

secondary containment bypass and main steam isolation valves, and on unfiltered leakage into the Control Room. This is acceptable due to the new assumptions used in calculating Control Room and offsite dose following the affected design basis accident using the AST methodology.

The proposed changes do not affect the normal design or operation of the facility before the accident; rather, once the occurrence of an accident has been postulated, the new source term is an input to evaluate the consequence. The radiological consequences of the analyzed DBAs have been evaluated with application of AST assumptions. The results conclude that the radiological consequences remain within applicable regulatory limits. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or 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 accident previously evaluated.

The application of AST does not affect the design, functional performance or normal operation of the facility. Similarly, it does not affect the design or operation of any component in the facility such that new equipment failure modes are created. Elimination of the MSIV Leakage Control System cannot create a new accident because it is used as a mitigation system to limit MSIV leakage after the accident has occurred. Similarly, the use of Standby Liquid Control System to buffer suppression pool pH to prevent iodine reevolution is another mitigation function credited after the accident has occurred and; therefore, cannot create a new accident.

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

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

This proposed license amendment involves changes from the original source term developed in accordance with Technical Information Document (TID) 14844 to a new AST, as described in Regulatory Guide 1.183. The results of the DBA analyses and the requested Technical Specification changes, are subject to revised acceptance criteria. The analyses have been performed using conservative methodologies.

Safety margins and analytical conservatisms have been evaluated and have been found acceptable. The analyzed events have been carefully selected and margin has been retained to ensure that the analysis adequately bounds postulated event scenario. The dose consequences of these limiting events are within the acceptance criteria presented in 10 CFR 50.67, Regulatory Guide 1.183 and SRP Section 15.0.1.

The margin of safety is that provided by meeting the applicable regulatory limits. The effect of relaxation of these design and Technical Specification requirements has been analyzed and doses resulting from the design basis accidents have been found to remain within the regulatory limits. The changes continue to ensure that the doses at

the exclusion area and low population zone boundaries, as well as the control room, are within the corresponding regulatory limits.

Therefore, operation of Fermi 2 in accordance with the proposed changes will 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: Peter Marquardt, Legal Department, 688 WCB, Detroit Edison Company, 2000 2nd Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48226-1279.

NRC Section Chief: L. Raghavan.

Detroit Edison Company, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: February 13, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specification (TS) Section 5.5.10, "Technical Specification (TS) Bases Control Program," to be consistent with changes made to 10 CFR 50.59, which were published in the **Federal Register** on October 4, 1999 (64 FR 53582), and which became effective March 13, 2001.

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 proposed change deletes the reference to "unreviewed safety question" as defined in 10 CFR 50.59. Deletion of the definition of "unreviewed safety question" was approved by the NRC with the revision of 10 CFR 50.59. This change is administrative in nature. Consequently, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased. Changes to the TS Bases are still evaluated in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59. As a result, the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not significantly affected. There is no increase in the radiological dose at the site boundary for any previously evaluated accident. Therefore, this change does not involve 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 proposed change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (*i.e.*, no new

or different types of equipment will be installed) or a change to the methods governing normal plant operation. These changes are considered administrative in nature and do not modify, add, delete, or relocate any technical requirements in the TS. Therefore, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed change will not reduce a margin of safety because it has no direct effect on any of the safety analysis assumptions. Changes to the TS Bases that result in meeting the criteria in paragraph 10 CFR 50.59(c)(2) continue to require NRC approval pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59. This change is administrative in nature based on the revision to 10 CFR 50.59. 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: Peter Marquardt, Legal Department, 688 WCB, Detroit Edison Company, 2000 2nd Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48226-1279.

NRC Section Chief: L. Raghavan.

Detroit Edison Company (DECo), Docket No. 50-341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan.

Date of amendment request: March 31, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.7.3.6 associated with the verification of control room emergency filtration (CREF) system duct work unfiltered leakage. This amendment request supercedes DECo's previous amendment request dated September 26, 2002, in its entirety. The September 26, 2002, amendment request was previously noticed in the **Federal Register** on November 26, 2002 (67 FR 70765).

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

This license amendment proposes an alternative test for performing the (Control Room Emergency Filtration) CREF system surveillance associated with measuring the