

will be created. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident [from any accident] previously evaluated.

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No. The dose consequences were determined to be well within the limits of 10 CFR 100 and they meet the acceptance criteria of GDC 19. Therefore, the 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:* M. Stanford Blanton, Esq., Balch and Bingham, Post Office Box 306, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama 35201.

*NRC Section Chief:* John A. Nakoski.

**Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia**

*Date of amendment request:* October 3, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendments would add a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) for the Linear Heat Generation Rate. The new LCO will be included in Section 3.2, Power Distribution Limits. The proposed amendments would also change the recirculation loop LCO, Section 5.6.5, and the appropriate Bases.

*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?

The proposed addition of LCO 3.2.3 and supporting Bases are being made to support new modeling improvements in core monitoring. This change is administrative in nature in that it does not involve, require, or result from any physical change to the plant, including the reactor core or its fuel. The addition of LCO 3.2.3 and Bases B 3.2.3 is consistent with Revision 2 of Volumes 1 and 2 of NUREG-1433. Changes being proposed for Bases section B 3.2.1 and TS Section 5.6.5 are simply supportive in nature to the relocation of LHGR [linear heat generation rate] from the APLHGR [averageplant linear heat generation rate] Section Bases B 3.2.1 to the new section LHGR B 3.2.3.

Also, no changes are being proposed to any plant system, structure, or component designed to prevent or mitigate the consequences of a previously evaluated event.

Therefore, because the physical characteristics and performance requirements of the plant systems, structures, and components (including the reactor core and fuel) will not be altered, the proposed license amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

No plant systems, structures, or components (including the reactor core and fuel) will be altered by the proposed change to the LCO or supporting Bases.

Additionally, this TS [technical specification] change request does not propose changes in the operation of any plant system. Consequently, new and unanalyzed modes of operation are not introduced.

As a result, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated is not introduced.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Previously, the LHGR was included in the monitoring of the APLHGR. Now, SNC [Southern Nuclear Company] proposes to monitor LHGR on its own while continuing to monitor APLHGR. This proposed TS change adds an LCO for LHGR and a corresponding requirement for the COLR [core operating limits report].

The margin of safety is not reduced since the LHGR and APLHGR will continue to be monitored.

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:* Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Section Chief:* John A. Nakoski.

**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:* May 13, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed license amendment would allow use of a revised methodology, for performance of certain accident analyses, described in Westinghouse Electric Corp. (W) report WCAP-14882-S1-P, Revision 0 (Proprietary), "RETRAN-02, Modeling and Qualification for Westinghouse Pressurized Water Reactors Non-LOCA

Safety Analyses, Supplement 1—Thick Metal Mass Heat Transfer Model and NOTRUMP-Based Steam Generator Mass Calculation Method," dated December 2002.

*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 methodology uses more realistic computer models with unnecessary conservatism removed. The methodology used to analyze the consequences of a postulated accident is not an initiator that can affect the probability or consequences of that accident. The change does not alter assumptions previously made in the radiological consequences of the 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 methodology uses more realistic computer models with unnecessary conservatism removed. The methodology used to analyze the consequences of a postulated accident is not an initiator that can cause an accident to occur. Therefore, the proposed 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. The proposed methodology uses more realistic computer models with unnecessary conservatism removed. Using the methodology of WCAP-14882-S1-P results in additional margin to pressurizer overfill for a postulated loss of normal feedwater/ loss of offsite power at STP. Therefore, the 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 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.