325°F requirement has an analytical base. This requirement was recently changed from 325°F to 300°F simply for uniformity. With the revised P-T limit analysis requirement to assure that inadvertent HPSI injection will not occur below 300°F, it is necessary to revert to the former limit of 325°F to provide time to transition between these two contrasting HPSI pump requirements.

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

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-313, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: November 8, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment revises technical specifications (TSs) associated with requirements for performing the containment integrated leak rate test (ILRT). The proposed change describes the ILRT test frequency by referencing the test frequency requirements included in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. The existing specifications paraphrase the Appendix J requirements, but include differences that result in interpretation problems.

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:

Criterion 1 - Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change revises Technical Specification 4.4.1.1.4 to reference the testing frequency requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, and to state that NRC approved exemptions to the applicable regulatory requirements are permitted. The current requirements of TS 4.4.1.1.4 paraphrase the requirements of Section III.D.1.(a) of Appendix J. The proposed administrative revision simply deletes the paraphrased language and directly references Appendix J. No new requirements are added, nor are any existing requirements deleted. An approved exemption to Section III.D.1.(a) of Appendix J would not necessarily affect the requirements of TS 4.4.1.1.4, unless the proposed clarification phrase permitting the use of approved exemptions is added. Any

specific changes to the requirements of Section III.D.1(a) will require a submittal from Entergy Operations under 10CFR50.12 and subsequent review and approval by the NRC prior to implementation. The proposed change is stated generically to avoid the need for further TS changes if different exemptions are approved in the future.

The proposed change, in itself, does not affect reactor operations or accident analysis and has no radiological consequences. The change provides clarification so that TS changes will not be necessary in the future to correspond to applicable NRC approved exemptions from the requirements of Appendix J. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2 - Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or different Kind of Accident from any Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change provides clarification to a specification which paraphrases a codified requirement. Since the proposed amendment would not change the design, configuration or method of operation of the plant, it would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Criterion 3 - Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety.

The proposed change is administrative and clarifies the relationship between the requirements of TS 4.4.1.1.4, Appendix J, and any approved exemptions to Appendix J. It does not, in itself, change a safety limit, an LCO, or a surveillance requirement on equipment required to operate the plant. The NRC will directly approve change proposed exemption to III.D.1.(a) of Appendix J prior to implementation. Therefore, this change does 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 proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: December 2, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would replace Appendix B, "Environmental Technical Specifications" with an Environmental Protection Plan (Nonradiological) and revise the Operating Licenses to reflect these changes. The proposed changes are administrative in nature, altering only the format and location of programmatic controls and procedural details relative to nonradiological environmental monitoring.

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

The proposed changes to the **Environmental Technical Specifications** (ETS) are administrative in nature, altering only the format and location of programmatic controls and procedural details relative to nonradiological environmental values. The proposed Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) (Nonradiological) contains the programmatic controls now residing in the ETS, with appropriate plant procedures serving as implementing documents. The proposed changes to the operating licenses are also administrative in nature and change the Appendix B reference from ETS to EPP. Compliance with applicable regulatory requirements will be maintained. In addition, the proposed changes do not alter the conditions or assumptions in any of the accident analyses. Therefore, these proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes to the ETS do not involve any change to the configuration or method of operation of any plant equipment. These proposed changes are administrative in nature and consist of replacing the ETS with an EPP. The proposed changes to the operating licenses are also administrative in nature and change the Appendix B reference from ETS to EPP. Accordingly, no new failure modes have been identified for any plant system or component important to safety nor has any new limiting single failure been identified as a result of the proposed changes. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

 The proposed amendments do not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed changes to the ETS relate primarily to matters involving recordkeeping, reporting, and administrative procedures or requirements. No significant change in the type or quantity of any effluent release will result from this action. These changes replace