

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

This change will not affect the service water system function or any components that are accident initiators. The ability to isolate the turbine building load in the event of a system malfunction has been previously evaluated.

Therefore, any change to the system would not affect the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

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

This change will ensure that Engineered Safety Features (ESF) components receiving service water-cooling are not negatively impacted by turbine building load. There are no components served by the turbine building header that are safety systems, structures, or components.

Therefore, NMC concludes that there is not 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: Bradley D. Jackson, Esq., Foley and Lardner, P.O. Box 1497, Madison, WI 53701-1497.

NRC Section Chief: L. Raghavan.

PPL Susquehanna, LLC, Docket No. 50-387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: July 1, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Unit 1 Technical Specifications (TSs) by including the Unit 1 Cycle 14 (U1C14) Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) Safety Limits in Section 2.1.1.2, changing the references listed in Section 5.6.5.b, and changing the design features in Section 4.2.1.

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 of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change to the MCPR Safety Limits does not directly or indirectly affect any plant system, equipment, component, or change the processes used to operate the plant. Further, the U1C14 MCPR Safety Limits are generated using NRC approved

methodology and meet the applicable acceptance criteria. Thus, this proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated.

Prior to the startup of U1C14, licensing analyses are performed (using NRC approved methodology referenced in Technical Specification Section 5.6.5.b) to determine changes in the critical power ratio as a result of anticipated operational occurrences. These results are added to the MCPR Safety Limit values proposed herein to generate the MCPR operating limits in the U1C14 COLR [Core Operating Limits Report]. These limits could be different from those specified for the U1C13 COLR. The COLR operating limits thus assure that the MCPR Safety Limit will not be exceeded during normal operation or anticipated operational occurrences. Postulated accidents are also analyzed prior to startup of U1C14 and the results shown to be within the NRC approved criteria.

The U1C14 reload fuel bundles will utilize a small amount of depleted uranium in certain fuel rods, in addition to natural and slightly enriched uranium. There is no change to the composition of the fuel pellets containing depleted uranium material (*i.e.*, UO₂) except a slight decrease in the amount of Uranium-235. Therefore, the use of depleted uranium in the fuel rods does not affect the mechanical performance of the fuel rods. The depleted uranium was modeled in the approved design and licensing methodology.

The changes to the references in Section 5.6.5.b were made to properly reflect the NRC approved methodology used to generate the U1C14 core operating limits. The use of this approved methodology does not increase the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, this proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

The change to the MCPR Safety Limits does not directly or indirectly affect any plant system, equipment, or component and therefore does not affect the failure modes of any of these items. Thus, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a previously unevaluated operator error or a new single failure.

The use of depleted uranium in the fuel rods does not affect the mechanical performance of the fuel rods.

The changes to the references in Section 5.6.5.b were made to properly reflect the NRC approved methodology used to generate the U1C14 core operating limits. The use of this approved methodology does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

Response: No.

Since the proposed changes do not alter any plant system, equipment, component, or the processes used to operate the plant, the proposed change will not jeopardize or degrade the function or operation of any plant system or component governed by Technical Specifications. The proposed MCPR Safety Limits do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety as currently defined in the Bases of the applicable Technical Specification sections, because the MCPR Safety Limits calculated for U1C14 preserve the required margin of safety.

The use of depleted uranium in the fuel rods does not affect the mechanical performance of the fuel rods.

The changes to the references in Section 5.6.5.b were made to properly reflect the NRC approved methodology used to generate the U1C14 core operating limits. This approved methodology is used to demonstrate that all applicable criteria are met, thus, demonstrating that there is no reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, these proposed changes do 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: Bryan A. Snapp, Esquire, Assoc. General Counsel, PPL Services Corporation, 2 North Ninth St., GENTW3, Allentown, PA 18101-1179.

NRC Section Chief: Richard J. Laufer.

PSEG Nuclear, LLC, Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: July 9, 2003.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.7.2, to increase the allowed outage time (AOT) for one train of the control room emergency filtration (CREF) system from 7 days to 30 days. The proposed AOT change would only apply when one CREF train is inoperable due to an inoperable chiller during Modes 1, 2, or 3.

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

Response: No.