

extension of the time until inoperable equipment is discovered to be inoperable by the missed Surveillance. However, given the rare occurrence of inoperable equipment, and the rare occurrence of a missed Surveillance, a missed Surveillance on inoperable equipment would be very unlikely. This must be balanced against the real risk of manipulating the plant equipment or condition to perform the missed Surveillance. In addition, parallel trains and alternate equipment are typically available to perform the safety function of the equipment not tested.

[Specification 4.0.1]

The proposed changes to TS 4.0.1, including relocation and rewording of existing requirements from Specification 4.0.3, are administrative in nature and do not reduce the level of programmatic or procedural controls associated with the Surveillance Requirements. There are no substantive differences in meaning or intent between the existing specifications and the corresponding STS requirements. Further, these changes have no impact on equipment design, configuration, analytical basis, setpoints or operation.

[Bases Control Program]

The proposed change to adopt a Technical Specification Bases Control Program is also administrative in nature and does not reduce the level of programmatic or procedural controls associated with the Bases. There is no impact on equipment design, configuration, analytical basis, setpoints or operation.

Thus, there is confidence that the equipment can perform its assumed safety function. Therefore, this 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.

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:
December 19, 2002.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendments would change the Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications associated with an increase in the licensed reactor

power level of 1.5 percent for each reactor (from 2763 megawatts thermal (MWt) to 2804 MWt).

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:

[Southern Nuclear Company] SNC's conclusion that the proposed change to the Plant Hatch Unit 1 and 2 Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications does not involve a significant hazards consideration is based upon the following:

1. The proposed amendment does not change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated[.]

The comprehensive analytical efforts performed to support the proposed uprate conditions included a review and evaluation of all components and systems that could be affected by this change. Performance requirements for these systems were evaluated and found acceptable. Furthermore, evaluation of accident analyses confirmed the effects of the proposed uprate are bounded by the current dose analyses. The systems will function as designed. The performance requirements for these systems were evaluated and found acceptable.

The primary loop components (e.g., reactor vessel, reactor internals, control rod drive housings, piping and supports, and recirculation pumps) continue to comply with their applicable structural limits and will continue to perform their intended design functions. Thus, the probability of a structural failure of these components is not increased as a result of this change.

The Nuclear Steam Supply System (NSSS) systems will still perform their intended design functions during normal and accident conditions. The balance-of-plant (BOP) systems and components will continue to meet their applicable structural limits and perform their intended design functions. Thus, the probability of a structural failure of these components is not increased as a result of this change.

The NSSS/BOP interface systems will continue to perform their intended design functions. The safety relief valves and containment isolation valves still meet design sizing requirements at the uprated power level.

Because the integrity of the plant will not be affected by operation at the uprated condition, SNC concluded that all structures, systems, and components required to mitigate a transient remain capable of fulfilling their intended functions. The reduced uncertainty in the flow input to the core thermal power uncertainty measurement allows most of the current safety analyses to be used, with small changes to the core operating limits, to support operation at a core power of 2804 MWt. Other analyses performed at a nominal power level were either evaluated or reperformed for the 1.5% increased power level. The results demonstrate that the applicable analysis acceptance criteria continue to be met at the

1.5% uprate conditions. Thus, all Plant Hatch Final Safety Analysis Report accident analyses continue to demonstrate compliance with the relevant event acceptance criteria. The analyses performed to assess the effects of mass and energy release remain valid. The source terms used to assess radiological consequences were reviewed and determined to bound operation at the 1.5% uprated condition. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of the proposed change. All systems, structures, and components previously required for the mitigation of a transient remain capable of fulfilling their intended design functions. The proposed change will have no adverse effect on any safety-related system or component and does not challenge the performance or integrity of any safety-related system. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Operation at the uprated power condition does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Analyses of the primary fission product barriers confirm that all relevant design criteria remain satisfied, both from the standpoint of the integrity of the primary fission product barrier and from the standpoint of compliance with the required acceptance criteria. As appropriate, all evaluations were performed using methods that were either reviewed and approved by the NRC, or are in compliance with regulatory review guidance and standards. 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: 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:
November 14, 2002.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would delete