the necessity of shifting suction from the BASTs to the RWST, reducing the complexity of the operation. Since the pumps remain connected to the RWST throughout the injection phase, there is no possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Neither the reduction in initial boron concentration for safety injection, nor the increase in the boron concentration in the RWST would create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Lastly, the reactivity control function of the boron in the CVCS and SI systems is not being changed. Therefore, the proposed changes will not adversely affect the health and safety of the public or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The change in concentration of boron injected into the primary system for accident mitigation has been analyzed. These analyses conclude that all applicable criteria for a LOCA are satisfied. A change in safety injection boron concentration to 2400 ppm will not adversely affect the Large or Small-Break LOCA analysis because the evaluation model codes used in analyzing these accidents did not take credit for boron. However, a minimum RWST boron concentration of 2400 ppm is required to maintain long term post LOCA reactor core sub-criticality. To meet this requirement, the RWST minimum boron concentration is being raised to 2400 ppm. All criteria of 10 CFR 50.46 can be achieved for both the Large or Small-Break LOCA with 2400 ppm boron in the RWST. Since all criteria of 10 CFR 50.46 are satisfied, there is no adverse effect on the health and safety of the public and there is not a significant reduction in the margin of safety for these casualties.

Since both the core response and the containment response can be limiting in the SLB event, both were considered in the boron concentration reduction analysis. Although a minimum RWST boron concentration of 1950 ppm is sufficient to provide adequate protection for the SLB event, a 2400 ppm boron solution will be maintained to provide protection for the post large break LOCA concerns. Since the containment pressure remains below the design pressure, and a minimum DNBR of 1.45 can be maintained throughout the event, there is not a significant reduction in the margin of safety for this event.

These proposed changes involve the conversion of the TS to Word Perfect format now being used at WPSC. Minor typographical errors and format inconsistencies were corrected. These proposed changes are administrative in nature; accordingly, these proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Additionally, the proposed changes are similar to example C.2.e.(i) in 51 FR 7751. Example C.2.e.(i) states that changes which are purely administrative in nature; i.e., to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correct an error, or a change in nomenclature, are not likely to involve a significant hazard.

Significant Hazards Determination for Proposed Changes to Technical Specification (TS) Section 4.5 "Emergency Core Cooling System and Containment Air Cooling System Tests."

The proposed changes were reviewed in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR 50.92 to show no significant hazards exist. The proposed changes will not:

 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 the margin of safety.

The above listed surveillance requirements insure BAST operability. The BASTs will no longer be relied upon as a source of boron for safety injection, and will serve no safety related function. Whether the BASTs are operable or not will have no effect on plant safety. Therefore, elimination of the surveillance requirements which insure BAST operability is possible without any adverse effect on the health and safety of the public and presents no significant hazards.

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: University of Wisconsin Library Learning Center, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

Attorney for licensee: Bradley D. Jackson, Esq., Foley and Lardner, P. O. Box 1497, Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1497.

NRC Project Director: Leif J. Norrholm

Previously Published Notices Of Consideration Of Issuance Of Amendments ToFacility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination,And Opportunity For A Hearing

The following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances. They are repeated here because the biweekly notice lists all amendments issued or proposed to be issued involving no significant hazards consideration.

For details, see the individual notice in the **Federal Register** on the day and page cited. This notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice.

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One,Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: November 29, 1994

Brief description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would delete requirements to perform the full complement of steam generator surveillances as outlined in the technical specifications (TSs) when the steam generators are subjected to special inspections that are in addition to inspections that are required by the TSs.

Date of individual notice in the Federal Register: December 5, 1994 (59 FR 62416)

Expiration date of individual notice: January 4, 1995

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

Notice Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental