

continue to provide assurance of EDG operability.

Therefore, the proposed changes do 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.

The proposed changes are procedural in nature and make no changes that affect the ability of plant SSCs to perform their design basis accident functions. In addition, the proposed changes do not change the margin of safety since no SSCs are changed. The results of accident analysis remain unchanged by the proposed changes to TS.

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:* Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

*NRC Section Chief:* James W. Clifford.

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

*Date of amendment request:* October 24, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed change to Technical Specifications will revise surveillance requirements associated with reactor protection system instrumentation, control rod block instrumentation, source range monitors, and power distribution limits, to minimize unnecessary testing.

*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 amendment would revise the Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirements (SRs) for certain Reactor Protection System and Control Rod Block Instrumentation, the source range monitors and power distribution limits, consistent with NUREG-1433, "Standard Technical Specifications (STS) General Electric Plants, BWR [Boiling Water Reactor]/4," Revision 2. No changes are being made to any instrumentation setpoints or plant components. The revised SRs continue to

assure that the necessary quality of systems and components is maintained, that facility operation will be within safety limits, and that the Limiting Conditions for Operation will be met.

Since the proposed changes do not affect any accident initiator and since the associated equipment will remain capable of performing its design function, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or radiological 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 changes do not change the design function or operation of any plant equipment. No new failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators are being introduced by the proposed changes. Therefore, the proposed changes do 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.

No changes are being made to any plant instrumentation setpoints or to the required level of redundancy. No changes are being made to any power distribution limits.

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:* Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire, Nuclear Business Unit—N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

*NRC Section Chief:* James W. Clifford.

*Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia*

*Date of amendment request:* September 12, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:*

The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) Sections 1.1, 3.7.10, 3.7.12, 3.7.13, 3.7.14, 3.9.4, 5.5.2, and 5.5.10, and the associated Bases Sections to implement an alternate source term at North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2. The proposed changes would implement NUREG-1465, "Accident Source Terms for Light-Water Nuclear Power Plants," dated February 1995, as the design-basis source term, achieve a consistent design basis for all accident dose assessments, increase operational flexibility by

allowing for increased emergency core cooling system leakage and unfiltered control room in-leakage, and eliminate the surveillance requirement to test the bottled air flow rate.

*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:

We have reviewed the proposed TS changes relative to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.92 and determined that a significant hazards consideration is not involved. Specifically, operation of North Anna Power Station with the proposed changes will not:

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

The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously analyzed. The North Anna MCR/ESGR [main control room/emergency switchgear room] EVS [emergency ventilation system], PREACS [pump room exhaust air cleanup system], and MCE [MCR]/ESGR Bottled Air systems only function following the initiation of a design basis radiological accident. Therefore, the changes to these specifications, the definition of currently irradiated fuel, and the increase [of] the depressurization time of [the] containment following a design basis LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident] will not increase the probability of any previously analyzed accident. These systems are not initiators of any design bases accident.

Revised dose calculations, which take into account the changes proposed by this [these] amendment[s] and the use of the alternative source term[,] have been performed for the North Anna design basis radiological accidents. The results of these revised calculations indicate that public and control room doses will not exceed the limits specified in 10 CFR 50.67 and Regulatory Guide 1.183. There is not a significant increase in predicted dose consequences for any of the analyzed accidents. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the consequences of any previously analyzed accident.

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

The implementation of the proposed changes does not create the possibility of an accident of a different type than was previously evaluated in the UFSAR [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report]. Although the proposed changes could affect the operation of the MRC [MCR]/ESGR EVS following a design basis radiological accident, none of these changes can initiate a new or different kind of accident since they are only related to system capabilities that provide protection from accidents that have already occurred. These changes do not alter the nature of events postulated in the UFSAR nor do they introduce any unique precursor mechanisms.