

Therefore, the proposed change will have no effect on the probability or consequences of any previously evaluated accident.

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

*Response:* No.

The request involves the testing of the HPCS battery on-line while the system is already out of service. The testing will not add additional out of service time. Testing during this period has no influence on, nor does it contribute in any way to, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident or malfunction from those previously analyzed. The method of performing this test is not changed. No new accident modes are created by testing during the period when the system is already unavailable. Because the system is already out of service, no safety-related equipment or safety functions are altered as a result of this change.

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 battery testing will be performed when the HPCS system is already out of service for maintenance. The out of service condition is controlled and evaluated for safety implications in accordance with 10 CFR 50.65. The batteries are not expected to be unavailable for more than 36 hours. This testing period is within the period of time that the system will already be out of service for other planned maintenance. Therefore, the battery test does not increase unavailability of the supported system or represent any change in risk above the current practice of planned system maintenance outages as currently allowed by the TS. Timing of this test has no effect on any fission product barrier.

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:* Mark Wetterhahn, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005.

*NRC Section Chief:* Robert A. Gramm.

*Entergy Nuclear Operations, Docket No. 50-247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York*

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

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would revise

Technical Specification Section 5.5.7, "Steam Generator (SG) Tube Surveillance Program," to allow a one-time extension of the frequency for examination of the SG tubes.

Specifically, the amendment would extend the examination, currently due no later than November 17, 2004, to June 17, 2006.

*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.

There is no direct increase in SG leakage because the proposed change does not alter the plant design. The scope of the inspection performed during the first refueling outage subsequent to SG replacement (last outage), exceeded the technical specification requirements for the first two refueling outages combined, after replacement. More tubes were inspected than were required by the technical specifications. Indian Point 2 does not have an active SG damage mechanism and will meet the current industry examination guidelines without performing inspections during the next refueling outage. The results of the Condition Monitoring Assessment subsequent to the last outage, demonstrated that all performance criteria were met during the last operating period. The results of the aforementioned Operational Assessment show that all performance criteria will be met over the proposed operating period.

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 change will not alter any plant design basis or postulated accident resulting from potential SG tube degradation. The scope of the inspections performed during the last (first after SG replacement) refueling outage significantly exceeds the Technical Specification requirements for the scope of the first two refueling outages combined subsequent to SG replacement.

The proposed change does not affect the SG design, the method of operation, or reactor coolant chemistry controls. No new equipment is being introduced, and installed equipment is not being operated in a new or different manner. The proposed change involves a one-time extension of the SG tube inservice inspection frequency, and therefore will not give rise to new failure modes. In addition, the proposed change does not impact any other plant system or components.

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.

SG tube integrity is a function of design, environmental, and current physical condition. Extending the SG tube inservice inspection frequency by one operating cycle will not alter the function or design of the SGs. Inspections conducted prior to placing the SGs into service (pre-service inspection) and inspection during the first refueling outage following SG replacement, demonstrate that the SGs do not have fabrication damage or an active damage mechanism. The scope of those inspections significantly exceeds those required by the technical specifications. These inspection results were comparable to similar inspection results for the same model SG installed at other plants, and subsequent inspections at those plants provided results that support the extension request. The improved design of the replacement SGs also provides assurance that significant tube degradation is not likely to occur over the proposed operating period.

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:* Mr. John Fulton, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 440 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

*NRC Section Chief:* Richard J. Laufer.

*Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-368, Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2, Pope County, Arkansas*

*Date of amendment request:* June 30, 2003, as supplemented by letter dated November 20, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would (1) reorganize the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 2 (ANO-2) Technical Specifications (TSs) Section 6.0, Administrative Controls, (2) modify the ANO-2 Facility Operating License, and actions and surveillance requirements (SRs) of various other TSs, to support the reorganization of Section 6.0, and (3) modify several actions and SRs that are related to systems that are shared by ANO-2 and Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1 (ANO-1). These changes are being proposed so that the philosophy and location of the TSs in Section 6.0 reflect the recently approved conversion of the ANO-1 TSs to the Improved Technical Specifications (ITS) and the subsequent amendments to the ANO-1 ITS. This amendment request supersedes the