

Tennessee Valley Authority, Post Office Box 2000, Spring City, Tennessee 37381-2000

JUN 2 3 2000

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ATTN: Document Control Desk Washington, D.C. 20555

Gentlemen:

In the Matter of Tennessee Valley Authority Docket No. 50-390

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT (WBN) UNIT 1 - REVISED INFORMATION -TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION (TS) CHANGE NO. 00-06 - INCREASE UNIT 1 REACTOR POWER TO 3459 MWt

)

}

Reference: TVA Letter to NRC Dated June 7, 2000, "Watts Bar Nuclear Plant (WBN) Unit 1 - Technical Specification (TS) Change No. 00-06 - Increase Unit 1 Reactor Power To 3459 MWt"

In the referenced letter, TVA submitted a request for an amendment to WBN's license NPF-90 to change the Operating License and Unit 1 TS to increase the full core thermal power rating by 1.4% from 3411 MWt to 3459 MWt. To assist the NRC Staff's review of TVA's request, Enclosure 6 of that letter provided a response to NRC questions raised in a similar licensing action for the Texas Utilities' Comanche Peak Unit 2. The purpose of this letter is to provide a revised response to Question No. 1 of TU letter TXX-99195, provided in Enclosure 6, Page E6-25 of TVA's June 7, 2000 letter.

If you have any questions about this change, please contact me at (423) 365-1824.

Sincerely,

Paul L. Pace, Manager Licensing and Industry Affairs

Enclosure cc: See page 2



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Page 2

JUN 2 3 2000

.

cc (Enclosure): NRC Resident Inspector Watts Bar Nuclear Plant 1260 Nuclear Plant Road Spring City, Tennessee 37381

Mr. Robert E. Martin, Senior Project Manager U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission One White Flint North 11555 Rockville Pike Rockville, Maryland 20852

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region II Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center 61 Forsyth St., SW, Suite 23T85 Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Michael H. Mobley, Director Division of Radiological Health 3rd Floor L & C Annex Nashville, Tennessee 37423

ENCLOSURE

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT (WBN) UNIT 1 - DOCKET NO. 390

REVISED RESPONSE TO QUESTION 1 (TXX-99195) PROVIDED IN ENCLOSURE 6 (Page E6-25) OF TVA's LETTER OF JUNE 7, 2000

Question 1 (TXX-99195):

Provide a comparison of the relevant acceptance criterion to the appropriate design limit (e.g., DNBR, RCS Pressure) for each of the following safety analyses:

- 15.4.2 Uncontrolled RCCA withdrawal from power
- 15.4.7 Misloaded fuel assembly
- 15.4.8 Rod Ejection
- 15.4.3 Dropped RCCA

Response:

Refer to Enclosure 1, Section III.6.5 for a discussion of the evaluation performed for the uncontrolled RCCA withdrawal at power, rod ejection and dropped rod events.

The misloaded fuel assembly event is discussed in Section 15.3.3 of the FSAR. The FSAR analysis remains valid for the 1.4% uprate conditions. The FSAR describes the administrative controls in place to prevent a core misload. In the unlikely event that a misload occurs, the resulting power distribution effects will either be readily detectable by the incore moveable detector system or will cause a sufficiently small perturbation to be within acceptable limits. This detection process is performed during power ascension testing (at several steps between HZP and HFP conditions). Therefore, since the core full power rating does not impact the administrative controls in place or the incore detection system usage below HFP conditions, FSAR Section 15.3.3 remains valid.