

*Attorney for licensee:* Christopher J. Warner, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120.

*NRC Section Chief:* Stephen Dembek.

*Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket No. 50-323, Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 2, San Luis Obispo County, California*

*Date of amendment request:* March 3, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed license amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 5.5.9, "Steam Generator Tube Surveillance Program," and TS 5.6.10, "Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report," for Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit 2, to apply a probability of detection (POD) of 1.0 to the bobbin indication in the steam generator (SG) 4 tube at row 44, column 45 at the second tube support plate (TSP) on the hot leg side (R44C45-2H) for the beginning of cycle (BOC) voltage distribution for the DCPP Unit 2 BOC Cycle 12 operational assessment.

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

The use of probability of detection (POD) of 1.0 for the bobbin indication in the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) Unit 2 steam generator (SG) 4 tube at row 44, column 45 at the second tube support plate (TSP) on the hot leg side (R44C45-2H) for the beginning of cycle (BOC) voltage distribution for the DCPP Unit 2 BOC cycle 12 operational assessment does not increase the probability of an accident. Based on industry and plant specific bobbin detection data for outside diameter stress corrosion cracks (ODSCC) within the SG tube support plate region, large voltage bobbin indications, such as those the size of indication R44C45-2H, can be detected with 100 percent certainty. Since large voltage ODSCC bobbin indications within the SG TSP can be detected, they will not be left in service, and therefore these indications should not be included in the voltage distribution for the purpose of operational assessments. Therefore, these large voltage indications will not result in an increase in the probability of a steam generator tube rupture (SGTR) accident or an increase in the consequences of a SGTR or main steam line break (MSLB) accident.

Therefore, the proposed changes will not result in a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The use of a POD of 1.0 for the DCPP Unit 2 R44C45-2H bobbin indication for the BOC voltage distribution for the DCPP Unit 2 BOC cycle 12 operational assessment concerns the SG tubes and can only affect the SGTR accident. Since the SGTR accident is already

considered in the Final Safety Analysis Report Update, there is no possibility to create a design basis accident which has not been previously evaluated.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The use of POD of 1.0 for the DCPP Unit 2 R44C45-2H bobbin indication for the BOC voltage distribution for the DCPP Unit 2 BOC cycle 12 operational assessment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The applicable margin of safety potentially impacted is the Technical Specification 5.6.10, "Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report," projected end-of-cycle leakage for a MSLB accident and the projected end-of-cycle probability of burst. Based on industry and plant specific bobbin detection data for ODSCC within the SG tube support plate region, large voltage bobbin indications, such as those the size of indication R44C45-2H, can be detected with 100 percent certainty and will not be left in service. Therefore these indications should not be included in the voltage distribution for the purpose of operational assessments. Therefore, these large voltage indications will not result in a significant increase in the actual end-of-cycle leakage for a MSLB accident or the actual end-of-cycle probability of burst.

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 requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Christopher J. Warner, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120.

*NRC Section Chief:* Stephen Dembek.

*PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey*

*Date of amendment request:* February 14, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would extend the surveillance test intervals and allowed out-of-service times for the end-of-cycle recirculation pump trip instrumentation.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Section 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?

*Response:* No.

The proposed amendment would extend the allowed out-of-service times (AOTs) and surveillance test intervals (STIs) for the end

of cycle recirculation pump trip (EOC-RPT) instrumentation system. No changes are being made to any EOC-RPT instrumentation setpoints or components. The effect of the proposed changes is to reduce the potential for unnecessary plant scrams or transients. The proposed changes were evaluated in General Electric Company Topical Report GENE-770-06-1-A which concluded that they do not result in a degradation in overall plant safety.

Since the proposed changes do not affect any accident initiator, and since the EOC-RPT instrumentation will remain capable of performing its design function, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in 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?

*Response:* No.

Extending the AOTs and STIs for the EOC-RPT instrumentation does not change the design function or operation of any plant equipment. Additionally, no new modes of plant operation are involved with these changes.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

*Response:* No.

No changes are being made to any plant instrumentation setpoints or to the required level of redundancy. The proposed changes were evaluated in General Electric Company Topical Report GENE-770-06-1-A, which concluded that they do not result in a degradation in overall plant safety.

Therefore, the proposed change does 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.

*Attorney for licensee:* Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

*NRC Section Chief:* James W. Clifford.

*PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey*

*Date of amendment request:* January 29, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The licensee proposed administrative and editorial changes to the Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Salem), Unit No. 1 and Unit No. 2 Technical Specifications (TSs) as follows: (1) The second equation in Salem Unit No. 2 TS