

November 2, 1995

Mr. George A. Hunger, Jr.
Director-Licensing, MC 62A-1
PECO Energy Company
Nuclear Group Headquarters
Correspondence Control Desk
P.O. Box No. 195
Wayne, PA 19087-0195

Dear Mr. Hunger:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING, PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3 (TAC NOS. M94114 AND M94120)

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice for your information. This notice relates to your application dated November 21, 1995, regarding a change to the test pressure requirements for the high pressure coolant injection system and the reactor core isolation cooling system surveillance tests. The proposed change also revises Section 5.5.7 of the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3 Technical Specifications to eliminate reference to a section which was previously eliminated.

This notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

^{/s/}
Joseph W. Shea, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-277/50-278

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/enclosure: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
PUBLIC
PDI-2 Reading
SVarga
JStolz
JShea
MO'Brien
OGC
ACRS
WPasciak, RGN-I

CP-1

OFFICE	PDI-2/LS	PDI-2/PM	PDI-2/D		
NAME	MO'Brien	JShea	JStolz		
DATE	11/28/95	11/28/95	11/29/95		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DOCUMENT NAME:G:\SHEA\PB94114.IND

9512040405 951129
PDR ADOCK 05000277
PDR

ENCLOSURE COPY

DF011



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 29, 1995

Mr. George A. Hunger, Jr.
Director-Licensing, MC 62A-1
PECO Energy Company
Nuclear Group Headquarters
Correspondence Control Desk
P.O. Box No. 195
Wayne, PA 19087-0195

Dear Mr. Hunger:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING, PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3 (TAC NOS. M94114 AND M94120)

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice for your information. This notice relates to your application dated November 21, 1995, regarding a change to the test pressure requirements for the high pressure coolant injection system and the reactor core isolation cooling system surveillance tests. The proposed change also revises Section 5.5.7 of the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3 Technical Specifications to eliminate reference to a section which was previously eliminated.

This notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. Shea".

Joseph W. Shea, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-277/50-278

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/enclosure: See next page

Mr. George A. Hunger, Jr.
PECO Energy Company

Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station,
Units 2 and 3

cc:

J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire
Sr. V.P. & General Counsel
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S26-1
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

Mr. Rich R. Janati, Chief
Division of Nuclear Safety
Pennsylvania Department of
Environmental Resources
P. O. Box 8469
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-8469

PECO Energy Company
ATTN: Mr. G. R. Rainey, Vice President
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
Route 1, Box 208
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Board of Supervisors
Peach Bottom Township
R. D. #1
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

PECO Energy Company
ATTN: Regulatory Engineer, A4-5S
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
Route 1, Box 208
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Public Service Commission of Maryland
Engineering Division
Chief Engineer
6 St. Paul Centre
Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
P.O. Box 399
Delta, Pennsylvania 17314

Mr. Richard McLean
Power Plant and Environmental
Review Division
Department of Natural Resources
B-3, Tawes State Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

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

Dr. Judith Johnsrud
National Energy Committee
Sierra Club
433 Orlando Avenue
State College, PA 16803

Mr. Roland Fletcher
Department of Environment
201 West Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

A. F. Kirby, III
External Operations - Nuclear
Delmarva Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 231
Wilmington, DE 19899

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONPECO ENERGY COMPANYDOCKET NOS. 50-277 AND 50-278NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-44 and DPR-56 issued to the PECO Energy Company (the licensee) for operation of the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3, located in York County, Pennsylvania.

The proposed amendments would revise surveillance requirements for the high pressure coolant injection and reactor core isolation cooling systems and would make an administrative change to Section 5.5.7 of the technical specifications to eliminate reference to a section which was previously eliminated.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously

evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. 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 changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the changes will not alter assumptions relative to initiation and mitigation of analyzed events. These changes will not alter the operation of process variables, or SSC [system, structure or component] as described in the safety analysis. These changes do not involve any physical changes to plant SSC or the manner in which these SSC are operated, maintained, modified or inspected. Routine testing is not assumed to be an initiator of any analyzed event. The proposed changes will not alter the operation of equipment assumed to be available for the mitigation of accidents or transients by the plant safety analysis or licensing basis. These changes have been confirmed to ensure no previously evaluated accident has been adversely affected. The proposed lower test pressure for the HPCI [high pressure coolant injection] and RCIC [reactor core isolation cooling] system flow testing is consistent with the minimum EHC [electro-hydraulic control] pressure setpoint at which reactor power can be increased without the need to adjust the EHC pressure setpoint during operation in MODE 1. Increasing the lower test pressure from 920 psig to 940 psig does not impact when the performance of the test is required. The proposed upper test pressure for the HPCI and RCIC system flow testing is consistent with the Reactor Steam Dome Pressure Limit in Specification 3.4.10. Additionally, the HPCI and RCIC systems are both designed to provide adequate core cooling at reactor pressures from 150 psig to 1150 psig. SR [surveillance requirement] 3.5.1.8 and SR 3.5.3.3 still will require verifying HPCI and RCIC pumps can develop the required flow rates against system head corresponding to reactor pressure. Therefore, the proposed changes provide adequate assurance that the HPCI and RCIC systems will be maintained operable. In addition, these proposed changes eliminate the need to adjust reactor pressure from normally stable plant conditions to perform the test. As such, the probability of plant transients is expected to be reduced. Therefore, the proposed changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.
- 2) The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated

because the proposed changes do not alter the plant configuration (no new or different type of equipment will be installed or removed) and will not alter the method used by any system to perform its design function. The proposed changes do not allow plant operation in any mode that is not already evaluated in the SAR [safety analysis report]. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

- 3) The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed change to the VFTP [ventilation filter test program] in Section 5.5.7 is administrative in nature and does not involve any technical changes. This proposed change will not reduce a margin of safety because it has no impact on any safety analysis assumptions. Because this change is administrative in nature, no question of safety is involved. The proposed changes also revise the upper and lower test pressure for the HPCI and RCIC system high pressure flow tests. These changes do not impact safety analysis assumptions or the ability of the HPCI and RCIC systems to perform their design functions. The HPCI and RCIC systems are designed to provide adequate core cooling at reactor pressures from 150 psig to 1150 psig. SR 3.5.1.8 and SR 3.5.3.3 still will require verifying HPCI and RCIC pumps can develop the required flow rates against system head corresponding to reactor pressure. The proposed lower test pressure for the HPCI and RCIC system flow testing is consistent with the minimum EHC pressure setpoint that provides adequate steam flow at which reactor power can be increased without the need to adjust the EHC pressure setpoint during operation in MODE 1. Increasing the lower test pressure from 920 psig to 940 psig does not impact when the performance of the test is required. The proposed upper test pressure for the HPCI and RCIC system flow testing is consistent with the initial condition for the reactor vessel overpressure protection analysis. In addition, the proposed changes provide the benefit of eliminating the need to adjust reactor pressure from normally stable plant conditions to perform the test, thereby reducing the potential for a plant transient. Therefore, these changes will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

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.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of

publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the FEDERAL REGISTER a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By _____, the licensee may file a request for a hearing

with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other

interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one

contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to John F. Stolz, Director,


Project Directorate I-2: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire, Sr. V.P. and General Counsel, PECO Energy Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated November 21, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of November 1995.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Joseph W. Shea, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation