

As mentioned previously, new tornado insights gained from a review of the current external event risk analysis have resulted in an enhanced risk model that more accurately characterizes station tornado damage risk. The proposed changes are part of the revised tornado mitigation strategy that provides for an assured, deterministic success path rather than a strategy that is based on risk insights and diversity for achieving safe shutdown.

There is no safety limit, set point, or design parameter changes required. The integrity of the fuel cladding, reactor coolant system, and containment are preserved. Thus, 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:* Anne W. Cottingham, Winston and Strawn, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005.

*NRC Section Chief:* John A. Nakoski. *Energy Northwest, Docket No. 50-397, Columbia Generating Station, Benton County, Washington*

*Date of amendment request:* December 30, 2002.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment revises two technical specifications (TSs). The first change proposes to revise TS 2.1.1.2, "Minimum Critical Power Ratio Safety Limit (MCPRSL)" to support operation during Cycle 17 with a mixed core. The second change proposes to revise the local power range monitor (LPRM) calibration frequency specified in the TS for the oscillation power range monitor (OPRM) in Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.3.1.3.2. This change will correct an inconsistency between the LPRM calibration frequency specified in SR 3.3.1.3.2 and SR 3.3.1.1.7, "Reactor Protection System (RPS) Instrumentation."

*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. The licensee addresses each change separately.

1. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

1. The requested change to TS 2.1.1.2, MCPRSL to support the cycle 17 core loading does not involve any plant modifications or operational changes that could affect system reliability, performance, or possibility of

operator error. The requested changes do not affect any postulated accident precursors, do not affect any accident mitigation systems, and do not introduce any new accident initiation mechanisms. The consequences of accidents previously evaluated are not changed because the number of rods that are protected from transition boiling is predicted to be greater than 99.9 percent which meets the acceptance criterion in NUREG-0800, Section 4.4.

2. The requested change to SR 3.3.1.3.2, OPRM/LPRM calibration frequency, does not involve a modification to the plant or introduce the probability of an operator error. The LPRMs are not the precursor to any accident. Making the LPRM surveillance frequency for the OPRM consistent with that approved for the RPS/APRM [reactor protection system/average power range monitor] does not change system reliability. The proposed LPRM surveillance frequency is supported by the uncertainties used to perform the MCPRSL analyses. Therefore, the number of rods that are calculated to experience transition boiling during normal operation or anticipated operational occurrences will not be changed and the consequences of these events will not be increased.

Therefore, these changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

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

1. The ATRIUM-10 fuel to be used in cycle 17 is compatible with the co-resident SVEA-96 fuel. This compatibility is demonstrated by application of the FRA-ANP critical power methodology to the core design that includes the ATRIUM-10 and SVEA-96 fuel. The proposed changes do not represent any new modes of operation, changes in setpoints or plant modifications other than those required for the reactor core. The change does not introduce new postulated accident precursors or mitigation systems. Reload design and analysis will be performed in accordance with approved NRC methodology.

2. Increasing the time interval for the OPRM/LPRM surveillance reduces the frequency to be consistent with the LPRM surveillance frequency for the RPS/APRM and does not involve a modification to the plant, introduce a new operator error or revise setpoints.

Therefore, these changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

1. The proposed MCPRSL does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety associated with the criterion set forth in NUREG-0800, section 4.4. The safety limit established for the core ensures that the criterion for the number of fuel rods allowed to experience transition boiling will be maintained for normal plant operation and anticipated operational transients.

The core operating limits will continue to be determined using methodologies that have been approved by the NRC.

2. The proposed LPRM surveillance frequency is supported by the uncertainties used to perform the MCPRSL analyses. Therefore, the number of rods that are calculated to experience transition boiling during normal operation or anticipated operational occurrences will not be changed.

Therefore, implementation of the change to the MCPRSL and the LPRM surveillance frequency 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:* Thomas C. Poindexter, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502.

*NRC Section Chief:* Stephen Dembek.

*Entergy Nuclear Generation Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts*

*Date of amendment request:* October 10, 2002, as supplemented on November 22, 2002, and January 28, 2003. This notice supercedes 67 FR 68735 published on November 12, 2002, which erroneously stated that the October 10, 2002, application was a supplement of the licensee's application dated December 12, 2001. The October 10, 2002, replaced the December 12, 2001, application. This notice also adds supplements dated November 22, 2002, and January 28, 2003.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specification Tables 3.2.A, 3.2.B, 4.2.A, and 4.2.B. The proposed changes affect various instrument trip level settings and decreases the calibration frequencies for a variety of instruments. The proposed changes also involve clarifications to the Reactor Water Cleanup system trip configuration and the titles of certain trip systems. In addition, the proposed changes would make certain editorial and administrative corrections. The proposed setpoint changes and calibration frequencies are based on the licensee's evaluation.

*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: