

should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated January 29, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room, located at the Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of February 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Beth A. Wetzel,
*Project Manager, Project Directorate III-1,
Division of Reactor Projects-III/IV, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-3055 Filed 2-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-344]

**Portland General Electric Company;
Notice of Consideration of Issuance of
Amendment to Facility Operating
License and Opportunity for a Hearing**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-1, issued to Portland General Electric Company (the licensee), for operation of the Trojan Nuclear Plant located in Rainier, Oregon.

The proposed amendment would allow the licensee to process and handle spent fuel pool debris in the Trojan Fuel Building. Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

By March 10, 1997, 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 request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition 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, NW.,

Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Portland State University Science Library, 951 SW Hall St., Portland OR. 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 aspect(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 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with

the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate: petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to Douglas Nichols, 1 WTC 1301, 121 S.W. Salmon Street, Portland OR, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no

significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated October 23, 1996 and the licensee's supplemental information dated December 12, 1996, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Portland State University Science Library, 951 SW Hall Street, Portland Oregon.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of January 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Seymour H. Weiss,

*Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate,
Division of Reactor Program Management,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-3054 Filed 2-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311]

Public Service Electric and Gas Company; Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed no Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75 issued to Public Service Electric and Gas Company (the licensee) for operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.4.3, "Relief Valves," for Salem Unit 1, and TS 3.4.5, "Relief Valves," for Salem Unit 2, to ensure that the automatic capability of the power operated relief valves (PORV) to relieve pressure is maintained when these valves are isolated by closure of the block valves.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, 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—2—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 proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposal does not involve any physical changes to plant systems or components. No new protection system logic is proposed, and therefore, there is no additional signal that can spuriously actuate the Safety Injection (SI) system. Consequently, there would be no change in the probability of occurrence of the accident, as previously evaluated in the [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report] UFSAR. The proposal is based upon a reanalysis of the Inadvertent SI event to include a case that demonstrates that the postulated event would not be likely to lead to a more serious event.

Sustained water relief through a PORV can result in a release of reactor coolant into containment from the Pressurizer Relief Tank. The release is limited, however, since (1) it is the result of the SI System addition and consequently cannot exceed the SI flow rate at the PORV setpoint pressure, and (2) the SI flow will eventually be terminated by the operators. The dose consequences for an Inadvertent SI is bounded by that which is calculated for the spurious opening of a pressurizer safety valve, Accidental RCS Depressurization event, which is also a Condition II event.

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

The Inadvertent Operation of the SI System at Power analysis cases, reported in the UFSAR, are analyzed to challenge fuel integrity. Accordingly, the UFSAR analysis cases produce transients that lead to a reduction in pressurizer pressure, in order to reduce the thermal margin. The results indicate that no fuel damage is predicted. The UFSAR analysis is revised in order to evaluate the effects of an increase in pressurizer pressure and other conditions that could lead to water relief through the pressurizer safety valves. Allowing water relief from the pressurizer would not affect the likelihood of fuel damage occurring during this event. The results of the accident reanalysis indicate that the pressurizer safety valves would not discharge water, (a condition for which they are not designed), and consequently this event will not result in the failure of a pressurizer safety valve due to the discharge of water through the pressurizer safety valves.

An evaluation of the effects of water relief through the PORVs and downstream piping

have also been conducted. The results of the accident reanalysis and the associated evaluation indicate that a different type of malfunction (e.g., a stuck open pressurizer safety valve or failure of downstream piping or components) would not be expected to result from the analyzed event. Therefore, a different type of accident would not be expected to occur as a result of implementation of this proposal.

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

For this proposed change, the safety analysis criterion, which the analysis of Inadvertent SI Actuation at Power event is required to satisfy, is to show that the pressurizer safety valves would not open and discharge water at any time during the event. Satisfaction of this criterion indicates that the safety margin is preserved by preventing the Inadvertent Operation of the SI System at Power event (a Condition II event) from escalating into a more serious event, (a Condition III event).

The proposal does not reduce the margin of safety, since the results of the reanalysis indicate that the applicable safety analysis acceptance criterion, which is established to protect the margin of safety, is satisfied.

The conclusions of the reanalyzed Inadvertent Operation of the SI System at Power event are based upon the assumption that the operators, working according to Emergency Operating Procedures, act within ten minutes after the event occurs to make at least one pressurizer PORV available by opening its associated block valve. This is a justifiable assumption, since simulator test results indicate that operators have been successful in accomplishing this procedure within seven to nine minutes and this requirement has been incorporated into the procedures as a time critical step. Therefore, relief capability is assured prior to the pressurizer achieving a solid water condition.

The PORV surveillance requirements that are currently contained in the Salem TSs ensure that the automatic operation of the PORVs is periodically tested.

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.

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.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license