

February 6, 2004

Mr. Roy A. Anderson
President & Chief Nuclear Officer
PSEG Nuclear, LLC - X04
Post Office Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2, ISSUANCE OF
AMENDMENTS RE: SPENT FUEL POOL BORON CONCENTRATION
(TAC NOS. MC0483 AND MC0484)

Dear Mr. Anderson:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. 262 and 244 to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75 for the Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Salem), Unit Nos. 1 and 2. These amendments consist of changes to the Salem Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated February 14, 2003, as supplemented on October 2, 2003.

These amendments revise the Salem TSs to add a spent fuel pool boron concentration limit, relocate fuel assembly storage requirements, and revise the existing refueling boron concentration requirements. The amendments will provide improved TS control of fuel storage pool boron concentration and fuel assembly storage restrictions at Salem.

A copy of our Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

/RA by JBoska for/

Robert J. Fretz, Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 262 to
License No. DPR-70
2. Amendment No. 244 to
License No. DPR-75
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

February 6, 2004

Mr. Roy A. Anderson
Chief Nuclear Officer
PSEG Nuclear, LLC - X04
Post Office Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2, ISSUANCE OF
AMENDMENTS RE: SPENT FUEL POOL BORON CONCENTRATION
(TAC NOS. MC0483 AND MC0484)

Dear Mr. Anderson:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. 262 and 244 to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75 for the Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Salem), Unit Nos. 1 and 2. These amendments consist of changes to the Salem Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated February 14, 2003, as supplemented on October 2, 2003.

These amendments revise the Salem TSs to add a spent fuel pool boron concentration limit, relocate fuel assembly storage requirements, and revise the existing refueling boron concentration requirements. The amendments will provide improved TS control of fuel storage pool boron concentration and fuel assembly storage restrictions at Salem.

A copy of our Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

/RA by JBoska for/

Robert J. Fretz, Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311

- Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 262 to License No. DPR-70
- 2. Amendment No. 244 to License No. DPR-75
- 3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC	CHolden	JUhle	RTaylor	GMeyer, RGN-I
PDI-2 Reading	JClifford	WBeckner	PHearn	GHill(4)
ACRS	RFretz	CRaynor	OGC	

ACCESSION NUMBER: ML033650405, TS(s): ML , Package: ML040360026
SE input provided by memo.

OFFICE	PDI-2/PM	PDI-2/LA	SRXB/SC*	RORP/SC*	OGC	PDI-2/SC(A)
NAME	RFretz, JBoska for	CRaynor	JUhle	RDennig	AHodgdon	DRoberts
DATE	01/07/03, 01/07/0304	01/09/04	12/23/03	05/01/03	01/22/04	02/04/04

Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2

cc:

Mr. A. Christopher Bakken, III
Senior Vice President - Site Operations
PSEG Nuclear - X15
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. John T. Carlin
Vice President - Nuclear Assessments
PSEG Nuclear - N10
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. David F. Garchow
Vice President - Eng/Tech Support
PSEG Nuclear - N28
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Steven Mannon
Manager - Licensing
PSEG Nuclear - N21
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire
PSEG Nuclear - N21
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Ms. R. A. Kankus
Joint Owner Affairs
PECO Energy Company
Nuclear Group Headquarters KSA1-E
200 Exelon Way
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Lower Alloways Creek Township
c/o Mary O. Henderson, Clerk
Municipal Building, P.O. Box 157
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Dr. Jill Lipoti, Asst. Director
Radiation Protection Programs
NJ Department of Environmental
Protection and Energy
CN 415
Trenton, NJ 08625-0415

Brian Beam
Board of Public Utilities
2 Gateway Center, Tenth Floor
Newark, NJ 07102

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Senior Resident Inspector
Salem Nuclear Generating Station
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Drawer 0509
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

PSEG NUCLEAR, LLC

EXELON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC

DOCKET NO. 50-272

SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 262
License No. DPR-70

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment filed by PSEG Nuclear, LLC and Exelon Generation Company, LLC (the licensees) dated February 14, 2003, as supplemented on October 2, 2003, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance: (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-70 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 262, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Darrell Roberts, Acting Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: February 6, 2004

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 262

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-70

DOCKET NO. 50-272

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A, Technical Specifications, with the attached revised pages as indicated. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove Pages

Index VII
Index XIV
Index XV
—
—
—
3/4 9-1
—
—
—
—
—
B 3/4 9-1
—
—
—
5-5a
5-6
5-6a
6-24

Insert Pages

Index VII
Index XIV
Index XV
3/4 7-35
3/4 7-36
3/4 7-37
3/4 9-1
B 3/4 7-9
B 3/4 7-10
B 3/4 7-11
B 3/4 7-12
B 3/4 7-13
B 3/4 9-1
B 3/4 9-1a
B 3/4 9-1b
B 3/4 9-1c
5-5a
5-6
5-6a
6-24

PSEG NUCLEAR, LLC

EXELON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC

DOCKET NO. 50-311

SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 244
License No. DPR-75

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment filed by PSEG Nuclear, LLC and Exelon Generation Company, LLC (the licensees) dated February 14, 2003, as supplemented on October 2, 2003, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance: (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-75 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 244, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Darrell Roberts, Acting Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate I
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance:

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 244

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-75

DOCKET NO. 50-311

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A, Technical Specifications, with the attached revised pages as indicated. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove Pages

Index VII
Index XIV
Index XV
—
—
—
3/4 9-1
—
—
—
—
—
B 3/4 9-1
—
—
—
5-5
5-5a
5-5b
6-24

Insert Pages

Index VII
Index XIV
Index XV
3/4 7-30
3/4 7-31
3/4 7-32
3/4 9-1
B 3/4 7-9
B 3/4 7-10
B 3/4 7-11
B 3/4 7-12
B 3/4 7-13
B 3/4 9-1
B 3/4 9-1a
B 3/4 9-1b
B 3/4 9-1c
5-5
5-5a
5-5b
6-24

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 262 AND 244 TO FACILITY OPERATING
LICENSE NOS. DPR-70 AND DPR-75
PSEG NUCLEAR, LLC
EXELON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC
SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 14, 2003, as supplemented on October 2, 2003, PSEG Nuclear, LLC (PSEG or the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (Salem), Technical Specifications (TSs). The requested changes would revise the Salem TSs to add a spent fuel pool (SFP) boron concentration limit, relocate fuel assembly storage requirements, and revise the existing refueling boron concentration requirements. PSEG's amendment requests provided improved TS control of fuel storage pool boron concentration and fuel assembly storage restrictions. The October 2, 2003, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Salem TSs currently permit the licensee to store 1632 fuel assemblies in each SFP. In 1994, PSEG installed Holtec International non-flux trap "Maximum Density Rack" fuel storage racks as part of its SFP rerecking project. As a result, the SFP is divided into two separate and distinct regions: Region 1 consists of 300 storage positions, and is designed to accommodate unrestricted storage of new fuel with a maximum enrichment of 4.25 weight percent U-235. Region 1 is also licensed to store unirradiated and irradiated fuel assemblies with initial enrichments up to a maximum of 5.0 weight percent, if certain restrictions are satisfied. A 10.5 inch nominal center-to-center pitch, which includes a flux-trap water gap, separates individual cells in the Region 1 racks. Region 2 consists of an additional 1332 fuel storage positions and is designed to accommodate unirradiated and irradiated fuel with stricter controls than Region 1. The Region 2 racks have a 9.05 inch nominal center-to-center pitch with no flux-trap water gap. Additionally, the Region 2 racks contain Boral, a neutron absorber panel insert. The larger pitch and the presence of a flux-trap permit Region 1 racks greater storage flexibility.

By letter dated May 4, 1994, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) approved the rerecking of the Salem SFPs. In approving these amendments, the NRC staff reviewed the criticality analyses used to demonstrate that the licensee could safely implement the desired changes. These amendments still serve as the current licensing basis

for the Salem SFPs. The licensee's current amendment request used the 1994 amendment and its licensing basis as the technical justification for one of the proposed TSs. To improve the controls on its SFPs, PSEG proposed three changes to the Salem TSs.

2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

In Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 50.36, the NRC established its regulatory requirements related to the content of TSs. Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.36, TSs are required to include items in the following five specific categories: (1) safety limits, limiting safety system settings, and limiting control settings; (2) limiting conditions for operation (LCOs); (3) surveillance requirements (SRs); (4) design features; and (5) administrative controls. The regulation does not specify the particular requirements to be included in a plant's TSs.

On July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132), the Commission published a "Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors" (Final Policy Statement) which discussed the criteria to determine which items are required to be included in the TSs as LCOs. The criteria were subsequently incorporated into the regulations by an amendment to 10 CFR 50.36 (60 FR 36953). Specifically, 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii) requires that a TS LCO be established for each item meeting one or more of the following criteria:

- (A) Criterion 1: Installed instrumentation that is used to detect, and indicate in the control room, a significant abnormal degradation of the reactor coolant pressure boundary.
- (B) Criterion 2: A process variable, design feature, or operating restriction that is an initial condition of a design basis accident [DBA] or transient analysis that either assumes the failure of or presents a challenge to the integrity of a fission product barrier.
- (C) Criterion 3: A structure, system, or component [SSC] that is part of the primary success path and which functions or actuates to mitigate a design basis accident or transient that either assumes the failure of or presents a challenge to the integrity of a fission product barrier.
- (D) Criterion 4: A structure, system, or component which operating experience or probabilistic risk assessment has shown to be significant to public health and safety.

In general, there are two classes of changes to TSs: (1) changes needed to reflect modifications to the design basis (TSs are derived from the design basis), and (2) changes to take advantage of the evolution in policy and guidance as to the required content and preferred format of TSs over time. In determining the acceptability of such changes, the staff interprets the requirements of 10 CFR 50.36, using as a model the accumulation of generically approved guidance in the improved Standard Technical Specifications (STSs). For this review, the staff used NUREG-1431, Revision 2, "Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants." The STSs reflect the general guidance and LCO scoping criteria provided by the Commission's Final Policy Statement. In addition, NUREG-1431 provides an acceptable methodology for a consistent TS format for most Westinghouse plants.

Within this general framework, licensees may remove material from their TSs on two conditions: (1) the material is not required to be in the TSs based on the staff's interpretation of 10 CFR 50.36, including judgments about the level of detail required in the TSs; and (2) there exist suitable alternative regulatory controls for the relocated material (e.g., 10 CFR 50.59). Licensees may revise the remaining TSs to adopt current improved STS format and content provided that plant-specific review supports a finding of continued adequate safety because: (1) the change is editorial, administrative, or provides clarification (i.e., no requirements are materially altered); (2) the change is more restrictive than the licensee's current requirement; or (3) the change is less restrictive than the licensee's current requirement, but nonetheless still affords adequate assurance of safety when judged against current regulatory standards.

Part 50 to 10 CFR, Appendix A, "General Design Criteria (GDC) for Nuclear Power Plants," provides a list of the minimum design requirements for nuclear power plants. According to GDC 62, "Prevention of criticality in fuel storage and handling," licensees must limit the potential for criticality in the fuel handling and storage system by physical systems or processes. The NRC staff reviewed the amendment requests to ensure that PSEG complied with GDC 62.

Section 50.68 of 10 CFR, "Criticality accident requirements," provides regulatory requirements for maintaining subcritical conditions in SFPs. Since the licensee currently uses 10 CFR 50.68 as the licensing basis for its SFP, the NRC staff reviewed the proposed changes against the appropriate parts of the section. The acceptance criteria for prevention of criticality in the SFP is referred to as k_{eff} , and k_{eff} shall be less than or equal to 0.95 if fully flooded with unborated water, which includes an allowance for uncertainties at a 95/95 level.

On October 3, 1988, the NRC issued Generic Letter (GL) 88-16, "Removal of Cycle-Specific Parameter Limits from Technical Specifications." GL 88-16 provides guidance to licensees on relocating cycle-specific TS limits to a Core Operating Limits Report (COLR). The NRC stated that cycle-specific parameters may be relocated to the COLR if the licensee uses an NRC-approved methodology, and references the topical report documenting the approved methodology in the appropriate TS section.

3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

3.1 Description of Proposed TS Changes

PSEG described the requested changes to the Salem TSs and provided marked-up and revised TS pages in its February 14, 2003, amendment request. Revised TS pages were also provided in the licensee's October 2, 2003, supplement. The NRC staff reviewed each of these changes against the regulatory criteria described in Section 2.0. The following is a descriptive list of proposed changes requested by the licensee:

1. Add new TS 3/4.7.11, "Fuel Storage Pool Boron Concentration": This proposed TS addition would incorporate a new SFP boron concentration limit into the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) for Salem. The licensee proposed to establish the limit as greater than or equal to 800 parts-per-million (ppm). Additionally, the licensee added a new action statement to be effective when boron concentration drops below the LCO limit, and added a new surveillance requirement (SR) to verify SFP boron concentration at least once per seven days.

2. Add new TS 3/4.7.12, "Fuel Assembly Storage in the Spent Fuel Pool": This proposed TS would relocate the fuel storage limitations currently located in TS 5.6.1.2d to the new LCO. The NRC approved the current TS 5.6.1.2d in a 1994 amendment and the licensee is not proposing to change any of those requirements.
3. TS 3/4.9.1, "Boron Concentration": The licensee proposed to revise this section to relocate requirements for boron concentration during refueling operations from TS Sections 3.0 and 4.0, LCO and SRs, to Section 6.0, Administrative Controls, as part of the COLR.

In determining the acceptability of PSEG's amendment request, the staff reviewed three aspects of the licensee's analyses: (1) the current NRC-approved criticality analyses for Salem; (2) the relocation of the fuel assembly storage requirements to an LCO; and (3) the relocation of refueling boron concentration to the COLR. For each part of the review, the NRC staff evaluated whether or not the licensee's analyses and methodologies provided reasonable assurance that adequate safety margins, in accordance with NRC regulations, were developed and could be maintained in the Salem SFPs. The NRC staff did not review the criticality analyses for the purpose of determining their acceptability, since that had been previously performed by the NRC in 1994. Instead, the NRC staff reviewed the criticality analyses to determine the appropriate TS limit on SFP soluble boron concentration.

3.2 Technical Review

3.2.1 Fuel Storage Pool Boron Concentration

PSEG proposes to add a new TS 3/4.7.11 to establish limits for the control of SFP soluble boron concentration. Boron concentration is a process variable and operating restriction that is an initial condition of a design-basis accident (fuel-handling accident) and transient analysis (boron concentration dilution) that either assumes the failure or presents a challenge to the integrity of the fission product barrier (fuel cladding). Therefore, the addition of TS 3/4.7.11 to the TS as an LCO is appropriate since it satisfies the requirements for inclusion in the TSs as set forth in 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(B).

As previously stated, the NRC staff provided a detailed description of the review it performed to approve the criticality analyses for the SFPs in a letter dated May 4, 1994. Those analyses served as the basis for the NRC staff's review of the current license amendment request submitted by PSEG. In its review of the 1994 amendment request, the NRC staff determined that the criticality aspects of the proposed rerack modifications to the Salem SFP storage racks were acceptable, and that Salem met the requirements of GDC 62.

Under Salem's current licensing basis, PSEG is not permitted to credit soluble boron during normal operating conditions. However, the NRC staff does not require the assumption of two unlikely, independent concurrent events to ensure protection against a criticality accident, i.e. the Double Contingency Principle. The absence of soluble boron from the SFP, in addition to a fuel assembly misloading event, would constitute two unlikely, independent events. Therefore, in addition to satisfying the requirements set forth in 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(B), the inclusion of a SFP soluble boron concentration will further ensure that the licensee has appropriate defense-in-depth controls to maintain the Salem SFPs in a subcritical state.

In its current amendment request, PSEG recalculated the minimum soluble boron concentration required to ensure subcriticality was maintained in the Salem SFPs during the most adverse accident conditions. In its 1994 amendment request, the licensee determined that 600 ppm of soluble boron would be adequate to ensure that a k_{eff} of 0.95 was not exceeded during the limiting assembly misloading event. The licensee used a conservative soluble boron worth of 10 percent-milli-rho (pcm)/ppm to determine the boron concentration (600 ppm) necessary to meet the regulatory limit. In its application dated February 14, 2003, PSEG recalculated the required boron concentration using a more conservative boron worth of 8.5 pcm/ppm as well as a 100 ppm boron concentration measurement uncertainty. Based on these conservative assumptions, the licensee calculated a required boron concentration of 800 ppm.

The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's calculations of the required soluble boron concentration and agrees that the calculation methodology results in a conservative determination of the proposed TS limit. Currently, the Salem TSs do not require the SFP to contain any soluble boron, but the licensee administratively controls the soluble boron concentration in the Salem SFPs. However, the addition of the requested TS limit will increase safety by providing regulatory controls and requiring routine surveillance. Therefore, based on the conservative calculation employed by the licensee and the NRC staff's review of the previously-approved criticality calculations, the NRC staff finds the licensee's proposed TS 3/4.7.11, "Boron Concentration," to be acceptable.

3.2.2 Relocation of Fuel Assembly Storage Requirements

In its approval of PSEG's rerack amendment, the staff imposed TSs on the licensee to control the fuel assembly storage requirements in the Salem SFPs. Currently, those requirements are located in TS 5.6.1.2d. Specifically, the fuel storage requirements control the storage of both unirradiated and irradiated fuel assemblies in the Region 1 and 2 racks. Storage of spent fuel assemblies is restricted based on an assembly's burnup and enrichment. Fresh fuel assembly storage is controlled based on enrichment, storage position within the racks, integrated fuel burnable poison loading, and checkerboard configurations. Each region of the Salem SFPs has its own storage restrictions.

As part of its current amendment request, the licensee proposed to relocate the requirements of TS 5.6.1.2d to a new TS LCO 3/4.7.12. Proposed TS 3/4.7.12 contains the unaltered requirements of TS 5.6.1.2d in a format that provides the LCO, its applicability, action statements if the LCO is not met, and SRs. The NRC staff reviewed the proposed TS to determine if the relocation of the fuel storage requirements would affect the licensee's ability to meet the requirements. The NRC staff found that the proposed TS was consistent with Westinghouse STS 3.7.17 requirements for spent fuel storage. Specifically, the proposed TS 3/4.7.12 is consistent with Westinghouse STS 3.7.17 regarding the wording of the LCO, its applicability, and its actions statements. The licensee's proposed SRs for TS 3/4.7.12 provide detailed controls to ensure the proper loading and storage of spent fuel assemblies in the storage racks. Additionally, the NRC staff found that the proposed TS 3/4.7.12 actually improved the effectiveness of the previous fuel storage requirements listed in current TS 5.6.1.2d. The added applicability requirements and action statements clarify the intent of the TS requirements and provide clear guidance on actions to be taken when conditions are not met. The licensee's proposed TS 3/4.7.12 improves the safety of the plant by ensuring fuel assembly storage requirements are unambiguous, while retaining plant Design Features

required by 10 CFR 50.36(c)(4) in TS Section 5.0. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the relocation of TS 5.6.1.2d requirements to new TS 3/4.7.12 is acceptable.

3.2.3 Relocation of Refueling Boron Concentration to the COLR

In its February 14, 2003, letter, the licensee proposed to relocate the Refueling Boron Concentration limit from TS 3/4.9.1 to the COLR. The proposed change would keep the LCO, but relocate the specific limiting value for boron concentration by adding a reference to the COLR. PSEG stated that this change would improve operational flexibility since the limit was cycle-specific and changes to the core loading were resulting in challenges to the current limit. The licensee added that the proposed change was consistent with the Westinghouse STSs.

As previously discussed, boron concentration is a process variable and operating restriction that is an initial condition in the fuel-handling accident and boron concentration dilution event analyses. Therefore, because it satisfies the requirements for inclusion in TSs as set forth in 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(B), maintaining an LCO for refueling boron concentration in TS 3/4.9.1 is still appropriate.

GL 88-16 guidance states that cycle-specific parameters may be relocated to the COLR if the licensee uses an NRC-approved methodology, and references the topical report documenting the approved methodology in the appropriate TS section. Consistent with this guidance, the NRC staff determined that the refueling boron concentration is a cycle-specific parameter, and that its relocation to the COLR is acceptable, when it reviewed and approved the Westinghouse STSs.

The NRC staff confirmed that the licensee's proposed revisions to TS 3/4.9.1 were consistent with the Westinghouse STS 3.9.1 for refueling boron concentration. However, the staff determined that since the SFP was connected to the refueling canal and refueling cavity, the potential existed for the proposed lower boron concentration (800 ppm) in the SFP to cause a dilution of the refueling cavity. By letter dated October 2, 2003, the licensee addressed this concern by adding the SFP to the proposed TS 3/4.9.1, thereby ensuring the SFP and refueling cavity would have the same boron concentration limits while they were physically connected during refueling activities. The NRC staff finds that this change eliminates the possibility of diluting the refueling cavity, and is, therefore, acceptable.

The NRC staff also reviewed the methodology that PSEG will use to calculate the specific concentration limit for each cycle. In its February 14, 2003, letter, the licensee provided a summary of the methodology it will use to calculate the appropriate limits. Additionally, the licensee stated in its letter dated October 2, 2003, that WCAP-9272-P-A, "Westinghouse Reload Safety Evaluation Methodology," is an NRC-approved methodology that is listed in the proposed revision to TS 6.9.1.9, "Core Operating Limits Report." The NRC staff confirmed that WCAP-9272-P-A is an approved methodology to calculate refueling pool boron concentration. Therefore, because the proposed changes to the Salem TSs will continue to require that the licensee control refueling boron concentration by conforming to a value that is calculated using an NRC-approved methodology, the proposed relocation of this cycle-specific parameter to the COLR assures that the licensee will continue to comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii)(B). The proposed changes also meet GL 88-16 guidelines, and are consistent with NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specification Westinghouse Plants." Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes that the proposed changes to TS 3/4.9.1 are acceptable.

3.2.4 NRC Staff's Conclusion

The staff reviewed the effects of the proposed changes using the appropriate requirements of 10 CFR Sections 50.36 and 50.68, and GDC 62. The staff found that the licensee's amendment request provided reasonable assurance that under both normal and accident conditions the licensee would be able to safely operate the plant and comply with the NRC regulations. Therefore, the NRC staff finds PSEG's amendment requests to be acceptable.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the New Jersey State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes SRs. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (68 FR 22753). Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendments.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

7.0 REFERENCES

1. Letter from T.J. O'Conner (PSEG) to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Revision to Request for Change in Technical Specifications," dated February 14, 2003, ADAMS Accession No. ML030690374.
2. Letter from A.C. Bakken III (PSEG) to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Supplement to Request for Change to Technical Specifications," dated October 2, 2003, ADAMS Accession No. ML033490589.
3. Letter from J.C. Stone (NRC) to S.E. Miltenberger (PSEG), "Spent Fuel Pool Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2 (TAC Nos. M85797 and M85798," dated May 4, 1994.

4. Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 50 Appendix A, General Design Criteria 62, "Prevention of criticality in fuel storage and handling."
5. Section 50.68 of 10 CFR, "Criticality accident requirements."
6. Generic Letter 88-16, "Removal of Cycle-Specific Parameter Limits from Technical Specifications," dated October 3, 1988.
7. NUREG-1431, Revision 2, "Standard Technical Specifications Westinghouse Plants," June 2001.
8. WCAP-9272-P-A, "Westinghouse Reload Safety Evaluation Methodology," July 1985.

Principal Contributors: R. Taylor
P. Hearn
R. Fretz

Date: February 6, 2004