

be reduced, supporting system performance will not be affected, and no severe testing of equipment will be imposed. No new failure modes or mechanisms will be introduced as a result of this proposed change.

Therefore, the changes to the material surveillance program and pressure-temperature limits that compose this proposed change do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than those previously evaluated.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. There is no change or impact on any safety analysis assumption or in any other parameter affecting the course of an accident analysis supporting the Bases of any Technical Specification. The proposed change does not involve any increase in calculated off-site dose consequences.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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: Mr. David R. Lewis, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037-1128.

NRC Section Chief: James W. Clifford.

FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC, Docket No. 50-443, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire

Date of amendment request: February 3, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.7.1.4, "Turbine Cycle—Specific Activity," and its associated bases. With the exception of TS 4.0.4, wording similar to that presented in the improved Standard Technical Specifications will be adopted. The amendment request proposes an exception to the requirements of TS 4.0.4 when entering MODE 4, along with conditions for when the surveillance requirement must be satisfied in MODE 4. Additionally there are editorial changes to the TS Index reflecting the proposed revision.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (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 changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes, in part, modify the modes of applicability by stating that TS 4.0.4 is not applicable for Mode 4 entry. For the surveillance requirement, the change specifies the conditions in Mode 4 that are necessary to obtain a representative sample from the steam generators. Analyzed events are assumed to be initiated by the failure of plant structures, systems or components. The level of specific activity contained in the reactor coolant is germane to the consequences of an accident and is not related in any way to the probability of failure of a plant structure, system or component which would result in the occurrence of an unanalyzed event. Because the probability of failure of plant equipment is not affected, there is no impact on the probability of occurrence of a previously analyzed accident.

The consequences of a previously analyzed event are dependent on the initial conditions assumed for the analysis, and the availability and successful functioning of the equipment assumed to operate in response to the analyzed event. The proposed changes do not alter the initial conditions assumed in the analysis of interest. The plant parameters assumed for the analyses are maintained within assumed limits through compliance with the Technical Specifications and plant procedures. Additionally, the proposed changes do not impose any new safety analyses limits. Any deviation from the allowable activity limits will require the plant to be placed in a condition where the specification does not apply. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant. No new equipment is being introduced, and installed equipment is not being operated in a new or different manner. There is no change being made to the parameters within which the plant is operated, or to the setpoints at which protective or mitigative actions are initiated. No alteration in the procedures that ensure the plant remains within analyzed limits is being proposed, and no change is being made

to the procedures relied upon to respond to an off-normal event. As such, no new failure modes are being introduced. These changes have no physical effect on any plant equipment. Therefore, the changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The margin of safety is established through equipment design, limitations on operating parameters, and the setpoints at which automatic actions are initiated. No equipment design features are impacted by these changes, no operating parameters are revised, and no changes are proposed to the actuation setpoints. The limit on secondary coolant Dose Equivalent Iodine remains at the current value of 0.1 microcuries per gram. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the 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: M. S. Ross, Florida Power & Light Company, PO Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420.
NRC Section Chief: James W. Clifford.

Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC, Docket No. 50-220, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (NMP1), Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: October 7, 2002, as supplemented on March 24, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The licensee's October 7, 2002, application proposed to add Specification 4.0.3 to address missed surveillances to the Technical Specifications (TSs). This new specification specifies an initial 24-hour delay period for performing a missed surveillance prescribed by Specification 3.0.3. Specification 4.0.3 will also require: "A risk evaluation shall be performed for any surveillance delayed greater than 24 hours and the risk impact shall be managed." In addition, the licensee proposed to add wording to each of the following existing specifications such that the new Specification 4.0.3 would apply to them: Specification 6.16, 6.17, 6.18, and 6.19. On November 12, 2002, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff published a proposed no significant hazards consideration determination and opportunity for a