

February 12, 1986

Docket No.: 50-413

Mr. H. B. Tucker, Vice President  
Nuclear Production Department  
Duke Power Company  
422 South Church Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Dear Mr. Tucker:

Subject: Issuance of Amendment No. 3 to Facility Operating License  
NPF-35 - Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 3 to Facility Operating License NPF-35 for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1, located in York County, South Carolina. This amendment is in response to your letter dated April 29, 1985.

The amendment changes the Technical Specifications to revise surveillance requirement 4.3.4.2 from a turbine control valve testing frequency of once in seven days to at least once in 31 days. The amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

A copy of the related safety evaluation supporting Amendment No. 3 to Facility Operating License NPF-35 is enclosed.

Notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's next bi-weekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

151

B. J. Youngblood, Director  
PWR Project Directorate #4  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 3 to NPF-35
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures: See next page

PWR#4/DPWR-A  
MDuncan/mac  
12/6/85

KNT  
PWR#4/DPWR-A  
KJabbour  
12/27/85

DSH/m  
PWR#4/DPWR-A  
BJYoungblood  
12/29/85

8602240186 860212  
PDR ADOCK 05000413  
P PDR

Mr. H. B. Tucker  
Duke Power Company

Catawba Nuclear Station

cc:  
William L. Porter, Esq.  
Duke Power Company  
P.O. Box 33189  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq.  
Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell  
and Reynolds  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

North Carolina MPA-1  
Suite 600  
3100 Smoketree Ct.  
P.O. Box 29513  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27626-0513

Mr. C. D. Markham  
Power Systems Division  
Westinghouse Electric Corp.  
P.O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

NUS Corporation  
2536 Countryside Boulevard  
Clearwater, Florida 33515

Mr. Jesse L. Riley, President  
Carolina Environmental Study Group  
854 Henley Place  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28208

Richard P. Wilson, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
S.C. Attorney General's Office  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Piedmont Municipal Power Agency  
100 Memorial Drive  
Greer, South Carolina 29651

Mark S. Calvert, Esq.  
Bishop, Liberman, Cook,  
Purcell & Reynolds  
1200 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Brian P. Cassidy, Regional Counsel  
Federal Emergency Management Agency,  
Region I  
J. W. McCormack POCH  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

North Carolina Electric Membership  
Corp.  
3333 North Boulevard  
P.O. Box 27306  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Saluda River Electric Cooperative,  
Inc.  
P.O. Box 929  
Laurens, South Carolina 29360

Senior Resident Inspector  
Route 2, Box 179N  
York, South Carolina 29745

Regional Administrator, Region II  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Robert Guild, Esq.  
2759 Rosewood Drive  
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

Palmetto Alliance  
2759 Rosewood Drive  
Columbia, South Carolina 29205

Karen E. Long  
Assistant Attorney General  
N.C. Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 629  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Spence Perry, Esquire  
Associate General Counsel  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
Room 840  
500 C Street  
Washington, D. C. 20472

Mr. Michael Hirsch  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
Office of the General Counsel  
Room 840  
500 C Street, S.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20472



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

FEB 12 1986

DUKE POWER COMPANY

NORTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION

SALUDA RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

DOCKET NO. 50-413

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 3  
License No. NPF-35

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
  - A. The application for amendment to the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (the facility) Facility Operating License No. NPF-35 filed by the Duke Power Company acting for itself, North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation and Saluda River Electric Cooperative, Inc., (licensees) dated April 29, 1985, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
  - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, as amended, the provisions of the Act, and the 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 license amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public;
  - 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 hereby amended by page changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachments to this license amendment and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-35 is hereby amended to read as follows:
  - (2) Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan  
The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 3, and the Environmental Protection Plan

8602240203 860212  
PDR ADOCK 05000413  
PDR

FEB 12 1986

- 2 -

contained in Appendix B, both of which are attached hereto, are hereby incorporated into this license. Duke Power Company shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

151

B. J. Youngblood, Director  
PWR Project Directorate #4  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

Attachment:  
Technical Specification Changes

Date of Issuance: February 12, 1986

PWR#4/DPWR-A  
MDuncan/mac  
12/6/85

PWR#4/DPWR-A  
KJabbour  
12/27/85  
1

OELD  
GE Johnson  
12/1/85  
2/5/86

Dist m  
PWR#4/DPWR-A  
BJYoungblood  
12/29/85  
1

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 3

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-35

DOCKET NO. 50-413

Replace the following page of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications with the enclosed page. The revised page is identified by Amendment Number and contains vertical lines indicating the area of change.

Amended  
Page

3/4 3-91

## INSTRUMENTATION

### 3/4.3.4 TURBINE OVERSPEED PROTECTION

#### LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

---

3.3.4 At least one Turbine Overspeed Protection System shall be OPERABLE.

APPLICABILITY: MODES 1, 2, and 3.

ACTION:

- a. With one stop valve or one control valve per high pressure turbine steam line inoperable and/or with one intermediate stop valve or one intercept valve per low pressure turbine steam line inoperable, restore the inoperable valve(s) to OPERABLE status within 72 hours, or close at least one valve in the affected steam line(s) or isolate the turbine from the steam supply within the next 6 hours.
- b. With the above required Turbine Overspeed Protection System otherwise inoperable, within 6 hours isolate the turbine from the steam supply.

#### SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

---

4.3.4.1 The provisions of Specification 4.0.4 are not applicable.

4.3.4.2 The above required Turbine Overspeed Protection System shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- a. At least once per 7 days while in MODE 1 and while in MODE 2 with the turbine operating, by cycling each of the following valves through at least one complete cycle from the running position:
  - 1) Four high pressure turbine stop valves,
  - 2) Six low pressure turbine intermediate stop valves, and
  - 3) Six low pressure turbine intercept valves.
- b. At least once per 31 days while in MODE 1 and while in MODE 2 with the turbine operating, by direct observation of the movement of each of the above valves and the four high pressure turbine control valves, through one complete cycle from the running position,
- c. At least once per 18 months by performance of a CHANNEL CALIBRATION on the Turbine Overspeed Protection Systems, and
- d. At least once per 40 months by disassembling at least one of each of the above valves (including the four high pressure turbine control valves) and performing a visual and surface inspection of valve seats, disks and stems and verifying no unacceptable flaws or corrosion.



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

FEB 12 1986

SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 3 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-35

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1

DUKE POWER COMPANY

NORTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION

SALUDA RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

I. Introduction

By letter dated April 29, 1985, Duke Power Company requested a license amendment to revise surveillance requirement 4.3.4.2 in the Technical Specifications (TS) for Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1, from a turbine control valve testing frequency of once in seven days to at least once in 31 days. The testing frequency for the other turbine valves remains at seven days.

II. Evaluation

The NRC staff currently requires weekly testing of all turbine valves as stated in Standard Review Plan Section 10.2 "Steam Turbines". The staff position was established after extensive discussions with major steam turbine manufacturers and is based largely on engineering judgement and the recommendations of the manufacturers.

General Electric in Technical Information Letter No. 969, dated May 22, 1984, stated that operating experience on inservice nuclear turbine steam valves shows that operability and reliability will not be significantly affected by increasing the periodic control valve testing interval from the present weekly to a much longer interval. They have also concluded that reduced turbine valve testing on this type of turbine has little or no effect on the probability of turbine missile generation. In General Electric's judgement, lack of a significant number of valve failures and good operating experience provide a reasonable basis to increase the periodic test interval for the turbine control valves.

The staff has evaluated the information submitted by Duke in the April 29, 1985, letter and General Electric's information presented in Technical Information Letter No. 969. Considering the information presented by Duke and General Electric, and the staff's original basis for the TS, the staff concludes that the surveillance interval for periodic turbine control valve testing can be increased for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1, from once in seven days to at least once in 31 days without significantly affecting the capability of the turbine control valves to function on demand, and is acceptable.

8602240215 860212  
PDR ADDCK 05000413  
P PDR

### III. Environmental Consideration

The amendment involves a change in the use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes in surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the amendment involves 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 exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there have been no public comments on such finding. Accordingly, the amendment meets 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 amendment.

### IV. Conclusion

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register on November 20, 1985 (50 FR 47860) and consulted with the state of South Carolina. No public comments were received, and the state of South Carolina did not have any comments.

We have 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: Kahtan Jabbour, PWR Project Directorate #4  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

John Thompson, PWR Project Directorate #4  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

R. Giardina, Plant Systems Branch  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

J. Tsao, Engineering Branch  
Division of BWR Licensing

Dated: February 12, 1986



Dated February 12, 1986

## RGiardina