated to nuclear safety. License condition 2.E incorporated into the Operating License the requirements of U.S. Department of Interior publication "Environmental Criteria for Electric Transmission Systems"-1970. The goal of this standard is to "safeguard aesthetic and environmental values within the constraints imposed by the current state of high-voltage transmission technology." License condition 2.E addresses the preservation of the environment and natural resources. Removing this condition from the Facility Operating License has no bearing on plant safety or the health and safety of the public considering its nonnuclear nature. The transmission line rightof-ways maintained by the [Power] Authority [of the State of New York] are subject to regulation by other State and Federal Agencies. Removal of this license condition will not affect operation of safety related structures, systems or components nor affect the quality assurance program at the FitzPatrick plant. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

License condition 2.E of the James A. FitzPatrick Plant Operating License applies to the construction cleanup, restoration, and maintenance of transmission lines. The Authority's transmission lines are managed under guidelines based on the "Generic Transmission Line Right-of-Way Management" plan requirements. The

requirements imposed by the plan on the FitzPatrick transmission line right-of-ways exceed those of the U.S. Department of Interior publication referenced in license condition 2.E in both scope and details. Therefore, implementing the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

License condition 2.E of the James A. FitzPatrick Plant Operating License applies to the construction cleanup, restoration, and maintenance of transmission lines. The requirements imposed by this license condition are unrelated to nuclear safety. Continued operation of the plant without Condition 2.E does not involve a significant reduction in 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 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: Reference and Documents Department, Penfield Library, State University of New York, Oswego, New York 13126.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, 1633 Broadway, New York, New York 10019.

*NRC Project Director:* Ledyard B. Marsh.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50–327 and 50–328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee

Date of amendment request: December 16, 1994; supplemented February 10, 1995 (TS 94–07).

Description of amendment request:
The proposed change would reduce the maximum allowed power levels and more clearly specify the plant conditions allowed by the technical specifications for operation with one or more main steam safety valves inoperable. In addition, the Bases would be revised to reflect these changes and incorporate the revised methodology used to establish the neutron flux setpoints.

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:

TVA has evaluated the proposed technical specification (TS) change and has determined that it does not represent a significant hazards consideration based on criteria established in 10 CFR 50.92(c). Operation of