The proposed relocations are considered to be administrative in nature and do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety since they only involve transferring limits from the Technical Specifications to the COLR. The values and setpoints placed in the COLR are addressed in the reload report for each particular fuel cycle. The development of limits for future reloads will continue to conform to methodologies described in NRC approved documentation. Each future reload involves a 10CFR50.59 safety review to assure that operation of the unit within the cycle-specific limits will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The revision of Specification 3.1.1.1.a and addition of the footnote to Table 2.3–1 result in additional restrictions on operation with one reactor coolant pump in each loop with the reactor critical. This more restrictive specification limits operation with one reactor coolant pump in each loop to a 24 hour period when the reactor is critical. This change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety, rather, it constitutes an additional limitation not previously included in the Technical Specifications.

Therefore, this change does *not* involve a significant reduction in 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: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801.

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005–3502.

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner.

Entergy Operations, Inc., et al., Docket No. 50–416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of amendment request: November 9, 1994.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment revises those specifications associated with various engineered safety feature systems following a design basis fuel handling accident. The proposed changes affect conditions where irradiated fuel is handled in the primary or secondary containment and when fuel is handled over the reactor vessel with fuel in the vessel. These changes are based on a recent re-analysis of the fuel handling accident for Grand Gulf Nuclear Station (GGNS).

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 significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed definition of RECENTLY IRRADIATED fuel is used to establish operational conditions where specific activities represent situations where significant radioactive releases can be postulated. These operational conditions are consistent with the design basis analysis. Because the equipment affected by the revised operational conditions is not considered an initiator to any previously analyzed accident, inoperability of the equipment cannot increase the probability of any previously evaluated accident. The proposed applicability in conjunction with existing administrative controls on light loads, bounds the conditions of the current design basis fuel handling accident analysis which concludes that the radiological consequences are within the acceptance criteria of NUREG 0800, Section 15.7.4 and General Design Criteria 19. Therefore, the proposed changes do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of any previously evaluated accident.

Based on the above, the proposed changes do not significantly increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previous analyzed.

The proposed definition is used to establish operational conditions where specific activities represent situations where significant radioactive releases can be postulated. These operational conditions are consistent with the design basis analysis. The proposed changes do not introduce any new modes of plant operation and do not involve physical modifications to the plant. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previous analyzed.

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

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

The revised definition is used to establish operational conditions where specific activities represent situations where significant radioactive releases can be postulated. These operational conditions are consistent with the design basis analysis and are established such that the radiological consequences are at or below the current GGNS licensing limit. Safety margins and analytical conservatisms have been evaluated and are well understood. Substantial margins are retained to ensure that the analysis adequately bounds all postulated event scenarios. The proposed change only eliminates the excess margin from the

analysis. The current margin of safety is retained.

Specifically, the margin of safety for the fuel handling accident is the difference between the 10 CFR 100 limits and the licensing limit defined by NUREG 0800, Section 15.7.4. With respect to the control room personnel doses, the margin of safety is the difference between the 10 CFR 100 limits and the licensing limit defined by 10 CFR 50, Appendix A, Criterion 19 (GDC 19). Excess margin is the difference between the postulated doses and the corresponding licensing limit.

The proposed applicability continues to ensure that the whole-body and thyroid doses at the exclusion area and low population zone boundaries as well as control room, doses are at or below the corresponding licensing limit. The margin of safety is unchanged; therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not result in 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: Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce Street, Natchez, Mississippi 39120.

Attorney for licensee: Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., 12th Floor, Washington, DC 20005–3502.

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner.

Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50–309, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, Lincoln County, Maine

Date of amendment request: December 6, 1994.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would revise
the Technical Specifications to allow
the use of the Combustion Engineering
sleeving process for repairing steam
generator tubes. (The current
requirement specifies that degraded
steam generator tubes be repaired by
plugging.)

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. The NRC has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standard of 10 CFR 59.92(c). The staff's review is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the