

March 27, 1990

Dockets Nos. 50-413
and 50-414

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. 72 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE
NPF-35 AND AMENDMENT NO. 66 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-52 -
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TACS 75530/75531)

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 72 to Facility Operating License NPF-35 and Amendment No. 66 to Facility Operating License NPF-52 for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. These amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated December 21, 1989.

The amendments change the TSs for Units 1 and 2 by removing the provision of TS 4.0.2 that limits the combined time interval for three consecutive surveillances to less than 3.25 times the specified interval. The amendments are in accordance with Generic Letter (GL) 89-14, "Line-Item Improvements in Technical Specifications - Removal of the 3.25 Limit on Extending Surveillance Intervals."

The amendments also revise Bases 4.0.2 to be consistent with the model specified in GL 89-14. Use of the generic model in lieu of the basis given in your letter of December 21, 1989, is in accordance with my telephone discussions with Mr. R. Morgan of your Company on February 28, 1990.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation supporting the amendments is also enclosed. Notice of issuance of amendments will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

9004050397 900327
PDR ADOCK 05000414
P PDC

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

*See previous concurrence

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 72 to NPF-35
2. Amendment No. 66 to NPF-52
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:

See next page

KNS See previous concurrences

OFC :LA:PDII-3	:PM:PDII-3	:OGC	:D:PDII-3	:	:	:
NAME :RIngram	:KJabbour:cb	:	:DMatthews	:	:	:
DATE : / * /90	: 3/26/90	: / * /90	: 3/27/90	:	:	:

March 27, 1990

Dockets Nos. 50-413
and 50-414

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. TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE
NPF-35 AND AMENDMENT NO. TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-52 -
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TACS 75530/75531)

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. to Facility Operating License NPF-35 and Amendment No. to Facility Operating License NPF-52 for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. These amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) in response to your application dated December 21, 1989.

The amendments change the TSs for Units 1 and 2 by removing the provision of TS 4.0.2 that limits the combined time interval for three consecutive surveillances to less than 3.25 times the specified interval. The amendments are in accordance with Generic Letter (GL) 89-14, "Line-Item Improvements in Technical Specifications - Removal of the 3.25 Limit on Extending Surveillance Intervals."

The amendments also revise Bases 4.0.2 to be consistent with the model specified in GL 89-14. Use of the generic model in lieu of the basis given in your letter of December 21, 1989, is in accordance with Kahtan Jabbour's telephone discussions with Mr. R. Morgan of your Company on February 28, 1990.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation supporting the amendments is also enclosed. Notice of issuance of amendments will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Project Manager
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. to NPF-35
2. Amendment No. to NPF-52
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:

See next page

OFC	:LA:PDII-3	:PM:PDII-3	:OGC	:D:PDII-3	:	:
NAME	:RIngram	:KJabbour:cb	:DMatthews	:	:	:
DATE	:3/2/90	:3/2/90	:3/5/90	: / /90	:	:

DATED: March 27, 1990

AMENDMENT NO. 72 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-35 - Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1
AMENDMENT NO. 66 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-52 - Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File

NRC & Local PDRs

PD#II-3 R/F

McGuire R/F

S. Varga 14-E-4

W. Hehl 14-H-3

D. Matthews

R. Ingram

K. Jabbour

H. Silver

OGC-WF 15-B-18

E. Jordan MNBB-3302

W. Jones P-130A

T. Meek (8) P1-137

ACRS (10) P-135

GPA/PA 17-F-2

OC/LFMB AR-2015

D. Hagan MNBB-3302

Mr. H. B. Tucker
Duke Power Company

cc:

A.V. Carr, Esq.
Duke Power Company
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq.
Bishop, Cook, Purcell and Reynolds
1400 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

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

Ms. S. S. Kilborn
Area Manager, Mid-South Area
ESSD Projects
Westinghouse Electric Corp.
MNC West Tower - Bay 239
P.O. Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

County Manager of York County
York County Courthouse
York, South Carolina 29745

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

Mr. Alan R. Herdt, Chief
Project Branch #3
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, NW, Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Catawba Nuclear Station

North Carolina Electric Membership
Corp.
3400 Sumner 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

Mr. Heyward G. Shealy, Chief
Bureau of Radiological Health
South Carolina Department of Health
and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

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

Mr. Robert G. Morgan
Nuclear Production Department
Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 33189
Charlotte, North Carolina 28241



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

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. 72
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 December 21, 1989, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and 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 amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - 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.

9004050401 900327
PDR ADUCK 05000414
P PDC

2. Accordingly, the license is hereby amended by page changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and Paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-35 is hereby amended to read as follows:

Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 72, are hereby incorporated into the license. The licensee 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



David B. Matthews, Director
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Technical Specification
Changes

Date of Issuance: March 27, 1990



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

DUKE POWER COMPANY
NORTH CAROLINA MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY NO. 1
PIEDMONT MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY
DOCKET NO. 50-414
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 2
AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 66
License No. NPF-52

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (the facility) Facility Operating License No. NPF-52 filed by the Duke Power Company acting for itself, North Carolina Municipal Power Agency No. 1 and Piedmont Municipal Power Agency, (licensees) dated December 21, 1989, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and 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 amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - 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 attachment to this license amendment, and Paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-52 is hereby amended to read as follows:

Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 66 , are hereby incorporated into the license. The licensee 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



David B. Matthews, Director
Project Directorate II-3
Division of Reactor Projects-I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Technical Specification
Changes

Date of Issuance: March 27, 1990

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 72

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-35

DOCKET NO. 50-413

AND

TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 66

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-52

DOCKET NO. 50-414

Replace the following pages of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the areas of change.

Amended Page

3/4 0-2

B 3/4 0-4

APPLICABILITY

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.0.1 Surveillance Requirements shall be met during the OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions specified for individual Limiting Conditions for Operation unless otherwise stated in an individual Surveillance Requirement.

4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified time interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25% of the surveillance interval.

4.0.3 Failure to perform a Surveillance Requirement within the allowed surveillance interval, defined by Specification 4.0.2, shall constitute noncompliance with the OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation. The time limits of the ACTION requirements are applicable at the time it is identified that a Surveillance Requirement has not been performed. The ACTION requirements may be delayed for up to 24 hours to permit the completion of the surveillance when the allowable outage time limits of the ACTION requirements are less than 24 hours. Surveillance Requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment.

4.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other specified condition shall not be made unless the Surveillance Requirement(s) associated with the Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the stated surveillance interval or as otherwise specified. This provision shall not prevent passage through or to OPERATIONAL MODES as required to comply with ACTION requirements.

4.0.5 Surveillance Requirements for inservice inspection and testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components shall be applicable as follows:

- a. Inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda as required by 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.55a(g)(6)(i);

APPLICABILITY

BASES

Specification 4.0.1 establishes the requirement that surveillances must be performed during the OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions for which the requirements of the Limiting Conditions for Operation apply unless otherwise stated in an individual Surveillance Requirement. The purpose of this specification is to ensure that surveillances are performed to verify the operational status of systems and components and that parameters are within specified limits to ensure safe operation of the facility when the plant is in a MODE or other specified condition for which the associated Limiting Conditions for Operation are applicable. Surveillance Requirements do not have to be performed when the facility is in an OPERATIONAL MODE for which the requirements of the associated Limiting Condition for Operation do not apply unless otherwise specified. The Surveillance Requirements associated with a Special Test Exception are only applicable when the Special Test Exception is used as an allowable exception to the requirements of a specification.

Specification 4.0.2 establishes the limit for which the specified time interval for Surveillance Requirements may be extended. It permits an allowable extension of the normal surveillance interval to facilitate surveillance scheduling and consideration of plant operating conditions that may not be suitable for conducting the surveillance; e.g., transient conditions or other ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. It also provides flexibility to accommodate the length of a fuel cycle for surveillances that are performed at each refueling outage and are specified with an 18-month surveillance interval. It is not intended that this provision be used repeatedly as a convenience to extend surveillance intervals beyond that specified for surveillances that are not performed during refueling outages. The limitation of Specification 4.0.2 is based on engineering judgment and the recognition that the most probable result of any particular surveillance being performed is the verification of conformance with the Surveillance Requirements. This provision is sufficient to ensure that the reliability ensured through surveillance activities is not significantly degraded beyond that obtained from the specified surveillance interval.

Specification 4.0.3 establishes the failure to perform a Surveillance Requirement within the allowed surveillance interval, defined by the provisions of Specification 4.0.2, as a condition that constitutes a failure to meet the OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation. Under the provisions of this specification, systems and components are assumed to be OPERABLE when Surveillance Requirements have been satisfactorily performed within the specified time interval. However, nothing in this provision is to be construed as implying that systems or components are OPERABLE when they are found or known to be inoperable although still meeting the Surveillance Requirements. This specification also clarifies that the ACTION requirements are applicable when Surveillance Requirements have not been completed within the allowed surveillance interval and that the time limits of the ACTION requirements apply from the point in time it is identified that a surveillance has not been performed and not at the time that the allowed surveillance interval was exceeded. Completion of the Surveillance Requirement within the allowable outage time limits of the ACTION requirements restores compliance with the requirements of Specification 4.0.3. However, this does not negate the fact that the failure to have performed the surveillance within the allowed surveillance interval, defined by the provisions of Specification 4.0.2, was a violation of the OPERABILITY



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 72 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-35
AND AMENDMENT NO. 66 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-52

DUKE POWER COMPANY, ET AL.

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKETS NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 21, 1989, Duke Power Company, et al. (the licensee) proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The proposed changes remove the provision of Specification 4.0.2 that limits the combined time intervals for three consecutive surveillances to less than 3.25 times the specified interval. Guidance on this proposed change to the TSs was provided to all power reactor licensees and applicants by Generic Letter 89-14 dated August 21, 1989.

2.0 EVALUATION

Specification 4.0.2 includes the provision that allows a surveillance interval to be extended by 25 percent of the specified time interval. This extension provides flexibility for scheduling the performance of surveillances and to permit consideration of plant operating conditions that may not be suitable for conducting a surveillance at the specified time interval. Such operating conditions include transient plant operation or ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. Specification 4.0.2 further limits the allowance for extending surveillance intervals by requiring that the combined time interval for any three consecutive surveillances not exceed 3.25 times the specified time interval. The purpose of this provision is to assure that surveillances are not extended repeatedly as an operational convenience to provide an overall increase in the surveillance interval.

Experience has shown that the 18-month surveillance interval, with the provision to extend it by 25 percent, is usually sufficient to accommodate normal variations in the length of a fuel cycle. However, the NRC staff has routinely granted requests for one-time exceptions to the 3.25 limit on extending refueling surveillances because the risk to safety is low in contrast to the alternative of a forced shutdown to perform these surveillances. Therefore, the 3.25 limitation on extending surveillances has not been a practical limit on the use of the 25-percent allowance for extending surveillances that are performed on a refueling outage basis.

Extending surveillance intervals during plant operation can also result in a benefit to safety when a scheduled surveillance is due at a time that is not suitable for conducting the surveillance. This may occur when transient plant operating conditions exist or when safety systems are out of service for maintenance or other surveillance activities. In such cases, the benefit to safety of extending a surveillance interval would exceed any safety benefit derived by limiting the use of the 25-percent allowance to extend a surveillance. Furthermore, there is the administrative burden associated with tracking the use of the 25-percent allowance to ensure compliance with the 3.25 limit.

In view of these findings, the NRC staff concluded that Specification 4.0.2 should be changed to remove the 3.25 limit for all surveillances because its removal will have an overall positive effect on safety. The guidance provided in Generic Letter 89-14 included the following change to this specification and removes the 3.25 limit on three consecutive surveillances with the following statement:

"4.02 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified surveillance interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25 percent of the specified surveillance interval."

In addition, the Bases of this specification were updated to reflect this change. The revised Bases continue to note that it is not the intent of the allowance for extending surveillance intervals that it be used repeatedly merely as an operational convenience to extend surveillance intervals beyond that specified.

The licensee has proposed changes to Specification 4.0.2 that are consistent with the guidance provided in Generic Letter 89-14, as noted above. On the basis of its review of this matter, the NRC staff finds that the above changes to the TSs for Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, are acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments involve changes in requirements with respect to 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 amendments involve 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 radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the amendments meet 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 these amendments.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission's determination that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration was published in the Federal Register (55 FR 4265) on February 7, 1990. The Commission 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 the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: Thomas G. Dunning, OTSB/DOEA
K. Jabbour, PD#II-3/DRP-I/II

Dated: March 27, 1990