

a result of the TMI-2 accident can be adequately met without reliance on a PASS.

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

The NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

*NRC Section Chief:* James W. Clifford.

*Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama*

*Date of amendment request:* March 21, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specifications (TS) Section 5.5.1, "Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (ODCM)," to remove reference to the Plant Operations Review Committee review and acceptance of licensee initiated changes to the ODCM.

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

The proposed change for TS section 5.5.1.b removes the reference to the Plant Operations Review Committee review and acceptance of licensee initiated changes to the ODCM. This change is an administrative change and does not change plant design or responses.

The proposed change does not involve changing any structure, system, or component, or affect reactor operations. It is not an initiator of an accident and does not change any existing safety analysis previously analyzed in the UFSAR. As such, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated. Since the proposed change does not alter the plant design, it does not involve a significant increase in the 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 proposed change for TS section 5.5.1.b removes the reference to the Plant Operations Review Committee review and acceptance of licensee initiated changes to the ODCM. This change is an administrative change and does not change plant design or responses.

The proposed change will not alter any plant design basis or postulated accident. In addition, the proposed change does not impact any plant systems or components.

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

The proposed change for TS section 5.5.1.b removes the reference to the Plant Operations Review Committee review and acceptance of licensee initiated changes to the ODCM. This change is an administrative change and does not change plant design or responses. The proposed change does not impact accident offsite dose, containment pressure or temperature, emergency core cooling system setpoints, reactor protection system settings or any other parameter that could affect 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:* M. Stanford Blanton, Esq., Balch and Bingham, Post Office Box 306, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama 35201.

*NRC Section Chief:* John A. Nakoski.

*Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260 and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2 and 3, Limestone County, Alabama*

*Date of amendment request:* April 11, 2003 (TS-424).

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would reduce the number of Emergency Core Cooling System subsystems that are available in response to certain design basis loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) scenarios because of TVA's planned restart of Unit 1. The licensee stated that the reduced number has been analyzed and is consistent with the current approved LOCA analysis methodology. The amendments are needed to eliminate the potential for overloading a shutdown board or a diesel generator when both Units 1 and 2 are in-service. The reduction requires a change to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

*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. Do the proposed amendments and Technical Specification changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No. The proposed amendments revise the actual number of Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) subsystems that are available in response to certain design basis Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA) scenarios. The associated modifications also result in a revision to the number of required channels for the Low Pressure Coolant Injection (LPCI)

pump start time delay relay function specified in Technical Specifications. The proposed amendments and Technical Specification changes do not affect any accident precursors. Therefore, the probability of an evaluated accident is not increased.

The reduction in the number of ECCS subsystems that are actually available in response to the bounding LOCA case (A recirculation suction line break with an assumed battery failure) will now be the same as the number of ECCS subsystems evaluated in the current BFN SAFER/GESTR-LOCA analysis. The ECCS performance for the bounding LOCA case has previously been evaluated using the approved SAFER/GESTR-LOCA application methodology and is described in Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Sections 6.5 and 14.6.3. The revision to the number of required channels for the LPCI pump start time delay relay function does not affect the LOCA analysis. The requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 and Appendix K are met. Therefore, the proposed amendments and Technical Specification changes will not significantly increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed amendments and Technical Specification changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No. The proposed amendments revise the number of ECCS subsystems that are actually available in response to certain design basis LOCA scenarios. The proposed Technical Specification changes revise the number of required channels for the LPCI pump start time delay relay function. The proposed amendments and Technical Specification changes do not introduce new equipment, which could create a new or different kind of accident.

No new external threats, release pathways, or equipment failure modes are created. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed amendments and Technical Specification changes will not create a possibility for an accident of a new or different type than those previously evaluated.

3. Do the proposed amendments and Technical Specification changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No. The proposed amendments and Technical Specification changes revise the number of ECCS subsystems that are actually available in response to certain design basis LOCA scenarios. The reduction in the number of ECCS subsystems that are actually available in response to the bounding LOCA case (A recirculation suction line break with an assumed battery failure) will now be the same as the number of ECCS subsystems evaluated in the current BFN SAFER/GESTR-LOCA analysis. The ECCS performance for the bounding LOCA case has previously been evaluated using the approved SAFER/GESTR-LOCA application methodology. The revision to the number of required channels for the LPCI pump start time delay relay function does not affect the LOCA analysis. The requirements of 10 CFR 50.46 and Appendix K are met. Therefore,