

ATTACHMENT 2

REVISED INSERT A

QUAD CITIES Section 6.9.A.6.b Technical Specification Insert

- (19) ANFB Critical Power Correlation Application for Coresident Fuel, EMF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix C, Siemens Power Corporation, August 1997.
- (20) ANFB Critical Power Correlation Determination of ATRIUM-9B Additive Constant Uncertainties, ANF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix E, Siemens Power Corporation, September, 1998.

9810210051 981013
PDR ADOCK 05000237
P PDR

ATTACHMENT 2

REVISED INSERT B

DRESDEN Section 6.9.A.6.b Technical Specification Insert

- (12) ANF-1125(P)(A), ANFB Critical Power Correlation Determination of ATRIUM-9B Additive Constant Uncertainties, Supplement 1, Appendix E, Siemens Power Corporation, September, 1998.

ATTACHMENT 2

REVISED INSERT C

LASALLE UNIT 1 Bases Section 2.1.2 Technical Specification Insert

6. ANFB Critical Power Correlation Application for Coresident Fuel, EMF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix C, Siemens Power Corporation, August 1997.
7. ANFB Critical Power Correlation Determination of ATRIUM-9B Additive Constant Uncertainties, ANF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix E, Siemens Power Corporation, September, 1998.

ATTACHMENT 2

REVISED INSERT D

LASALLE UNIT 1 Section 6.6.A.6.b Technical Specification Insert

- (23) BWR Jet Pump Model Revision for RELAX, ANF-91-048(P)(A), Supplement 1 and Supplement 2, Siemens Power Corporation, October 1997.
- (24) ANFB Critical Power Correlation Application for Coresident Fuel, EMF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix C, Siemens Power Corporation, August 1997.
- (25) ANFB Critical Power Correlation Determination of ATRIUM-9B Additive Constant Uncertainties, ANF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix E, Siemens Power Corporation, September, 1998.

ATTACHMENT 2

REVISED INSERT E

LASALLE UNIT 2 Bases Section 2.1.2 Technical Specification Insert

6. ANFB Critical Power Correlation Application for Coresident Fuel, EMF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix C, Siemens Power Corporation, August 1997.
7. ANFB Critical Power Correlation Determination of ATRIUM-9B Additive Constant Uncertainties, ANF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix E, Siemens Power Corporation, September, 1998.

ATTACHMENT 2

REVISED INSERT F

LASALLE UNIT 2 Section 6.6.A.6.b Technical Specification Insert

- (23) BWR Jet Pump Model Revision for RELAX, ANF-91-048(P)(A), Supplement 1 and Supplement 2, Siemens Power Corporation, October 1997.
- (24) ANFB Critical Power Correlation Application for Coresident Fuel, EMF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix C, Siemens Power Corporation, August 1997.
- (25) ANFB Critical Power Correlation Determination of ATRIUM-9B Additive Constant Uncertainties, ANF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1, Appendix E, Siemens Power Corporation, September, 1998.

ATTACHMENT 3

REVISED EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATIONS

The following outline provides a list of the changes requested in this Technical Specification Submittal.

1. Addition of Siemens Power Corporation (SPC) Revised Jet Pump Methodology (LaSalle Units 1 and 2)
2. Addition of SPC Generic Methodology for Application of ANFB Critical Power Correlation to Non-SPC Fuel (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)
3. Addition of SPC Topical for Revised ANFB Correlation Uncertainty (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)
4. Change to Minimum Critical Power Ratio Safety Limit (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)
5. Removal of Footnotes Limiting Operation with ATRIUM-9B Fuel Reloads (Quad Cities Unit 2 and Dresden Units 2 and 3)
6. Revision to Thermal Limit Descriptions (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

Adding References 1, 3, and 7 to Technical Specification Section 6 and applying these methods at ComEd BWRs is evaluated for significant hazards consideration in this section. These documents have been submitted to the NRC under separate correspondence. References 1, 3, and 7 have received NRC approval.

ComEd has evaluated the proposed Technical Specification amendment and determined it does not represent a significant hazards consideration. Based on the criteria for defining a significant hazard consideration established in 10 CFR 50.92(c), operation of Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2, in accordance with the proposed amendments, will not represent a significant hazards consideration for the following reasons:

These changes do not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The probability of an evaluated accident is derived from the probabilities of the individual precursors to that accident. The consequences of an evaluated accident are determined by the operability of plant systems designed to mitigate those consequences. Limits have been established consistent with NRC approved methods to ensure that fuel performance during normal, transient, and accident conditions is acceptable. These changes do not affect the operability of plant systems, nor do they compromise any fuel performance limits.

a. Addition of SPC Revised Jet Pump Methodology (LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The Reference 1 methodology to be added to the Technical Specifications is used as part of the LOCA analysis and does not introduce physical changes to the plant. The Reference 1 revised jet pump model changes the calculational behavior of the jet pump under reversed drive flow conditions. The revised jet pump model methodology makes the LOCA model behave more realistically and calculates small break LOCA PCTs that are comparable to the large break LOCA results. Therefore, this change only affects the methodology for analyzing the LOCA event and determining the protective APLHGR limits. The Technical Specification requirements for monitoring APLHGR are not affected by this change. The revised method will result in higher APLHGR limits, thus the SPC fuel will be allowed to operate at higher nodal powers. The approved methodology, however, still protects the fuel performance limits specified by 10 CFR 50.46. Therefore, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated will not change.

b. Addition of SPC Generic Methodology for Application of ANFB Critical Power Correlation to Non-SPC Fuel (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident are not increased by adding Reference 3 to Section 6.9.A.6.b of the Quad Cities Technical Specifications and Bases Section 2.1.2 and Section 6.6.A.6.b of the LaSalle Technical Specifications. Reference 3 determines the additive constants and the associated uncertainty for application of the ANFB correlation to the coresident GE fuel. Therefore, it provides data that is used in the determination of the MCPR Safety Limit. This approved methodology for applying the ANFB critical

power correlation to the GE fuel will protect the fuel from boiling transition. Operational MCPR limits will also be applied to ensure that the MCPR Safety Limit is protected during all modes of operation and anticipated operational occurrences. Because Reference 3 contains conservative methods and calculations and because the operability of plant systems designed to mitigate any consequences of accidents have not changed, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated will not increase.

c. Addition of SPC Topical for Revised ANFB Correlation Uncertainty (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident are not increased by adding Reference 7 to Section 6.9.A.6.b of the Quad Cities and Dresden Technical Specifications and Bases Section 2.1.2 and Section 6.6.A.6.b of the LaSalle Technical Specifications. Reference 7 documents the additive constant uncertainty for the SPC ATRIUM-9B fuel design with an internal water channel. This methodology is used to determine an input to the MCPR Safety Limit calculations, which ensures that at least 99.9% of the fuel rods avoid transition boiling during normal operation as well as anticipated operational occurrences. This change does not require any physical plant modifications, physically affect any plant components, or entail changes in plant operation. This methodology for determining the ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainty for the MCPR Safety Limit calculation will continue to support protecting the fuel from boiling transition. Operational MCPR limits will be applied to ensure the MCPR Safety Limit is not violated during all modes of operation and anticipated operational occurrences. Therefore, no individual precursors of an accident are affected and the operability of plant systems designed to mitigate the probability or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated is not affected by these changes.

d. Change to Minimum Critical Power Ratio Safety Limit (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

Changing the MCPR Safety Limit at Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2 will not increase the probability or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The MCPR Safety Limits for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2 are anticipated to be conservative and acceptable for future cycles. Cycle specific MCPR Safety Limit calculations will be performed, consistent with SPC's approved methodology, to confirm the appropriateness of the MCPR Safety Limit. Additionally, operational MCPR limits will be applied that will ensure the MCPR Safety Limit is not violated during all modes of operation and anticipated operational occurrences. The MCPR Safety Limits are being set at the CPR value where less than 0.1% of

the rods in the core are expected to experience boiling transition. These Safety Limits are expected to be applicable for future cycles of ATRIUM-9B. Therefore the probability or consequences of an accident will not increase.

e. Removal of Footnotes Limiting Operation with ATRIUM-9B Fuel Reloads (Quad Cities Unit 2 and Dresden Units 2 and 3)

The removal of footnotes from the Quad Cities and Dresden Technical Specifications does not involve any significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The footnotes were added to clarify that cycle specific methods were used until the generic methodology was approved by the NRC. Since the NRC has approved SPC's generic methodology for application of the ANFB correlation to the coresident GE fuel (Reference 3) and SPC has addressed the concerns regarding the database used to calculate the ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainties (Reference 7), the footnotes are no longer necessary. The removal of the Unit 2 specific "a" pages, 2-1a and B2-3a, in the Quad Cities Technical Specifications is justified by the removal of the footnotes. Therefore, removing these footnotes and "a" pages does not require any physical plant modifications, nor does it physically affect any plant components or entail changes in plant operation. Therefore, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not expected to increase.

f. Revision to Thermal Limit Descriptions (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The revision to the Section 3 Technical Specification description of the APLHGR limits has no implications on accident analysis or plant operations. The purpose of the revision is to allow flexibility for the MAPLHGR limits and their exposure basis to be specified in the COLR and to establish consistency with approved methodologies currently utilized by Siemens Power Corporation, which calculate MAPLHGR limits based on bundle or planar average exposures. This revision also provides for consistency in the APLHGR limit Technical Specification wording between the ComEd BWRs. The revision to the 3.11.D SLHGR Technical Specification for Dresden also has no implications on accident analysis or plant operations. The purpose of this revision is to allow flexibility for the LHGR limits and their exposure basis to be specified in the COLR. This revision makes the Dresden LHGR definition consistent with NUREG 1433/1434, Revision 1 wording. The definition of the Average Planar Exposure is deleted, because the exposure basis of the APLHGR and LHGR is being removed. Therefore, no plant equipment or processes are affected by this change. Thus, there is no alteration in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated:

Creation of the possibility of a new or different kind of accident would require the creation of one or more new precursors of that accident. New accident precursors may be created by modifications to the plant configuration, including changes in allowable modes of operation. This Technical Specification submittal does not involve any modifications to the plant configuration or allowable modes of operation. No new precursors of an accident are created and no new or different kinds of accidents are created. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

a. Addition of SPC Revised Jet Pump Methodology (LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The revised jet pump model methodology will be used to analyze the LOCA for LaSalle Units 1 and 2, and does not introduce any physical changes to the plant or the processes used to operate the plant. This change only affects the methods used to analyze the LOCA event and determine the MAPLHGR limits. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident is not created.

b. Addition of SPC Generic Methodology for Application of ANFB Critical Power Correlation to Non-SPC Fuel (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

Addition of the generic methodology for the application of the ANFB critical power correlation to GE fuel in Section 6.9.A.6.b of the Quad Cities Technical Specifications and Bases Section 2.1.2 and Section 6.6.A.6.b of the LaSalle Technical Specifications does not introduce any physical changes to the plant, the processes used to operate the plant, or allowable modes of operation. This change only involves adding an NRC approved methodology, which is used to determine the additive constants and additive constant uncertainty for GE fuel, to Section 6 of the Technical Specifications. Therefore, no new precursors of an accident are created and no new or different kinds of accidents are created.

c. Addition of SPC Topical for Revised ANFB Correlation Uncertainty (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

Addition of the Reference 7 methodology to Section 6.9.A.6.b of the Quad Cities and Dresden Technical Specifications and Bases Section 2.1.2 and Section 6.6.A.6.b of the LaSalle Technical Specifications will not create the possibility of

a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. This methodology describes the calculation of an input to the MCPR Safety Limit – the ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainty. This change does not introduce any physical changes to the plant, the processes used to operate the plant, or allowable modes of operation. Therefore, no new precursors of an accident are created and no new or different kinds of accidents are created.

d. Change to Minimum Critical Power Ratio Safety Limit (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

Changing the MCPR Safety Limit will not create the possibility of a new accident from an accident previously evaluated. This change will not alter or add any new equipment or change modes of operation. The MCPR Safety Limit is established to ensure that 99.9% of the rods avoid boiling transition.

The MCPR Safety Limit is changing for Quad Cities, Dresden Unit 3 and LaSalle due to the revised ATRIUM-9B additive constants and the ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainty calculated in Reference 7. The new MCPR Safety Limit for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2 are greater than the current values at Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2 and are being increased now in anticipation of bounding future reloads of ATRIUM-9B. This change does not introduce any physical changes to the plant, the processes used to operate the plant, or allowable modes of operation. Therefore, no new accidents are created that are different from any accident previously evaluated.

e. Removal of Footnotes Limiting Operation with ATRIUM-9B Fuel Reloads (Quad Cities Unit 2 and Dresden Units 2 and 3)

The removal of the footnotes from the Quad Cities and Dresden Technical Specifications does not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The removal of the footnotes does not affect plant systems or operation. The footnotes were temporarily established to implement a conservative cycle specific MCPR Safety Limit until the SPC generic methodology was approved. With the approval of References 3 and 7, these footnotes are no longer applicable. Removing these footnotes does not introduce any physical changes to the plant, the processes used to operate the plant, or allowable modes of operation. The removal of the Unit 2 specific “a” pages, 2-1a and B2-3a, in the Quad Cities Technical Specifications, which is justified by the removal of the footnotes, also does not create a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

f. Revision to Thermal Limit Descriptions (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle 1 and 2)

The revision of the APLHGR and LHGR limit descriptions will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. This revision will not alter any plant systems, equipment, or physical conditions of the site. This revision allows the flexibility of the APLHGR and the LHGR limits to be specified in the COLR and to maintain consistency with the calculated results of methodologies currently used to determine the APLHGR. The definition of the Average Planar Exposure is deleted, because it is being removed from LHGR and APLHGR Technical Specifications. This change does not introduce any physical changes to the plant, the processes used to operate the plant, or allowable modes of operation. Therefore this change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety for the following reasons:

a. Addition of SPC Revised Jet Pump Methodology (LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The revised jet pump model methodology, and the MAPLHGRs, resulting from the revised jet pump methodology, will continue to ensure fuel design criteria and 10 CFR 50.46 compliance. The results of LOCA analyses performed with this methodology must continue to comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.46. Therefore, there is no significant reduction in the margin of safety.

b. Addition of SPC Generic Methodology for Application of ANFB Critical Power Correlation to Non-SPC Fuel (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2 and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The margin of safety is not decreased by adding Reference 3 to Section 6.9.A.6.b of the Quad Cities Technical Specifications and Bases Section 2.1.2 and Section 6.6.A.6.b of the LaSalle Technical Specifications. Siemens Power Corporation methodology for application of the ANFB Critical Power Correlation to coresident GE fuel is approved by the NRC and is the same methodology used in the cycle specific topicals for coresident fuel (References 4 and 5). The MCPR Safety Limit will continue to ensure that greater than 99.9% of the rods in the core avoid boiling transition. Additionally, operating limits will be established to ensure the MCPR Safety Limit is not violated during all modes of operation.

c. Addition of SPC Topical for Revised ANFB Correlation Uncertainty (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The MCPR Safety Limit provides a margin of safety by ensuring that less than 0.1% of the rods are expected to be in boiling transition if the MCPR Safety Limit is not violated. This Technical Specification amendment request proposes to insert the topical report that describes SPC's calculation of the ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainty. The new ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainty calculation is conservative and is based on a larger database than previous calculations. Because the criteria of ensuring that 99.9% of the rods are expected to avoid boiling transition has not been changed and a conservative method is used to calculate the ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainty, a decrease in the margin to safety will not occur due to adding this methodology to the Technical Specifications. In addition, operational limits will be established to ensure the MCPR Safety Limit is protected for all modes of operation. This revised methodology will ensure that the appropriate level of fuel protection is being employed.

d. Change to Minimum Critical Power Ratio Safety Limit (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

Changing the MCPR Safety Limit for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Unit 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2 will not involve any reduction in margin of safety. The MCPR Safety Limit provides a margin of safety by ensuring that less than 0.1% of the rods are calculated to be in boiling transition if the MCPR Safety Limit is not violated. The proposed Technical Specification amendment request reflects the MCPR Safety Limit results from conservative evaluations by SPC using the ANFB critical power correlation with the ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainty calculated in Reference 7.

Because a conservative method is used to apply the ATRIUM-9B additive constant uncertainty in the MCPR Safety Limit calculation, a decrease in the margin to safety will not occur due to changing the MCPR Safety Limit. The revised MCPR Safety Limit will ensure the appropriate level of fuel protection. Additionally, operational limits will be established based on the proposed MCPR Safety Limit to ensure that the MCPR Safety Limit is not violated during all modes of operation including anticipated operation occurrences. This will ensure that the fuel design safety criterion of more than 99.9% of the fuel rods avoiding transition boiling during normal operation as well as during an anticipated operational occurrence is met.

e. Removal of Footnotes Limiting Operation with ATRIUM-9B Fuel Reloads (Quad Cities Unit 2 and Dresden Units 2 and 3)

The removal of the cycle specific footnotes in Quad Cities and Dresden Technical Specifications does not impose a change in the margin of safety. These footnotes were added due to concerns regarding the calculation of the additive constant uncertainty for the ATRIUM-9B fuel and the cycle specific application of the ANFB critical power correlation to coresident GE fuel in Quad Cities Unit 2 Cycle 15. Because the generic ANFB application to coresident GE fuel MCPR methodology (Reference 3) has received NRC approval and the topical report describing the increased database used to calculate the additive constant uncertainties for ATRIUM-9B (Reference 7) has also received NRC approval and both are proposed to be added to the Technical Specifications in this amendment request, there is no reason for the footnotes to remain. Removal of the Unit 2 specific "a" pages, 2-1a and B2-3a, in the Quad Cities Technical Specifications is justified by the removal of the footnotes. Therefore, the removal of the "a" pages, 2-1a and B2-3a, also does not impose a change in the margin of safety.

f. Revision to Thermal Limit Descriptions (Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, Dresden Units 2 and 3, and LaSalle Units 1 and 2)

The revision to the APLHGR and LHGR limit descriptions will not involve a reduction in the margin of safety. The methodology used to calculate the APLHGR must comply with the guidelines of Appendix K of 10 CFR Part 50, and the APLHGR and LHGR will still be required to be maintained within the limits specified in the COLR. The surveillance requirements for these two thermal limits remain unchanged. Thus, there will be no reduction in the margin of safety.

Guidance has been provided in "Final Procedures and Standards on No Significant Hazards Considerations," Final Rule, 51 FR 7744, for the application of standards to license change requests for determination of the existence of significant hazards considerations. This document provides examples of amendments which are and are not considered likely to involve significant hazards considerations. This proposed amendment most closely fits the example of a change which may either result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan.

This proposed Technical Specification amendment request does not involve a significant relaxation of the criteria used to establish the safety limits, a significant relaxation of the bases for the limiting safety system settings, or a significant relaxation of the bases for

the limiting conditions for operations. Therefore, based on the guidance provided in 10 CFR 50.92(c), the proposed change does not constitute a significant hazards consideration.

ATTACHMENT 4

REVISED REFERENCE LIST

1. ANF-91-048(P)(A), Supplement 1 and Supplement 2, "BWR Jet Pump Model Revision for RELAX", October 1997 and NRC SER, "Review of Siemens Topical Report ANF-91-048(P), *BWR Jet Pump Revisions for RELAX* (TAC No M995381), T. H. Essig to H. D. Curet, September 19, 1997.
2. XN-NF-80-19(P)(A), "Exxon Nuclear Methodology for Boiling Water Reactors -- Volume 2A, RELAX: A RELAP4 Based Computer Code for Calculating Blowdown Phenomena," June 1981.
3. EMF-1125(P)(A), Supplement 1 Appendix C, "ANFB Critical Power Correlation Application for Coresident Fuel", August 1997, and NRC SER, "Acceptance for Referencing of Licensing Topical Report EMF-1125(P), Supplement 1 Appendix C, "ANFB Critical Power Correlation Application for Co-Resident Fuel", J. E. Lyons to R. A. Copeland, May 9, 1997.
4. EMF-96-021(P), Revision 1, "Application of the ANFB Critical Power Correlation to Coresident GE fuel for LaSalle Unit 2 Cycle 8", February 1996, and NRC SER, "Safety Evaluation for Topical Report EMF-96-021 (P), Revision 1, 'Application of the ANFB Critical Power Correlation to Coresident GE Fuel for LaSalle Unit 2 Cycle 8' (TAC NO. M94964)", D.M. Skay to I. Johnson, September 26, 1996.
5. EMF-96-051(P), "Application of the ANFB Critical Power Correlation to Coresident GE Fuel for Quad Cities Unit 2 Cycle 15", May, 1996, and NRC SER, "Approval of Topical Report EMF-96-051(P) - Quad Cities, Unit 2 (TAC NO. M96213)", R. Pulsifer to I. Johnson, May 16, 1997.
6. ANF-1125(P)(A), Supplements 1 and 2, "ANFB Critical Power Correlation, Advanced Nuclear Fuels Corporation", April 1990.
7. ANF-1125(P), Supplement 1, Appendix E, "ANFB Critical Power Correlation Determination of ATRIUM-9B Additive Constant Uncertainties", and NRC SER, "Acceptance for Referencing of Licensing Topical Report ANF-1125(P), Supplement 1, Appendix E, "ANFB Critical Power Correlation Determination of ATRIUM-9B Additive Constant Uncertainties" (TAC No. MA2437)", T.H. Essig to H.D. Curet, September 23, 1998.

8. ANF-91-048(P)(A), "Advanced Nuclear Fuels Corporation Methodology for Boiling Water Reactors EXEM BWR ECCS Evaluation Model, January 1993.
9. "Dresden Nuclear Power Stations Units 2 and 3 Application for Amendment of Facility Operating License DPR-19 and DPR-25 Technical Specifications, NRC Docket Nos. 050-237 and 050-249," J.S. Perry to US NRC, June 20, 1996.
10. "Dresden Nuclear Power Station Units 2 and 3 Supplement to Application for Amendment of Facility Operating Licenses DPR-19 and DPR-25 Technical Specifications", J.S. Perry to US NRC, December 30, 1996.
11. "Dresden Nuclear Power Station Units 2 and 3 Supplement to Application for Amendment of Facility Operating License DPR-19 and DPR-25 Technical Specifications", J.S. Perry to US NRC, March 5, 1997.
12. "LaSalle County Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2 Application for Amendment Request to Facility Operating Licenses NPF-11 and NPF-18, Technical Specifications Changes for Siemens Power Corporation Fuel Transition Docket Numbers 050-373 and 050-374", R.E. Querio to US NRC, April 8, 1996.
13. "LaSalle County Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2 Supplement to Application for Amendment of Facility Operating Licenses NPF-11 and NPF-18, Appendix A, Technical Specification Changes for Siemens Power Corporation Fuel Transition", W.T. Subalusky to U.S. NRC, October 14, 1996.
14. "Quad Cities Nuclear Power Stations Units 1 and 2, Application for Amendment Request to Facility Operating Licenses DPR-29 and DPR-30, Technical Specification Changes for Siemens Power Corporation (SPC) Fuel Transition, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265", E.S. Kraft, to USNRC, June 10, 1996.
15. "Quad Cities Nuclear Power Stations Units 1 and 2 Supplement to Application for Amendment of Facility Operating License DPR-29 and DPR-30 Technical Specifications", E.S. Kraft to US NRC, February 17, 1997.
16. "Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2 Exigent Application for Amendment Request to Facility Operating Licenses Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91(a)(6), DPR-29 and DPR-30, Technical Specification Changes for Revised Minimum Critical Power Ratio Safety Limit for Quad Cities Unit 2 Cycle 15, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265", E.S. Kraft, Jr. to USNRC, April 21, 1997.
17. "Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2, Emergency Application for Amendment to Facility Operating Licenses Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91, DPR-29 and DPR-30, Operation with ATRIUM-9B Fuel in Modes 3, 4, and 5", E.S. Kraft, Jr. to USNRC, April 29, 1997.

18. "Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit 2 Exigent Amendment Request to Facility Operating License, DPR-19, Technical Specification Submittal for Dresden Unit 2 Cycle 16, Docket No. 50-237", J.M. Heffley to USNRC, March 19, 1998.

19. ComEd submittal, "Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2, Dresden Nuclear Power Station Units 2 and 3, LaSalle County Nuclear Power Station Units 1 and 2, Application for Amendment Request to Facility Operating Licenses, DPR-29 and DPR-30, DPR-19 and DPR-25, and NPF-11 and NPF-18, respectively, Technical Specification Changes for Transition to Siemens Power Corporation ATRIUM-9B Fuel, Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, 50-237 and 50-249, and 50-373 and 50-374, respectively," J. Hosmer to U.S. NRC, August 29, 1997.