

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 design function of the emergency core cooling system (ECCS) is to provide core cooling and reactivity control for various design basis accidents. With gas potentially entrained in the safety injection system hot leg injection piping, the primary considerations would be maintenance of adequate core cooling and prevention of water hammer resulting from initiation of flow to the reactor core for mitigation of a design basis event. In the event of a postulated large break loss of coolant accident (LBLOCA), the reactor coolant system (RCS) will de-pressurize rapidly, ECCS injection from the refueling water storage tank (RWST) will occur, followed by cold leg recirculation, and then hot leg recirculation. No flow will exist in the hot leg injection piping until hot leg recirculation is initiated.

TVA reviewed the Nuclear Steam Supply System (NSSS) vendor's previous bounding evaluation performed on the effects of injecting the nitrogen gas contained in the four safety injection system accumulators into the RCS following a LOCA. The mass of nitrogen for the accumulators assumed to be injected into the RCS is significantly greater than the mass of gas that could reasonably be expected to exist in the safety injection hot leg injection lines. Therefore, the injection of the postulated gas in the hot leg injection lines would have an insignificant effect on the cooldown of the RCS in the hot leg recirculation mode.

If a layer of gas existed, it would flow to the core by mixing with the water in the line. If a solid bubble were conservatively assumed with the RCS depressurized, the pressure from the pump would push any entrained gas to the RCS hot legs as the hot leg injection valves opened and the safety injection pump came up to operating speed. The two separated water volumes would travel to the RCS hot legs at near the same velocity and would not impact one another. No significant water hammer would occur.

For the design basis small break LOCA (SBLOCA) and the SBLOCA that is smaller than the design basis 4-inch pipe size break, the hot leg swapover is the same, although delayed, for the SBLOCA scenario as for the LBLOCA. No significant water hammer would occur.

Therefore, 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?

No. The proposed change to the WBN TS and its associated bases do not introduce any new accident initiator mechanisms. The exclusion of hot leg injection piping from the ECCS water inventory surveillance does not cause the initiation of any accident nor create any new credible limiting single failure. Further, the change does not result in any event previously deemed incredible being made credible since, as discussed above, there are no new adverse impacts associated with the introduction of gas into the reactor core from those previously evaluated. Further, there is no adverse impact created by a potential water hammer situation.

Therefore, the proposed change does 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.

No. The exclusion of safety injection system hot leg injection piping from the ECCS water inventory surveillance does not result in a condition where the design, material, and construction standards that were acceptable prior to this change are altered. The potential to introduce gas from the hot leg injection piping into the reactor core during postulated large and small break LOCA accidents does not adversely affect design assumptions for emergency core cooling or reactivity control. Since adverse water hammer events are not postulated, the proposed changes to TS and its associated Bases will have no effect on the availability, operability, or performance of the WBN ECCS systems. Therefore, the subject change does not involve a significant reduction in 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.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 14 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 14-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 14-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. 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, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

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

By May 16, 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 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, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and available electronically on the Internet at the NRC Web site <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. 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