

and on a consistent basis; therefore, this change will not reduce the 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.

*Local Public Document Room location:* B.F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, PA 15001.

*Attorney for licensee:* Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Project Director:* Robert A. Capra.

*GPU Nuclear, Inc. et al., Docket No. 50-219, Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Ocean County, New Jersey*

*Date of amendment request:* July 21, 1998.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed change request would permit an alternative to the requirement to perform Control Rod Drive (CRD) scram time testing with the reactor depressurized prior to resuming power operation. The change would permit: (1) scram time testing with the reactor depressurized prior to resuming operation, and (2) a second scram time test with the reactor pressure above 800 psig, prior to exceeding 40% reactor power.

*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. Involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (or)

There will not be an increase in the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR) because the requested change provides additional assurance that the CRD System is able to perform its safety function, and therefore does not change the probability of occurrence of an accident.

There will not be an increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the Safety Analysis Report (SAR) because the requested change will ensure that the CRD System is able to perform its safety function, and therefore does not change the consequences of an accident.

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

The requested change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The first issue associated with the

requested change is increased wear on the CRDs, resulting in increased buffer seal wear or failure. This wear or failure of the buffer seal would result in difficulty or inability to withdraw the rod subsequent to the depressurized scram. The safety function of the rod to insert on a scram signal, however, would be unaffected by this seal degradation. Therefore, there is no safety concern with the increased wear due to performance of the cold scram test.

The other consideration associated with the new requested change is the possible increased risk of stub tube leakage during the cold (depressurized) test. Without the download due to reactor pressure, the momentary upward loading on the CRD stub tube puts the stub tube into tension. Any flaws in the stub tube could grow and eventually result in a stub tube leak. The likelihood of flaws in the stub tubes, however, is very small, based on the extensive repair work on the stub tube surfaces performed prior to plant operation. The integrity of the stub tube repairs is verified by the 1000 pound leak test performed during every startup of the reactor. This test, therefore, poses very minimal risk of stub tube leakage.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The change will not decrease the margin of safety as defined in the basis of any Technical Specification. This is because the requested change, like the existing Technical Specification test, provides assurance that the CRD System is able to perform its safety function, and therefore does not change the 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.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Ocean County Library, Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753

*Attorney for licensee:* Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pitman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Project Director:* Cecil O. Thomas.

*GPU Nuclear, Inc., et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania*

*Date of amendment request:* June 11, 1998

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would incorporate an alternative high radiation area control for Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1 (TMI-1) in accordance with 10 CFR 20.1601(c). The alternative would modify Technical Specification 6.12 to allow for a

conspicuously posted barricade and flashing light in individual high radiation areas that are located within large areas where no enclosure exists for locking, and no enclosure can be reasonably erected. A minor clarification to indicate that the requirement of paragraph 6.12.1.a also applies to 6.12.1.b and an editorial change were added.

*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. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The proposed amendment involves changes to the TMI-1 Technical Specifications, which are consistent with Regulatory Guide 8.38. This change does not involve any change to system or equipment configuration. The proposed amendment incorporates an alternative high radiation area control, which has been previously found to be acceptable by the NRC. The reliability of systems and components relied upon to prevent or mitigate the consequences of accidents previously evaluated is not degraded by the proposed changes. Therefore, this change does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. This change only involves controls for access to high radiation areas. Access to plant equipment during normal or accident conditions will not be affected by utilizing this alternate method. Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed amendment is consistent with Regulatory Guide 8.38. The proposed amendment involves high radiation area access control and is not related to the margin of safety associated with any plant operation or transients. Therefore, it is concluded that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment 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.

*Local Public Document Room location:* Law/Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105.

*Attorney for licensee:* Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pitman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Project Director:* Cecil O. Thomas.

*North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-443, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire*

*Date of amendment request:* May 20, 1998.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed change would revise the Refueling Water Storage Tank (RWST) setpoint associated with Automatic Switchover to the Containment Sump. This change would require a revision to the Engineered Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation Trip Setpoints, Table 3.3-4, Functional Unit 8.b, RWST Level—Low-Low, along with associated Bases Section 3/4.3.2.

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

The proposed change does not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors and does not alter the design assumptions affecting the ability of the RWST and the ECCS [Emergency Core Cooling System] pumps to mitigate the consequences of an accident.

Revising the RWST Level Low-Low setpoint has a negligible effect on the operating margin for the RWST. The revised setpoint assures that the minimum RWST volume assumed in the accident analyses is injected prior to switchover to the recirculation mode. The effect on containment flood level, equipment qualification, and pH of the containment sump and the containment spray fluid, remain within the limits assumed in the accident analyses.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

The setpoint change does not affect the function of the level monitoring channels or any function of the accident mitigation equipment associated with the RWST. No new components or physical changes are

involved with this change. There are no changes to the source term, containment isolation or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences in the Seabrook Station [updated final safety analysis report] UFSAR. The new setpoint will continue to initiate the automatic ECCS transfer from the injection mode to the recirculation mode and provide the alarm to alert the operator(s) to begin the manual actions necessary to complete the transfer to the recirculation mode. Manual operator action is required to complete the switchover to the recirculation mode. With the new setpoint, sufficient time remains available for the operator(s) to complete the transfer prior to receipt of the RWST EMPTY alarm and reaching the vortexing level in the RWST. Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The design bases for the RWST Level Low-Low setpoint is to ensure that the minimum volume of water to support the assumptions made in the safety analysis is injected prior to switchover and that there is adequate time available for the operators to complete the manual actions necessary to complete the switchover to the recirculation mode prior to actuation of the RWST EMPTY alarm. The minimum injection volume assumed in the accident analyses, and time required for the operator(s) to initiate and complete manual actions to complete switchover to the recirculation mode prior to receipt of the RWST EMPTY alarm, remains unaffected by this change. 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 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

*Local Public Document Room*

*location:* Exeter Public Library, Founders Park, Exeter, NH 03833.

*Attorney for licensee:* Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq., Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141-0270.

*NRC Project Director:* Cecil O. Thomas.

*North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-443, Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1, Rockingham County, New Hampshire*

*Date of amendment request:* May 21, 1998.

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed change would revise selected Technical Specification (TS) surveillance requirements to accommodate fuel cycles of up to 24 months for surveillances that are currently performed at each 18-month

or other specified outage interval. Specifically, the following TS surveillance requirements would be revised by the proposed change: 4.1.3.3, Digital Rod Position Indication; 4.8.1.1.1.b, A.C. Sources—Operating—Transfer of 1E Bus Power from Normal to Alternate Source; 4.8.1.1.2.f.1 through 15, A.C. Sources—Operating—Emergency Diesel Generator Surveillances; 4.8.3.3, Onsite Power Distribution—Trip Circuit For Inverter I-2A; 4.8.2.1.c, d & f, D.C. Sources—Operating—125V D.C. Batteries and Chargers; 4.8.4.2.a.1) & a.2), Containment Penetration Conductor Overcurrent Protective Devices and Protective Devices for Class 1E Power Sources Connected to Non-Class 1E Circuits; 4.8.4.3, Motor Operated Valves Thermal Overload Protection. In addition, the components listed in Technical Specification 4.8.2.2, D.C. Sources—Shutdown—125V DC Batteries and Chargers, have been evaluated to support an extension in frequency to 24 months (+25%).

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

The proposed changes do not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, configuration of the facility or the manner in which the plant is operated. The proposed changes do not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, or components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the acceptance limits assumed in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not change the level of programmatic controls or the procedural details associated with aforementioned surveillance requirements.

Changing the frequencies of the aforementioned surveillance requirements from at least once per 18 months to at least once per refueling interval does not change the basis for the frequencies. The frequencies were chosen because of the need to perform these verifications under the conditions that are normally found during a plant refueling outage, and to avoid the potential of an unplanned transient if these surveillances were conducted with the plant at power.

Equipment performance over several operating cycles was evaluated to determine the impact of extending the surveillance intervals. This evaluation included a review of surveillance results, preventative maintenance records, and the frequency and type of corrective maintenance activities, a