

instrumentation, the associated isolation valves or the proposed surveillance. The evaluation determined that mitigating actions can be taken to identify and terminate all postulated draindown events prior to fuel uncover. As a result, the probability of draindown events causing fuel uncover and the potential for radiological releases has not significantly increased. The operation or failure of the shutdown cooling suction isolation does not contribute to the occurrence of an accident. No active or passive failure mechanisms that could lead to an accident are affected by the proposed change.

The consequences of a vessel drainage event are not significantly increased by the proposed change. Entergy has evaluated various draindown and pumpdown events through the shutdown cooling flow path and determined that adequate time is available for operations personnel to identify and take action to mitigate such events such that adequate core cooling is maintained and a radiological release does not occur.

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.

Entergy has evaluated various draindown events through the shutdown cooling flow path and determined that adequate time is available for operations personnel to identify and take action to mitigate any events such that adequate core cooling is maintained. The proposed surveillance requirement only enhances the ability of operating personnel to detect inventory loss associated with a draindown event. With the containment refueling cavity flooded, sufficient inventory is available to allow operator action to terminate the inventory loss prior to reaching a low water level in the reactor. Installed equipment is not operated in a new or different manner; no new or different system interactions are created, and no new processes are introduced. No new failures have been created by the proposed changes.

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.

The proposed changes do not introduce any new setpoints at which protective or mitigative actions are initiated. No current setpoints are altered by this change. The design and functioning of the containment and drywell isolation function is also unchanged. The change simply modifies the applicability of the TS by removing the requirement that the RHR system isolation on low reactor vessel level be operable with the upper containment cavity flooded in MODE 5. During MODE 5, the RHR system isolation mitigates postulated draindown events through the RHR system. The proposed surveillance requirement only enhances the ability of operating personnel to detect

inventory loss associated with a draindown event and does not impact a margin of safety. Entergy has evaluated various draindown events through this flow path and determined that adequate time is available for operations personnel to identify and take action to mitigate such events such that adequate core cooling is maintained.

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.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

This notification is based on the revised license amendment request dated December 5, 2003, and supercedes the original notification based on the request dated May 12, 2003, published in the **Federal Register** on June 10, 2003 (68 FR 34665).

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D59, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays.

Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By January 14, 2004, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714, which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, or electronically on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If there are problems in accessing the document, contact the Public Document Room Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov). If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for