

so as to assure that lower flow rates will not be used without prior NRC approval. Consequently, no safety margins will be impacted.

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:* Ms. Lisa F. Vaughn, Legal Department (PB05E), Duke Energy Corporation, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006.

*NRC Section Chief:* John A. Nakoski.

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, Ottawa County, Ohio*

*Date of amendment request:* August 11, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would relocate Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.f (vacuum leak rate test of the watertight enclosure for decay heat removal system valves DH-11 and DH-12) from the TSs to the Technical Requirements Manual.

*Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:* As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensees have provided their 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.

Under the proposed change, initial conditions and assumptions remain as previously analyzed for accidents in the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station Updated Safety Analysis Report. 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.

Under the proposed change, the manner in which the watertight enclosure is sealed and tested is not altered, and the operability requirements of the watertight enclosure for Decay Heat Removal System valves DH-11 and DH-12 will continue to be adequately addressed by testing. No different accident initiators or failure mechanisms are introduced by the proposed change. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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

*Response:* No.

Since there are no new or significant changes to the initial conditions contributing to accident severity or consequences, there are no significant reductions in a margin of safety. Therefore, the proposed change does 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:* Mary E. O'Reilly, Attorney, FirstEnergy Corporation, 76 South Main Street, Akron, OH 44308.

*NRC Section Chief:* Anthony J. Mendiola.

*GPU Nuclear Inc., Docket No. 50-320, Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania*

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

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment application proposes a revision to the Technical Specifications (TS) administrative controls for the radioactive effluent controls program. The proposed changes will make the Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station Unit 2 (TMI-2) radioactive effluent controls program technical specifications consistent with the technical specifications for the operating facility on site—Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1). The proposed change adopts the TMI-1 liquid discharge limits since both TMI-1 and TMI-2 use the same liquid discharge monitor and have a common discharge pathway. The gaseous discharge limits will also be updated to reflect the current 10 CFR part 20 nomenclature along with some minor editorial changes. Additionally, the definition of a member of the public will be made consistent with the definition in 10 CFR part 20.

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

No. The TMI-2 TS for radioactive liquid effluent release, TS 6.7.4.a.2, will be revised to be consistent with the equivalent TS for TMI-1 (TS 6.8.4.b.(2)). The change will allow

up to 10 times the concentrations specified in 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B, Table 2, Column 2. Making the limits on the liquid effluent release concentrations for TMI-2 equivalent to those for TMI-1 is justified in that both units share a common effluent monitoring instrument and a common discharge path to the Susquehanna River.

The TMI-2 TS for limits on dose rate for radioactive gaseous effluent, TS 6.7.4.a.7, will be changed from the limits in 10 CFR 20, Appendix B, Table 2, Column 1, to be consistent with the equivalent TS for TMI-1 (TS 6.8.4.b.(7)). The revised limits will be as follows: (a) For noble gases: less than or equal to 500 mrem/yr to the total body and less than or equal to 3000 mrem/yr to the skin, and (b) For tritium and all radionuclides in particulate form with half-lives greater than 8 days: less than or equal to 1500 mrem/yr to any organ. The TMI-2 TS will continue to specify that annual and quarterly doses conform to Appendix I of 10 CFR Part 50.

The other changes are administrative and do no affect plant systems.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

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

No. These changes will affect administrative controls on radionuclides that may be released from the site. It does not change the allowable off-site dose limits for any calendar year of operations. It does not change any plant system or the ALARA philosophy on discharges. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

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

No. These changes will affect the administrative controls on radionuclides that may be released from the site. It does not change the allowable off-site dose limits for any calendar year of operations. It does not change any plant system and will not affect the actual discharges from the plant. Therefore, there cannot be 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:* Mary E. O'Reilly, Esq., First Energy Legal Department, 76 South Mail Street, Akron, OH 44308.

*NRC Section Chief:* Scott W. Moore.