

compliance with the methodology used to calculate and predict effects of radiation on embrittlement of reactor pressure vessel beltline materials. There are no physical changes to the plant or new modes of operation being introduced by the proposed change. Further, the proposed change does not involve a change to any activities or equipment and is not assumed in the safety analysis to initiate any accident sequence. The proposed change does not adversely affect the integrity of the reactor coolant pressure boundary such that its function in the containment of radioactive materials is affected.

Additionally, the proposed change will not create any failure mode not bounded by previously evaluated accidents. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The current P-T curves were generated in accordance with the fracture toughness requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, and ASME Code, Section XI, Appendix G, and were approved by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for use through OC 14. The proposed change would extend use of the P-T curves for two additional OCs. No new modes of operation are introduced by the proposed change. Plant operation in compliance with the current P-T curves ensures conditions in which brittle fracture of primary coolant pressure boundary materials is avoided. Accidents involving a breach of the primary coolant pressure boundary have previously been evaluated and no other types of accidents associated with the proposed change have been identified. 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?

The proposed curves were established in compliance with the methodology used to calculate and predict effects of radiation on embrittlement of reactor pressure vessel beltline materials and are estimated for 48 effective full-power years. The current curves are approved for use through the end of OC 14 (~19 EFPYs) which provides a conservatism factor of 1.7 between the actual EFPYs at the end of OC 14 and the end-of-life curve (32 EFPY). The change would extend the use of the proposed curves to the end of OC 16 (~23 EFPYs) which

provides a conservatism factor of approximately 2.0. The actual EFPYs at the end of OC 16 is bounded by the 48 EFPYs estimated for the current curves. 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 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* J. M. Fulton, Esquire, Assistant General Counsel, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, 600 Rocky Hill Road, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360-5599.

*NRC Section Chief:* James W. Clifford.

*Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont*

*Date of amendment request:*  
December 10, 2002

*Description of amendment request:*  
The proposed Technical Specification (TS) amendment request changes the diesel fuel specification to a more current revision in TS 4.10.C. The change would also make administrative revisions to reflect generic position titles in TS 6.0, correct page numbers and titles in the Table on Contents, and delete the General Table of Contents. Bases pages were also revised to reflect the fuel specification revision as well as to make administrative changes to provide clarity and correct a misspelling.

*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 operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station [VY] in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

VY has determined that the probability of occurrence of a previously evaluated accident is not increased because the proposed changes do not impact any accident initiating conditions. The proposed changes will have no significant impact on any safety related structures, systems or components. Additionally, the administrative changes do not affect any system operation or function.

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

2. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with

the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

VY has determined that the proposed changes do not involve any physical alteration of plant equipment and do not change the method by which any safety-related system performs its function. No new or different types of equipment will be installed. The proposed changes do not create any new accident initiators or involve an activity that could be an initiator of an accident of a different type.

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

3. The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

VY has determined that the proposed changes do not alter the basic operation of process variables, systems, or components as described in the safety analysis. No new equipment is introduced.

The proposed changes do not impact design margins of any system to perform its intended safety functions. There is no physical or operational change being made which would alter the sequence of events, plant response, or margins in existing safety analyses. The proposed changes result in no impact on analyzed accident event precursors or effects. These proposed changes do not alter the physical design of the plant. There is no change in methods of operation.

Therefore, the proposed change does 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:* Mr. David R. Lewis, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037-1128.

*NRC Section Chief:* James W. Clifford.

*Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois; Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374, LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, LaSalle County, Illinois; Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2 Docket Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania; Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois*

*Date of amendment request:*  
November 27, 2002.