

July 9, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: File

FROM: Jack N. Donohew, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate IV */RA/*
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON LICENSEE APPLICATION
REGARDING (1) LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST INVOLVED WITH
DELETING LICENSE CONDITIONS, AND (2) PRESSURIZER
PRESSURE ALLOWABLE VALUES FOR WOLF CREEK GENERATING
STATION (TAC NOS. MB1611 AND MB1612)

Attached is an e-mail providing responses from Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (WCNOC, the licensee) regarding questions on its application of March 23, 2001 (CO 01-0031) that proposed to delete certain license conditions in Section 2.F of Facility Operating License No. NPF-42.

The responses clarify statements made in the licensee's application, do not expand the scope of the application as noticed in the *Federal Register*, and does not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination published in the *Federal Register* on May 2, 2001 (66 FR 22035).

This memorandum on the docket was discussed with the licensee in the weekly call on June 28, 2001. The licensee agreed to have the information in the attached e-mail placed on the Wolf Creek docket. This is documented in the second attached e-mail. In that second e-mail, the licensee also agreed to have the information that was submitted in the e-mail dated June 1, 2001 (ADAMS Accession No. ML011570432) on the pressurizer pressure allowable values (application dated March 22, 2001) placed on the Wolf Creek docket.

Docket No. 50-482

Attachment: 1. E-mail dated June 20, 2001
2. E-mail dated July 6, 2001

July 9, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: File

FROM: Jack N. Donohew, Senior Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate IV /RA/
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON LICENSEE APPLICATION
REGARDING (1) LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST INVOLVED WITH
DELETING LICENSE CONDITIONS AND (2) PRESSURIZER
PRESSURE ALLOWABLE VALUES FOR WOLF CREEK GENERATING
STATION (TAC NOS. MB1611 AND MB1612)

Attached is an e-mail providing responses from Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (WCNOC, the licensee) regarding questions on its application of March 23, 2001 (CO 01-0031) that proposed to delete certain license conditions in Section 2.F of Facility Operating License No. NPF-42.

The responses clarify statements made in the licensee's application, do not expand the scope of the application as noticed in the *Federal Register*, and does not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination published in the *Federal Register* on May 2, 2001 (66 FR 22035).

This memorandum on the docket was discussed with the licensee in the weekly call on June 28, 2001. The licensee agreed to have the information in the attached e-mail placed on the Wolf Creek docket. This is documented in the second attached e-mail. In that second e-mail, the licensee also agreed to have the information that was submitted in the e-mail dated June 1, 2001 (ADAMS Accession No. ML011570432) on the pressurizer pressure allowable values (application dated March 22, 2001) placed on the Wolf Creek docket.

Docket No. 50-482

Attachments: 1. E-mail dated June 20, 2001
2. E-mail dated July 6, 2001

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC
PDIV-2 R/F
RidsNrrPMJDonohew
RidsNrrLAEPeyton

ADAMS Accession No.: **ML011780677**

NRR-106

To receive a copy of this document, indicate "C" in the box					
OFFICE	PDIV-2/PM	C	PDIV-2/LA	C	PDIV-2/SC
NAME	JDonohew:am		EPeyton		SDembek
DATE	7/6/2001		7/6/01		7/9/01

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

E-MAIL DATED JUNE 20, 2001

From: Wideman Steven G <stwidem@WCNOC.com>
To: "Donohew Jack" <JND@nrc.gov>
Date: 6/20/01 10:58AM
Subject: Response to Question on License Conditions Amendment Request

Jack - attached is a response to the 6 questions that you had concerning the amendment request for deletion of various license conditions. Sorry, it took me so long to provide this response.

<<NRC RAI.doc>>

The information contained [below] in this electronic correspondence is informally submitted to the NRC and is not considered to be docketed by Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation (WCNOC). Should the NRC wish to assign a docket number to this correspondence, WCNOC requests it be contact to obtain concurrence.

Steve Wideman

CC: Hall Kenneth W <kehall@WCNOC.com>, Harris Karl A <kaharri@WCNOC.com>, Mahler Sharon R <shmahle@WCNOC.com>

QUESTIONS FOR THE LICENSEE

1. For License Condition 2.C.(10): Provide the status in completing the procedures in FEMA 44 CFR 350. Is the basis for deleting the licensee condition that the condition duplicates 50.54(s)(2)(ii) and/or (s)(3)? How does the license condition duplicate the stated regulations? Was there any inspection conducted on the licensee meeting these FEMA requirements, including drills or exercises?

RESPONSE:

Initially, when developing the license amendment request, specific documentation could not be readily identified that documented FEMA's final approval of the State of Kansas and associated radiological emergency response plans. Subsequently, I did locate a letter dated May 11, 1989 from L. J. Callan (NRC Region IV) to WCNOC which included a copy of the FEMA exercise evaluation report of the State of Kansas and local plans for WCGS. The NRC letter states: "The letter dated April 18, 1989, confirms the adequacy of such plans to protect the health and safety of the public."

So the initial approach was that it did not appear that a license condition was necessary because 50.54(s) was applicable to Wolf Creek and the NRC could enforce the requirements of 50.54(s) without the license condition. It appears that the license condition was reiterating what was currently enforceable under 50.54(s).

2. For License Condition 2.C.(11): In the safety evaluation for Amendment No. 30, dated April 20, 1989, the staff stated that it would address the acceptability of the SGTR analysis in future correspondence. With regard to the SGTR analysis, the staff was then examining the assumptions used for operator action times and reviewing the radiological dose calculations. When did the staff address the acceptability of the SGTR analysis?

Response:

NRC letter dated May 7, 1991, "Safety Evaluation Report for the Wolf Creek Generating Station Steam Generator Tube Rupture Analysis (TAC NO. 57363)," indicates that the staff finds the analysis acceptable. The cover letter further indicates that in the WCNOG letter of January 15, 1991, a commitment was made to perform additional demonstration runs by plant operators on the Wolf Creek simulator in order to verify operator action times assumed in the SGTR analysis. The cover letter states: "This is a confirmatory issue that will be evaluated separately by the staff." WCNOG letter WM 92-0075 dated May 5, 1992 provided the results of the additional demonstration runs. A search for a NRC response to this letter could not be found.

3. For License Condition 2.C.(13): For Item 2.2.2 of GL 83-28, the staff concluded in its letter of October 18, 1990, that the vendor interface program for safety-related components for WCGS was acceptable. The letter stated that the program would be modified to conform to the guidance provided in the GL by January 31, 1991. In the memo-to-file dated April 30, 1991, the then project manager for Wolf Creek stated that he confirmed on April 26, 1991, that the modification of the program to the GL was completed. Is this completion date (i.e., by April 26, 1991) correct or was the modification completed before January 31, 1991, as committed to in the licensee's letter of September 25, 1990? Was there an inspection conducted on this program where the modification of the program was checked? Was the completion of the program modification reported to NRC?

Response:

A review of the Regulatory Commitment Management System (RCMS # 1990-135) identified that the commitment to revise the vendor interface program was closed on February 7, 1991. A review of the commitment documentation indicated that the procedure modifications were issued on February 7, 1991. A search of a Wolf Creek database of inspection reports did not identify that an inspection of the vendor interface program was conducted (note that if it was covered in a resident inspection it would not be identified in the database as such). The completion of the program modification was not reported to the NRC nor were there any requirements or commitments to report the completion.

4. For License Condition 2.C.(13): For Items 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 of GL 83-28, the staff concluded in its letter of October 22, 1986, that post maintenance testing of reactor trip

system and other safety-related components for WCGS was acceptable. In the Safety Evaluation attached to the October 22, 1986, letter, the staff stated that Technical Specification (TS) changes addressing concerns about diesel generator testing would be submitted in response to GL 84-15 guidance. Does Amendment No. 8 issued May 28, 1987, address the diesel generator testing in response to GL 84-15?

RESPONSE:

Letter KMLNRC 86-212 (11/14/86) submitted a proposed change to TS 3/4.8.1 and indicated that this amendment request supports, in part, resolution of License Condition 2.c(11). Note that it appears that the reference to the License Condition should have been 2.c(13), Condition 2.c(11) is associated with the SGTR analysis. In Attachment I of KMLNRC 86-212, a number of the justifications indicate that the changes are consistent with Generic Letter 84-15. The NRC Safety Evaluation associated with Amendment No. 8, states, in part: "KG&E has in general used the staff's guidance outlined in Generic Letter 84-15 and the technical specifications approved for the North Anna Power Station as the basis for the proposed changes to the diesel generator Action statements and Surveillance Requirements." Therefore, KMLNRC 86-212 (and supplement letters) and the issuance of Amendment No. 8 address the diesel generator testing in response to Generic Letter 84-15.

5. For License Condition 2.C.(14): In the letter of August 26, 1991, the results of the inspections of the hafnium control rods were addressed and the following was stated: "An amendment to WCGS Technical Specifications has been received which will allow the use of silver-indium-cadmium control rods, hafnium control rods, or a mixture of both. This change supplements [the licensee's] options for future replacement of hafnium control rods that are in operation. Pending further operating experience and control rod examination[,] hafnium will remain a viable option as a neutron adsorbing material in control rods at WCGS." What amendment to the TSs is being referred to in the statement and has anything changed concerning hafnium control rods since this conclusion was stated?

RESPONSE:

The amendment being referred to is Amendment No. 48 dated August 22, 1991. There have been no changes since the above conclusion was stated. Technical Specification 4.2.2 currently allows the use of hafnium for control rods although it is unlikely that we would use a hafnium control rod.

6. For Section 2.F of the operating license: Is the reference to Condition 2.G on page 4 of 14, second bullet, of the application, meant to be a reference to Section 2.F? Because Section 2.F is the only requirement to report violations of license conditions in Section 2.C of the license, are there any violations of license conditions that would not be covered by 50.72 and 50.73, which are directed toward safety significant events? How does 50.72 and 50.73 cover violations to the following license conditions in 2.C: maximum power level, environmental protection plan, and additional conditions? Is the proposed deletion of Section 2.F based on the premise that reporting of violations of license conditions in 2.C should only be for safety significant violations? Also, should

not Condition 2.F remain in the license in case new license conditions under Section 2.C are added to the license?

RESPONSE:

The reference to Condition 2.G on page 4 of 14, second bullet, should refer to Section 2.F instead of Section 2.G. This is a typographical error.

Concerning the deletion of the Section 2.F, 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73 addresses reporting of events of a significant nature and as such only those license condition violations that are significant should be reported.

As mentioned in the amendment request, there is precedence for deleting this Condition. The NRC safety evaluation dated March 26, 1999 for the Beaver Valley Power Station, states:

“Deletion of BVPS-2 License Condition 2.G, which provided for initial notification with written follow-up of any violations of requirements contained in Section 2.C. of the BVPS-2 Facility Operating License (License No. NPF-73). The NRC’s requirements for immediate notification with written follow-up requirements (Licensee Event Reports) of events at operating nuclear power reactors have been incorporated in 10 CFR 50.72 and 10 CFR 50.73. The requirements of BVPS-2 License Condition 2.G. are redundant to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.72 and 10 CFR 50.73. Therefore, License Condition 2.G. of License No. NPF-73 may be deleted.”

NRC Inspection Procedure 61706, “Core Thermal Power Evaluation,” discuss maximum power level. The average power level over any 8-hour shift should not exceed the “full steady-state licensed power level” (and similarly worded terms). The exact 8 hour periods defined as “shifts” are up to the plant, but should not be varied from day to day. The inspection procedure indicates that it is acceptable to briefly exceed the “full, steady -state license power level” by as much as 2% for as long as 15 minutes. In no case should 102% power be exceeded, but lesser power “excursions” for longer periods should be allowed, with the above guidance. For example, 1% excess for 30 minutes and ½% for 1 hour should be allowed. There are no limits on the number of times these “excursions” may occur, or the time interval that must separate such “excursions.” The above requirement regarding the 8-hour average power will prevent abuse of this allowance. If this guidance were violated, a review of 50.72 and 50.73 would be necessary to determine if it were reportable.

Regarding violations of the environmental protection plan, Section 2.F of the Operating License states in part “Except as otherwise provided in the Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan, the licensee shall report any violations of the requirements contained in Section 2.C....” Therefore, Section 2.F appears to exempt report of violations of the Environmental Protection Plan as a violation of a license condition.

E-MAIL DATED JULY 6, 2001

From: Wideman Steven G <stwidem@WCNOC.com>
To: "Donohew Jack" <JND@nrc.gov>
Date: 7/6/01 10:04AM
Subject: RE: Agreement to Add Response Information To Docket

It is acceptable to place the subject e-mails on the Wolf Creek docket.

> -----
> From: Jack Donohew[SMTP:JND@nrc.gov]
> Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2001 2:54 PM
> To: stwidem@wcnoc.com
> Subject: Agreement to Add Response Information To Docket
>
> In the responses to questions sent by email on LARs for (1) pressurizer
> pressure allowable values (application dated March 22, 2001), and (2)
> deletion of license conditions (application dated March 23, 2001), you
> stated that should the NRC wish to assign a docket number to the
> correspondence, WCNOC requests it be contacted to obtain concurrence. I
> discussed adding these responses to the Wolf Creek docket on June 5 and
> June 27, 2001, respectively. Would you confirmed the agreement to add
> these responses to the Wolf Creek docket by returning the email with such
> a statement of agreement. <JND>
>

CC: Hall Kenneth W <kehall@WCNOC.com>, Harris Karl A
<kaharri@WCNOC.com>