

*Attorney for licensee:* Nancy C. Loftin, Esq., Corporate Secretary and Counsel, Arizona Public Service Company, P.O. Box 53999, Mail Station 9068, Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999

*NRC Project Director:* William H. Bateman

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

*Date of amendment request:* July 14, 1995

*Description of amendment request:* The proposed amendment would change the scram insertion times, Section 3.3.C, Minimum Critical Power Ratio section, Section 4.11.C and the associated bases in Section 2.1.1 and 3/4.3.

*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:

**Section 2.1 Bases - Safety Limits**

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because equivalent fuel cladding protection (99.9 percent of all fuel rods do not experience transition boiling following a design basis transient) is provided.

2. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed change does not affect the function of any structure, system or component.

3. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the utilization of current General Electric fuel designs provides an equivalent margin of safety. As stated previously, equivalent fuel cladding protection is provided and ensures that 99.9 percent of all fuel rods will not experience transition boiling following a design basis transient.

**Section 3.3.C - Scram Insertion Times**

1. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability of consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The correlation of the scram insertion times with the actual notch position will simplify the surveillance procedure while maintaining the accuracy of the test.

2. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because no physical modifications are associated with the proposed change and it does not affect the function of any structure, system or component.

3. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment

will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The notch positions were chosen to coincide with the relative insertion values specified in the Technical Specifications. Use of the proposed combination of notch positions and scram insertion times will maintain the existing margins of safety that 99.9 percent of all fuel rods will not experience transition boiling following a design basis transient.

**Section 4.11.C - Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) Calculation Method**

1. The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the method used to calculate the measured scram speed distribution is consistent with the PNPS [Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station] licensing basis.

2. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed change does not affect the function of any structure, system or component.

3. The operation of Pilgrim Station in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the proposed changes provide equivalent fuel cladding protection which ensures that 99.9 percent of all fuel rods will not experience transition boiling following a design basis transient.

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:* Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

*Attorney for licensee:* W. S. Stowe, Esquire, Boston Edison Company, 800 Boylston Street, 36th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02199.

*NRC Project Director:* Ledyard B. Marsh

**Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, Illinois**

*Date of application for amendment requests:* September 17, 1993, as supplemented July 20, 1995

*Description of amendment requests:* As a result of findings by a Diagnostic Evaluation Team inspection performed by the NRC staff at the Dresden Nuclear Power Station in 1987, Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee) made a decision that both the Dresden

Nuclear Power Station and sister site Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station needed attention focused on the existing custom Technical Specifications (TS) used.

The licensee made the decision to initiate a Technical Specification Upgrade Program (TSUP) for both Dresden and Quad Cities. The licensee evaluated the current TS for both Dresden and Quad Cities against the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) contained in NUREG-0123, "Standard Technical Specifications General Electric Plants BWR/4." The licensee's evaluation identified numerous potential improvements such as clarifying requirements, changing TS to make them more understandable and to eliminate interpretation, and deleting requirements that are no longer considered current with industry practice. As a result of the evaluation, ComEd has elected to upgrade both the Dresden and Quad Cities TS to the STS contained in NUREG-0123.

The TSUP for Dresden and Quad Cities is not a complete adaption of the STS. The TSUP focuses on (1) integrating additional information such as equipment operability requirements during shutdown conditions, (2) clarifying requirements such as limiting conditions for operation and action statements utilizing STS terminology, (3) deleting superseded requirements and modifications to the TS based on the licensee's responses to Generic Letters (GL), and (4) relocating specific items to more appropriate TS locations.

The September 17, 1993, and July 20, 1995, applications proposed to upgrade only Section 3/4.7 (Containment Systems) of the Dresden and Quad Cities TS.

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

In general, the proposed amendment represents the conversion of current requirements to a more generic format, or the addition of requirements which are based on the current safety analysis. Implementation of these changes will provide increased reliability of equipment assumed to operate in the current safety analysis, or provide continued assurance that specified parameters remain within their acceptance limits, and as such, will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

Some of the proposed changes represent minor curtailments of the current