

standards that were applicable prior to the change are altered. The same RTS and ESFAS instrumentation is being used; the time response allocations/modeling assumptions in the Chapter 15 analyses are still the same; only the method of verifying time response is changed. The proposed change will not modify any system interface and could not increase the likelihood of an accident since these events are independent of this change. The proposed activity will not change, degrade or prevent actions or alter any assumptions previously made in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident described in the SAR [safety analysis report]. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not result in any increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to remove the footnote from Unit 1 Surveillance Requirement 4.3.2.1.3 is an administrative change and does not result in any 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?

*Response:* No.

This change does not alter the performance of the pressure and differential pressure transmitters and switches used in the plant protection systems. All sensors will still have response time verified by test before placing the sensor in operational service and after any maintenance that could affect response time. Changing the method of periodically verifying instrument response for certain sensors (assuring equipment operability) from time response testing to calibration and channel checks will not create any new accident initiators or scenarios. Periodic surveillance of these instruments will detect significant degradation in the sensor response characteristic. Implementation of the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to remove the footnote from Unit 1 Surveillance Requirement 4.3.2.1.3 is an administrative change and does 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?

*Response:* No.

This change does not affect the total system response time assumed in the safety analysis. The periodic system response time verification method for selected pressure and differential pressure sensors is modified to allow use of actual test data or engineering data. The method of verification still provides assurance that the total system response is within that defined in the safety analysis, since calibration tests will detect any degradation which might significantly affect sensor response time. Based on the above, it is concluded that the proposed license amendment does not result in a reduction in margin with respect to plant safety.

The proposed change to remove the footnote from Unit 1 Surveillance

Requirement 4.3.2.1.3 is an administrative change and does not involve a 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:* Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

*NRC Section Chief:* James W. Clifford.

*STP Nuclear Operating Company, Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499, South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, Matagorda County, Texas*

*Date of amendment request:* March 31, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed change would replace "Central Power and Light Company (CPL)" with "AEP Texas Central Company" throughout the Operating License of each unit.

*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?

*Response:* No.

The proposed administrative license amendment only changes the name of one of the owners of STP in the Operating Licenses. This is not an initiator for accidents nor does this action affect the consequences of an accident. 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?

*Response:* No.

The proposed administrative license amendment only changes the name of one of the owners of STP in the Operating Licenses. This is not an initiator for accidents. Therefore, the change does 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?

*Response:* No.

Margin of safety is associated with confidence in the ability of the fission product barriers (*i.e.*, fuel and fuel cladding, reactor coolant pressure boundary, and containment structure) to limit the level of radiation dose to the public. The proposed

administrative license amendment only changes the name of one of the owners of STP in the Operating Licenses. The proposed action does not affect margin of safety at all. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above, STPNOC concludes that the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92 and, accordingly, a finding of "no significant hazards consideration" is justified.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the request for amendments involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Attorney for licensee:* A. H. Gutterman, Esq., Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20004.

*NRC Section Chief:* Robert A. Gramm.

*Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas*

*Date of amendment request:* April 30, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment would modify several surveillance requirements (SRs) in Technical Specifications (TSs) 3.8.1 and 3.8.4 on alternating current and direct current sources, respectively, for plant operation. The revised SRs would have notes deleted or modified to allow the SRs to be performed, or partially performed, in reactor modes that are currently not allowed by the TSs. The current SRs are not allowed to be performed in Modes 1 and 2. Several of the current SRs also cannot be performed in Modes 3 and 4.

*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 design of plant equipment is not being modified by the proposed changes. In addition, the DGs [diesel generators] and their associated emergency loads are accident mitigating features. As such, testing of the DGs themselves is not associated with any potential accident-initiating mechanism. Therefore, there will be no significant impact on any accident probabilities by the approval of the requested changes.

The changes include an increase in the online time that a DG under test will be paralleled to the grid (for SRs 3.8.1.10 and