

the probability of fuel damage is not increased (*i.e.*, in the event of an accident or transient, the amount of fuel damaged would not be increased as a result of the new SLMCPR values). Furthermore, the proposed new SLMCPR values do not lead to, nor do they arise as a result of, plant design or procedural changes. Therefore, the proposed changes do 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?

The new SLMCPR values for OCNCS Cycle 19 core have been calculated in accordance with the methods and procedures described in NRC-approved topical reports. The proposed new SLMCPR values do not lead to, nor do they arise as a result of, plant design or procedural changes. The changes do not involve any new method for operating the facility and do not involve any facility modifications. As a result, no new initiating events or transients could develop from the proposed changes. Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The margin of safety as defined in OCNCS's licensing basis will remain the same. The new, cycle-specific SLMCPR values are calculated using NRC-approved methods and procedures that are in accordance with the current fuel design and licensing criteria. The SLMCPR values will remain high enough to ensure that greater than 99.9% of all fuel rods in the core are expected to avoid transition boiling if the limits are not violated, thereby preserving the fuel cladding integrity. Therefore, the proposed TS changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the requested amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Kevin P. Gallen, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036-5869.

*NRC Section Chief:* Richard J. Laufer.

*Consumers Energy Company, Docket No. 50-155, Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant, Charlevoix County, Michigan*

*Date of amendment request:* November 20, 2002.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment request reflects organizational changes due to the transfer of the Palisades Plant from Consumers Energy to Nuclear Management Company. The revision reduces redundancy between the Defueled Technical Specifications (DTS) and the Big Rock Point Quality Program Description for Nuclear Power Plants. Other changes are being proposed to correct minor typographical, grammatical, and spelling errors.

*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. Will the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Because this proposed change involves only a change in reporting relationships, and no accidents previously evaluated consider administrative controls, the change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously considered.

2. Will the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident [from any other accident] previously evaluated?

The proposed change would result in moving requirements for certain reporting relationships from the Defueled Technical Specifications to the Consumers Energy Quality Program Description for Nuclear Power Plants, Part 1—Big Rock Point Plant (CPC-2A). Because the Topical Report, CPC-2A, requires prior NRC [U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission] approval for any changes which would reduce the level of commitment in that document, an equivalent level of NRC oversight is applied to changes to CPC-2A as are applied to changes to Chapter 6 (Administrative Controls) of the Defueled Technical Specifications. Therefore, no changes in administrative controls defined in CPC-2A that might create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated would be permitted by the proposed change.

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

The proposed change stipulates that individuals who perform audits, surveillances and independent safety reviews will report as indicated in CPC-2A, which states that independent safety reviews are performed by the Restoration Safety Review Committee (RSRC). The proposed change involves no significant change in a margin of safety because margins of safety (in the Defueled Technical Specifications) are directly controlled by system design and

operation in accordance with Limiting Conditions of Operation, Surveillances and Design Features specified in the Defueled Technical Specifications are affected by this proposed change.

To the extent that design and operation of systems having safety margins might be affected by independent oversight, the following is offered as evidence that no significant reduction in margin of safety will result from the proposed change:

- The Manager, Nuclear Performance Assessment Department (NPAD) and the RSRC both report their findings directly to the Senior Nuclear Officer; therefore there will be no change in the ultimate reporting relationship.

- The membership of NPAD and RSRC consists of individuals who are independent of the plant organization.

- Changes to the Topical Report, CPC-2A that would result in a reduction in level of commitment in the Quality Program Description require a review and approval process equivalent to proposed changes to the administrative controls specified in the Defueled Technical Specifications.

- The requirements for performing onsite and offsite reviews and audits are specified in CPC-2A; the proposed change to the DTS to place the reporting relationship for individuals performing these audits and reviews eliminates redundancy between the Defueled Technical Specifications and CPC-2A.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's significant hazards 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:* David A. Mikelonis, Esquire, Consumers Energy Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

*NRC Section Chief:* Robert A. Gramm.

*Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., Docket No. 50-423, Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut*

*Date of amendment request:* December 11, 2002.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) related to N-1 loop operation. Specifically, the proposed changes would eliminate N-1 loop operation from particular sections of the TS and would make other changes that are clarifying and/or administrative in nature. In addition, the TS Bases would be revised to address the proposed changes.

*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