

continue to be met. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, there are no significant hazards associated with the changes in CST inventory.

Proposed Auxiliary Feedwater System Changes

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The LONF accident analyses have demonstrated that the TS required AFW [auxiliary feedwater] trains at the minimum assumed flow capability provide sufficient heat removal capacity to mitigate the LONF accident such that acceptance criteria are satisfied. Single failure criteria are still met, and no physical system changes have been made. Dose consequences have been evaluated for the power uprate and the results remain within the appropriate acceptance criteria. Therefore, the changes to the auxiliary feedwater system technical specifications do not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed change. The change has no adverse effect on any safety related system and does not change the performance or integrity of any safety related system. Additionally, no new safety related equipment is being added or changed as a result of these proposed changes to technical specifications. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident is not created.

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

The LONF analysis supporting the proposed changes to technical specifications meets the appropriate acceptance criteria. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, there are no significant hazards associated with the auxiliary feedwater system technical specification changes.

Proposed Editorial and Administrative Changes

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The editorial and administrative changes do not affect the analysis performed in support of the stretch power uprate. Therefore, the changes do not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The editorial and administrative changes do not affect the analysis performed in support of the stretch power uprate. No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed editorial and administrative changes. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident is not created.

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

The editorial and administrative changes do not affect the analysis performed in support of the stretch power uprate. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, there are no significant hazards associated with the editorial changes.

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: John H. O'Neill, Jr., Esq., Shaw Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N. Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037-1128.

NRC Section Chief: L. Raghavan.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: April 10, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would modify the Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Salem), Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TSs) Table 3.3-1 "Condition and Setpoint" description for permissive P-7 to reflect the new location of pressure transmitters.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), section 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). The NRC staff's review is presented below:

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

The proposed change to replace the words "impulse chamber" with "steam line input" in the descriptive text associated with the P-7 function of the Reactor Trip System does not involve any physical or design change to the P-7 function. The proposed change renames the turbine inlet pressure to reflect the change in turbine design and the new location where the pressure is sensed. Because the P-7 function is not affected by the proposed amendment request, the changes to the Salem TSs are effectively editorial in nature. Therefore, the proposed change does 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 intent of the proposed change is to revise the description of the P-7 permissive as a result of changes to the design of the turbine. The P-7 permissive function is based on a relationship between first stage turbine inlet pressure and rated thermal power (RTP). Although the pressure sensed at the new location will be slightly higher, the instrument and controls logic, and all design basis functions that rely on the P-7 function, will remain the same. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than any previously evaluated.

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

As previously stated, the proposed change is editorial in nature and maintains the design basis functions associated with the P-7 permissive interlock. This is accomplished because the turbine pressure input to the P-7 function will continue to exhibit a consistent and accurate relationship to RTP following plant modifications. Therefore, because there will be no changes to the input assumptions associated with Salem's accident analysis, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the 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: Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

NRC Section Chief: James W. Clifford.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: April 11, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would modify Surveillance Requirements and Bases regarding response time testing of the Engineered Safeguards System Actuation System (ESFAS) and the Reactor Trip System (RTS).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), section 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?

Response: No.

This change to the Technical Specifications does not result in a condition where the design, material, and construction