self-limiting due to inherent reactivity feedback mechanisms). Given the above, there will be no increase in the consequences of any accident or equipment malfunction.

In a letter dated September 8, 1994, the licensee submitted an application to amend their Technical specifications. In their submittal, the licensee confirmed the applicability of the analyses in GL 85–05 and NSAC–183 to the subject boron dilution event. Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59(c)(2), the proposed amendment is required since changes are needed to procedural controls as described in the FSAR. These changes involve an unreviewed safety question which require Commission approval prior to implementation.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves 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. 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 initiating events are presented in revised FSAR Section 15.4.6.2. The proposed changes affect only the procedural controls applicable for Mode 6.

Overall protection system performance will remain within the bounds of the accident analyses documented in FSAR Chapter 15, WCAP–10961–P, and WCAP–11883 since no hardware changes are proposed.

There will be no degradation in the performance of nor an increase in the number of challenges to equipment assumed to function during an accident situation.

This amendment application does not involve any hardware changes. There will be no change to normal plant operating parameters or accident mitigation capabilities. Therefore, there will be no increase in the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

The Technical Specification limits on Mode 6 boron concentration will be met. The conclusions of NRC Generic Letter 85–05 and NSAC–183 will remain valid (i.e., that gradual boron dilution events are selflimiting due to inherent reactivity feedback mechanisms). Given the above, there will be no increase in the consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

(2) As discussed above, there are no hardware changes associated with these Technical Specification revisions nor are there any changes in the method by which any safety-related plant system performs its safety function.

Administrative controls will limit the volume of unborated water which can be added to the refueling pool for decontamination activities. Administrative controls will also limit the potential for an unborated layer of water from entering the core region during the draining evolution. Technical Specification 3.9.1. will continue to be met.

Given the above and the safety evaluation continued in Attachment 1 to the licensee's September 8, 1994, letter, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated is not created.

(3) The proposed administrative controls are sufficient to preclude diluting the boron concentration of the refueling pool below 2000 ppm. There will be no effect on the manner in which safety limits or limiting safety system settings are determined nor will there be any effect on those plant systems necessary to assure the accomplishment of protection function. There will be no impact on DNBR limits, F_{Q} , F-delta-H, LOCA PCT, peak local power density, or any other margin of safety.

Based upon the preceding information, it has been determined that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed changes meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.92(c) and do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Therefore, based on the above considerations, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

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. The Commission will not normally make a final determination unless it receives a request for a hearing.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Regulatory Publications Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, 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, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By March 31, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions 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, N.W., Washington, DC 20555 and at the local public document room located at the Callaway County Public Library, 710 Court Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251.

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 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 aspects(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 fifteen (15) days prior to the