(1) The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability of consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Operation of PNPS [Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station] in accordance with the proposed license amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Implementation of the proposed change is expected to result in an increase in the probability of core damage, from 5.85E–5/year (this is the PNPS IPE [individual plant examination] core damage frequency) to 5.88E–5/year. This increase is less than one percent and is considered to be insignificant relative to the underlying uncertainties involved with probabilistic risk assessments.

Deleting the testing requirement for an EDG when the other EDG is in repair does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the reliability program and Technical Specification required surveillances continue to provide the added assurance sought by the testing. The elimination of this testing might improve the overall reliability of the EDGs.

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

Operation of PNPS in accordance with the proposed license amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. No change is being made in the manner in which the EDG's provide plant protection. No new modes of plant operation are involved. Extending the EDG OOS [out of service] and, deleting the testing requirement for one EDG when the other EDG is in repair does not necessitate physical alteration of the plant or changes in plant operational limits.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Operation of PNPS in accordance with the proposed license amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. [***], incorporation of the proposed change involves an insignificant reduction in the margin of safety.

As previously stated, implementation of the proposed changes is expected to result in an insignificant increase in: (1) power unavailability to the emergency buses (given that a loss of offsite power has occurred), and (2) core damage frequency. EDG reliability improvement is expected due to increased quality and thoroughness of EDG maintenance. Implementation of the proposed changes does not increase the consequences of a previously analyzed accident nor significantly reduce a margin of safety. Functioning of the EDGs and the manner in which limiting condition of operability are established are unaffected.

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:* Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

*Attorney for licensee:* W.S. Stowe, Esquire, Boston Edison Company, 800 Boylston Street, 36th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02199.

*NRC Project Director:* Walter R. Butler.

**Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50–261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2, Darlington County, South Carolina**

*Date of amendment request:* December 27, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The requested Technical Specifications (TS) change relocates the turbine rotor inspection requirement, TS 4.1–3, Item 13, to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), Section 10.2. This TS requires a turbine inspection, including visual, magnaflux, and dye petrant inspections on a frequency of every five years with a maximum time between tests of six years.

*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 requested change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The requested change relocates the turbine inspection requirement from the TS to the UFSAR. Turbine inspections will continue to be controlled and performed such that the low turbine missile generation probability will be maintained. The consequences of missile generation are unchanged since this change does not involve the addition or modification of plant equipment, nor does it alter the design or operation of plant systems. Therefore, there would be no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The requested change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The requested change relocates the turbine inspection requirement from the TS to the UFSAR. Turbine inspections will continue to be controlled and performed such that the low turbine missile generation probability will be maintained. This change does not involve the addition or modification of plant equipment, nor does it alter the design or operation of plant systems. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The requested change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The requested change relocates the turbine inspection requirement from the TS to the UFSAR. Turbine inspections will continue to be controlled and performed such that the low turbine missile generation probability will be maintained. Therefore, the proposed changes do 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 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:* Hartsville Memorial Library, 147 West College Avenue, Hartsville, South Carolina 29550.

*Attorney for licensee:* R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, Post Office Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602.

*NRC Project Director:* William H. Bateman.

**Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50–400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina**

*Date of amendment request:* December 19, 1994.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed one-time schedular extension would allow the third test of the first 10-year service period to be performed during refueling outage no. 7, at approximately a 54 month interval instead of the current maximum Technical Specification interval of 50 months, and coincident with the 10-year service period to be performed during refueling outage no. 7 and the 10-year inservice inspection,

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

This [extension] request applies to the ILRT [integrated leak rate testing] and does not affect the local leak rate testing of containment penetrations and isolation valves where the majority of the leakage occurs. The allowable containment leakage used in the accident analysis for offsite doses, $L_a$, is 0.1 [weight percent per day] and for conservatism the leakage is limited to 75 percent $L_a$ at startup to account for the possible degradation of containment leakage barriers between two ILRT tests. Based on the ''as left'' leakage data for the past two ILRTs, the additional time period added to the testing interval would not adversely impact the containment leakage barriers to the extent