2) Create the possibility for accident or malfunction of equipment of a different type than previously evaluated in the FSAR.

The proposed Technical Specification changes do not involve any design changes nor are there any changes to the method by which any safety-related plant system performs its safety function. The normal manner of plant operation is unaffected. No new accident scenarios, transient precursors, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as a result of these changes.

Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

There will be no affect [SIC] on the manner in which safety limits or limiting safety system settings are determined, nor will there be any effect in those plant systems necessary to assure the accomplishment of protection functions. There will be no impact on DNBR limits, F₀, F-delta-H, LOCA PCT, peak local power density or any other margin of safety.

Based on the information presented above, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated, or involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed changes meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.92(c) and does [SIC] 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 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: Callaway County Public Library, 710 Court Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037 NRC Project Director: Leif J. Norrholm

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of amendment request: August 27, 1993

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to be consistent with recent revisions to 10 CFR Part 20 and 10 CFR 50.36a. Administrative changes are also proposed.

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 will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The changes as proposed consist of revisions to the Technical Specifications to meet new regulatory requirements as contained in 10CFR20 and 10CFR50.36a, and other related changes of an administrative nature. There is no change in the types and amounts of effluents released, nor will there be any increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures. None of the changes proposed will affect any plant hardware, plant design, safety limit settings, or plant system operation, and therefore do not modify or add any initiating parameters that would significantly increase the probability or consequences of any previously analyzed accident.

2. The proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The changes as proposed do not physically alter the plant nor do they change the operation of the plant.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The changes will not increase the amount or types of effluents that may be released offsite, nor do they significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures. These changes will not alter any of the requirements or responsibilities for protection of the public and/or employees against radiation hazards.

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: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

Attorney for licensee: John A. Ritsher, Esquire, Ropes and Gray, One International Place, Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of amendment request: March 31, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify the requirements for avoidance and protection from thermal hydraulic instabilities to be consistent with the Boiling Water Reactor (BWR) Owner's Group long-term solution Option 1-D described in the Licensing Topical Report, "BWR Owner's Group Long-Term Stability Solutions Licensing Methodology, NEDO-31960 June 1991" and NEDO-31960, Supplement 1, dated March 1992. NEDO-31960 and NEDO-

31960, Supplement 1, were accepted by the NRC staff in a letter to L.A. England (BWR Owner's Group) dated July 12, 1993.

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 amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The implementation of BWR Owner's Group long term stability solution Option 1-D at Vermont Yankee does not modify the assumptions contained in the existing accident analysis. The use of an exclusion region and the operator actions required to avoid and minimize operation inside the region do not increase the possibility of an accident. Conditions of operation outside of the exclusion region are within the analytical envelope of the existing safety analysis. The operator action requirement to exit the exclusion region upon entry minimizes the possibility of an oscillation occurring. The actions to drive control rods and/or to increase recirculation flow to exit the region are maneuvers within the envelope of normal plant evolutions. The flow biased scram has been analyzed and will provide automatic fuel protection in the event of an instability. Thus, each proposed operating requirement provides defense in depth for protection from an instability event while maintaining the existing assumptions of the accident analysis.

2. The proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated. As stated in 1), the proposed operating requirements either mandate operation within the envelope of existing plant operating conditions of force specific operating maneuvers within those carried out in normal operation. Since operation of the plant with all of the proposed requirements are within the existing operating basis, an unanalyzed accident will not be created through implementation of the proposed change.

3. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Each of the proposed requirements for plant thermal hydraulic stability provides a means for fuel protection. The combination of avoiding possible unstable conditions and the automatic flow biased reactor scram provides an in depth means for fuel protection. Therefore, the individual or combination of means to avoid and suppress an instability supplements 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 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.