2. Will the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

The proposed change does not alter the plant configuration, systems, components, or operation; and does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change is expected to eliminate unnecessary challenges to a safety system that has already been determined to be operable by routine surveillance testing; therefore contributing to the overall safe operation of the facility.

3. Will the proposed change involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

The RDS [Reactor Depressurization System] provides for both manual and automatic depressurization of the primary system to allow injection of the core spray following a small-to-intermediate size break in the primary system. This will allow core cooling with the objective of preventing excessive fuel clad temperatures. The design of the system is based on the specified initiation set points described in the Technical Specifications. Transient analysis demonstrated that these conditions result in adequate safety margins for both the fuel and the system pressure. The proposed change does not affect these setpoints, therefore the margin of safety is not changed.

In addition, the proposed editorial change to correct a typographical error is administrative in nature and, therefore, would have no effect on the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92 discussed above.

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: North Central Michigan College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

Attorney for licensee: Judd L. Bacon, Esquire, Consumers Power Company, 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201.

NRČ Project Director: Cynthia A. Carpenter, Acting.

Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50–302, Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit No. 3, Citrus County, Florida

Date of amendment request: January 26, 1995, as supplemented March 9, 1995.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the technical specifications (TS) to increase the allowable nominal fuel enrichment from 4.2 to 5.0 weight percent for reload fuel assemblies. TS impose a limit on fuel enrichment of stored fuel assemblies to prevent inadvertent criticality. Presently, the Crystal River Unit 3 (CR3) TS specify a maximum enrichment of 4.5 weight percent for storage pool A and dry fuel (new fuel) storage racks, and 4.2 weight percent for fuel pool B. The licensee proposed to revise TS 3.7.15, 4.2, and 4.3, and associated TS bases to allow increasing the enrichment limits from 4.2 to 5.0 weight percent for the dry fuel storage racks and for A and B fuel pools. Additionally, a typographical error in TS 4.3.1.2.b will also be corrected.

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. This amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

An increase in fuel enrichment will not by itself affect the mixture of fission product nuclides. A change in fuel cycle design which makes use of an increased enrichment may result in fuel burnup consisting of a somewhat different mixture of nuclides. The effect in this instance is insignificant because:

- a. The isotopic mixture of the irradiated assembly is relatively insensitive to the assembly's initial enrichment.
- b. Most accident doses are such a small fraction of 10 CFR 100 limits, a large margin exists before any change becomes significant.
- c. The change in Pu content which would result from an increase in burnup would produce more of some fission product nuclides and less of other nuclides. Small increases in some doses are offset by reductions in other doses. The radiological consequences of accidents are not significantly changed.

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

An unplanned criticality event will not occur as $K_{\rm eff}$ [effective neutron multiplication factor] will not exceed 0.95 with the maximum allowable enriched fuel in Pool A and Pool B, when flooded with unborated water, and $K_{\rm eff}$ will not exceed 0.98 in the new fuel storage racks assuming conditions of optimum hypothetical low density moderation. The new fuel storage racks have two rows of storage cells physically blocked to ensure reactivity limits are not exceeded. Administrative controls assure fuel is stored in configurations which meet the requirements of the safety analysis.

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

While the increased enrichment in Pool A, Pool B, and the dry storage racks may lessen the margin to criticality, this reduction is not significant because the overall safety margin is within NRC criteria of K_{eff} [less than or equal to] 0.95 (NRC Standard Review Plan, Section 9.1.2.)

Therefore, this amendment request satisfies the criteria specified in 10 CFR 50.92 for amendments which do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

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: Coastal Region Library, 8619 W. Crystal Street, Crystal River, Florida 32629.

Attorney for licensee: A. H. Stephens, General Counsel, Florida Power Corporation, MAC–A5D, P. O. Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733. NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews.

Houston Lighting & Power Company, City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company, City of Austin, Texas, Docket Nos. 50–498 and 50–499, South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, Matagorda County, Texas

Date of amendment request: March 16, 1995.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification 4.6.1.2, regarding the overall integrated containment leakage rate tests, so that it would reference 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J directly, rather than paraphrase the regulation, and allow approved exemptions to the test frequency requirements. In addition, there is an associated proposed exemption, from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, to provide a one-time interval extension for the Unit 2 Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) from the current scheduled 48 months to approximately 66 months.

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:

Criterion 1—Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed change specific to Unit 2 will provide a onetime exemption from the 10 CFR 50, Appendix J Section III.D.I.(a) leak rate test schedule requirement. This change will allow for a one-time test interval for Type A Integrated Leak Rate Tests of approximately 66 months.

Leak rate testing is not an initiating event in any accident; therefore, this proposed