

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.

*FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, Docket No. 50-440, Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Lake County, Ohio*

*Date of amendment request:* March 14, 2002.

*Description of amendment request:* The amendment request proposes a one-time exception to the requirement in Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) 94-01 to perform an integrated leak rate test (ILRT) at a frequency of 10 years. The exception is to allow ILRT testing within 15 years from the last ILRT, completed July 1, 1994. The proposed amendment is considered risk-informed, therefore Regulatory Guide 1.174, "An approach for Using Probabilistic Risk Assessment in Risk-Informed Decisions on Plant-Specific Changes to the Licensing Basis," has been followed, while using the methodology of Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) report, "Risk Impact Assessment of Revised Containment Leak Rate Testing Intervals," (EPRI TR-104285).

*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. This proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed extension to Type A testing cannot increase the probability of an accident previously evaluated since extension of the containment Type A testing is not a physical plant modification that could alter the probability of accident occurrence, nor is it an activity or modification that could lead to equipment failure or accident initiation.

The proposed extension to Type A testing does not result in a significant increase in the consequences of an accident as documented in NUREG-1493. The NUREG notes that very few potential containment leakage paths are not identified by Type B and C tests. It concludes that reducing Type A (ILRT) testing frequency to once per twenty years leads to an imperceptible increase in risk.

Other testing and inspections provide a high degree of assurance that the containment will not degrade in a manner detectable only by Type A testing. The last three Type A tests performed at PPNP identified containment leakage within the acceptable criteria, indicating a very leak-tight containment. Inspections required by

the ASME Code are performed in order to identify indications of containment degradation that could affect leak-tightness. Containment pressure is monitored each shift during plant operation and would identify containment vessel shell leakage into the annulus by a decrease in containment pressure. Type B and C testing, required by Technical Specifications, identifies any containment leakage from designed penetrations, such as from valves, that would otherwise be detected by a Type A test. These factors establish that an extension to the PPNP Type A test interval will not represent a significant increase in the consequences of an accident.

Thus, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

2. This proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed revision to the Technical Specifications adds a one-time extension to the current interval for Type A testing for PPNP. The current test interval of ten years, based on past performance, would be extended on a one-time basis to fifteen years from the last Type A test. The proposed extension to Type A testing does not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident since there are no physical changes to the plant or changes to the operation of the plant that could introduce a new failure.

Thus, this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. This proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed revision to the PPNP Technical Specifications adds a one-time extension to the current interval for Type A testing. The current test interval of ten years, based on past performance, would be extended on a one-time basis to fifteen years from the last Type A test. The proposed extension to Type A testing will not significantly reduce the margin of safety. The NUREG-1493 generic study of the effects of extending containment leakage testing found that a 20-year interval in Type A testing resulted in an imperceptible increase in risk to the public. NUREG-1493 found that, generically, the design containment leakage rate contributes only about 0.1 percent of the overall risk and that decreasing the Type A testing frequency would have a minimal effect on this risk since 95% of the Type A detectable leakage paths would already be detected by Type B and C testing. Furthermore, for PPNP, monitoring containment vessel pressure each shift during operation further reduces the risk of any containment leakage path going undetected. The PPNP test and inspection performance has satisfactorily demonstrated that the containment remains very leak tight. The proposed change has no effect on Core Damage Frequency (CDF). The change in Large Early Release Frequency (LERF) was computed and found to be a "very small" change in accordance with the guidelines of

Regulatory Guide 1.174. The computed change in Conditional Containment Failure Probability (CCFP) and offsite dose have also been evaluated and are considered to be insignificant.

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

Based on the above considerations, it is concluded that a significant hazard would not be introduced as a result of this proposed change.

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.

*Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida*

*Date of amendment request:* October 11, 2002.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise Crystal River Unit 3 Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) 3.3.15 "Reactor Building Purge Isolation-High Radiation;" ITS Bases 3.7.15 "Spent Fuel Assembly Storage;" ITS 3.9.3 "Containment Penetrations;" and ITS 3.9.6 "Refueling Canal Water Level" to account for handling irradiated fuel within containment that has not occupied part of a critical reactor core within the previous 72 hours.

*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:

Crystal River Unit 3 (CR-3) proposes to revise Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) 3.3.15, 3.9.3, 3.9.6, and Bases 3.7.15.

Florida Power Corporation (FPC) has determined that this license amendment request does not involve a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10 CFR 50.92 based on the following:

(1) Does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change does not increase the probability of a fuel handling accident in that the proposed change deals with the results of such an accident, not the cause of such an accident. The proposed change does not increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in that the CR-3 Alternate Source Term (AST) has been