

The proposed amendment would revise the SQN, Unit 1, Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The revision provides a change in methodology using a through-bolted connection frame methodology that is different than the original design and construction of the Unit 1 steam generator (SG) roof compartment. This proposed frame methodology is described in Topical Report No. 24370-TR-C-003, Revision 1, and is requested for implementation upon the restoration of the roof compartment as part of the upcoming SG replacement project for SQN, Unit 1.

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 Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), section 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. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No. The probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident are not increased as presently analyzed in the safety analyses since the objective of the event mitigation is not changed. No changes in event classification as discussed in UFSAR Chapter 15 will occur due to the modification of the Unit 1 steam generator (SG) compartment roof design.

The grout used to fill the gap between the replaced concrete and the surrounding concrete, like the surrounding concrete, could "theoretically" experience the formation of micro-cracks when subjected to the design pressure load. Conservative estimates of the flow path through these micro-cracks yield values that are numerically insignificant when compared to the allowable divider barrier bypass leakage. Micro-cracks resulting from the design pressure load will have a negligible effect on the function of the divider barrier and the analyses that depend on the divider barrier. Therefore, the containment design pressure is

not challenged, thereby ensuring that the potential for increasing offsite dose limits above those presently analyzed at the containment design pressure of 12.0 pounds per square inch (psi) is not a concern.

Therefore, the proposed modification to the Unit 1 SG compartment roof design will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No. The possibility of a new or different accident situation occurring as a result of this condition is not created. The SG compartment roof forms part of the divider barrier. This barrier is not an initiator of any accident and only serves to force steam that is released from a loss-of-coolant accident/design basis accident (LOCA/DBA) to pass through the ice condenser. The failure of any part of the divider barrier is considered critical since it would allow LOCA/DBA steam to bypass the ice condenser, thereby increasing the pressure within the primary containment.

As discussed in the UFSAR, there is a maximum calculated leakage of 250 cubic feet per minute (cfm) between the upper and lower containment through the divider barrier. The amount of leakage between the two sections of the containment will not be significantly affected by the restoration of the SG compartment roofs. The use of non-shrink grout to seal the joint created between the concrete sections and the remaining structure will maintain the boundaries between upper and lower containment. It is noted that any leakage due to possible cracks in the grout, particularly under DBA loading, will be extremely small and therefore insignificant.

Therefore, the potential for creating a new or unanalyzed condition is not created.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No. A design DBA differential pressure assumed in the original design of the SG compartment roof is 23 percent higher than the maximum calculated differential pressure of 19.52 psi. Since the same design differential pressure was also used in the modified SG compartment roof stress evaluation, the margin of safety was not reduced.

As discussed previously, the amount of leakage that bypasses the divider barrier will not be affected by the restoration of the SG compartment roofs. The use of non-shrink grout to seal the joint created between the concrete sections and the remaining structure will maintain the boundaries between upper and lower containment. Hence, the worse-case accident conditions for the containment will not be affected by the proposed modifications.

Therefore, a significant reduction in the margin to safety is not created by this modification.

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 amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

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

By April 14, 2003, 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