

October 19, 1983

Docket Nos: 50-369
and 50-370

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. 25 to Facility Operating License
NPF-9 and Amendment No. 6 to Facility Operating License
NPF-17 - McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 25 to Facility Operating License NPF-9 and Amendment No. 6 to Facility Operating License NPF-17 for the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. These amendments are in response to your letter dated February 18, 1983.

The amendments authorize transfer of spent fuel between Units 1 and 2.

A copy of the related safety evaluation report supporting Amendment No. 25 to Facility Operating License NPF-9 and Amendment No. 6 to Facility Operating License NPF-17 is enclosed.

Sincerely,

5

Elinor G. Adensam, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 4
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 25 to NPF-9
2. Amendment No. 6 to NPF-17
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encl:
See next page

8310280037 831019
PDR ADOCK 05000369
P PDR

OFFICE	LA:DL:LB #4	DL:LB #4	DL:LB #4	DL:LB #4			
SURNAME	MDuncan/hmc	MThadant	RBirke1	EAdensam			
DATE	8/26/83	8/26/83	8/24/83	8/24/83			

McGuire

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

cc: Mr. A. Carr
Duke Power Company
P.O. Box 33189
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Mr. F. J. Twogood
Power Systems Division
Westinghouse Electric Corp.
P.O. Box 355
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Mr. G. A. Copp
Duke Power Company
Nuclear Production Department
P.O. Box 33189
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq.
Debevoise & Liberman
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Wm. Orders
Senior Resident Inspector
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Route 4, Box 529
Huntersville, North Carolina 28078

James P. O'Reilly, Regional Admin.
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Region II
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dr. John M. Barry
Department of Environmental Health
Mecklenburg County
1200 Blythe Boulevard
Charlotte, North Carolina 28203

Dayne H. Brown, Chief
Radiation Protection Branch
Division of Facility Services
Department of Human Resources

Attorney General
Department of Justice
Justice Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Office of Intergovernmental Relations
116 West Jones Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

County Manager of Mecklenburg County
720 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

Mr. Bruce Blanchard
Environmental Projects Review
Department of the Interior
Room 4256
18th and C Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20240

EIS Coordinator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IV Office
345 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Chairman, North Carolina
Utilities Commission
430 North Salisbury Street
Dobbs Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

R. S. Howard
Operating Plants Projects
Regional Manager
Westinghouse Electric Corporation -
R&D 701
P.O. Box 2728
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

OFFICE

P.O. Box 12200
Raleigh, North Carolina 27605

SURNAME

DATE

DUKE POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-369

MCGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 25
License No. NPF-9

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (the facility) Facility Operating License No. NPF-9 filed by the Duke Power Company (licensee) dated February 18, 1983, 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, Facility Operating License No. NPF-9 is changed as follows:
 - A. Change paragraph 2.B.(5) to read:
 - (5) Pursuant to the Act and 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70 to possess, but not separate, such byproduct and special nuclear materials as may be produced by the operation of McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2.

8310280043 831019
PDR ADOCK 05000369
P PDR

OFFICE						
SURNAME						
DATE						

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

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

s/ R. Purple

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

Date of Issuance: October 19, 1983

OFFICE	LA:DL:LB #4	DL:VB #4	DL:VB #4	OELD	DL:LB #4	ADL:DL	DIR:DL
SURNAME	MDuncan/hmc	MThadani	RBirkel	J. Johnson	EAdensam	INovak	DEisenhut
DATE	5/5/83	5/5/83	5/5/83	9/16/83	9/2/83	10/7/83	5/ /83

*Made
noticed in
next FR*

DUKE POWER COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-370

MCGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 6
License No. NPF-17

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (the facility) Facility Operating License No. NPF-17 filed by the Duke Power Company (licensee) dated February 18, 1983, 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, Facility Operating License No. NPF-17 is changed as follows:
 - A. Change paragraph 2.B.(5) to read:
 - (5) Pursuant to the Act and 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70 to possess, but not separate, such byproduct and special nuclear materials as may be produced by the operation of McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2; and

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

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

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

s/ R. Purple

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

Date of Issuance: October 19, 1983

*Must be
noted in
next
EE*

OFFICE	LA:DL:LB #4	DL:LB #4	DL:LB #4	OELD	DL:LB #4	AD:DL	DIR:DL
SURNAME	MDuncan/hmc	Mhadani	RBirke	G Johnson	EAdensam	T. [unclear]	DEisenhut
DATE	5/5/83	5/5/83	5/5/83	9/16/83	9/21/83	10/7/83	10/ /83

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

McGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DUKE POWER COMPANY

INTRODUCTION

Duke Power Company (licensee), by a letter dated February 18, 1983, requested that Facility Operating License No NPF-9 for McGuire Unit 1 and the license No. NPF-17 for McGuire Unit 2, be amended to authorize transfer of spent fuel between McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2. Specifically, the licensee requested that license condition 2.B.(5) which presently states:

"Pursuant to the Act and 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70, to possess, but not separate, such byproduct and special nuclear materials as may be produced by the operation of the facility."

be amended to read as follows:

"Pursuant to the Act and 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70, to possess, but not separate, such byproduct and special nuclear materials as may be produced by the operation of McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2."

This evaluation examines safety implications of the requested amendments.

EVALUATION

The staff has reviewed the licensee's request for amendments, and concludes that the transfer of spent fuel between the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, spent fuel pools will not involve any spent fuel handling accidents significantly different from those previously evaluated, and will not violate the conclusions in our previous Safety Evaluation Reports. Our previous evaluations in Safety Evaluation Report dated March 1978, and its Supplement No. 2, dated March 1979, found that the licensee has provided adequate systems to assure the the bulk pool temperature will not exceed 150°F, and to mitigate the radiological consequences of the postulated fuel handling accidents. The calculated radiation doses due to such accidents were found to be well within the Commission's dose guidelines.

The staff, therefore, finds that the licensee's proposed request for amendments regarding the transfer of spent fuel between McGuire Units 1 and 2 is acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendments do not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendments involve an action which is insignificant from the stand-

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY	8310280049 831019					
	PDR ADDCK 05000369					
	P	PDR				
SURNAME						
DATE						

point of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no SHC which was published in the Federal Register (48 FR 33076) on July 20, 1983, and consulted with the State of North Carolina. Neither the public nor the State of North Carolina provided 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.

Date: October 19, 1983

Principal Contributors: T. Chan, Auxiliary Systems Branch, DSI
J. Wermeil, Auxiliary Systems Branch, DSI
M. Thadani, Licensing Branch No. 4, DL

*NOTE: SEE PREVIOUS WHITE FOR CONCURRENCE

OFFICE	DL:LB #4	DL:LB #4	LA:DL:LB #4	ASB	DL:LB #4	AD:DL	
SURNAME	*MThadani/hmc	*RBirkel	*MDuncan	OParr	*EAdensam	TNovak	
DATE	5/05/83	5/05/83	5/05/83	9/28/83	8/29/83	10/7/83	

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

McGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DUKE POWER COMPANY

INTRODUCTION

Duke Power Company (licensee), by a letter dated February 18, 1983, requested that Facility Operating License No NPF-9 for McGuire Unit 1 and the not yet issued license No. NPF-17 for McGuire Unit 2, be amended to authorize transfer of spent fuel between McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2. Specifically, the licensee requested that license condition 2.B.(5) which presently states:

"Pursuant to the Act and 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70, to possess, but not separate, such byproduct and special nuclear materials as may be produced by the operation of the facility."

be amended to read as follows:

"Pursuant to the Act and 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70, to possess, but not separate, such byproduct and special nuclear materials as may be produced by the operation of McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2."

This evaluation examines safety implications of the requested amendments.

EVALUATION

The staff has reviewed the licensee's request for amendments, and concludes that the transfer of spent fuel between the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, spent fuel pools will not involve any spent fuel handling accidents significantly different from those previously evaluated, and will not violate the conclusions in our previous Safety Evaluation Reports, provided that the anticipated heat load of the pools does not result in bulk pool temperature to exceed 150°F. Our previous evaluations in Safety Evaluation Report dated March 1978, and its Supplement No. 2, dated March 1979, found that the licensee has provided adequate systems to mitigate the radiological consequences of the postulated fuel handling accidents. The calculated radiation doses due to such accidents were found to be well within the Commission's dose guidelines.

The staff, therefore, finds that the licensee's proposed request for amendments regarding the transfer of spent fuel between McGuire Units 1 and 2 is acceptable.

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendments do not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendments involve an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no SHC which was published in the Federal Register (48 FR 33076) on July 20, 1983, and consulted with the State of North Carolina. No public comments were received and the State of North Carolina did not have any comments. Based on the Commission's final review and the absence of State and Public comments, the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

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.

Date:

Principal Contributors: T. Chan, Auxiliary Systems Branch, DSI
J. Wermeil, Auxiliary Systems Branch, DSI
M. Thadani, Licensing Branch No. 4, DL

*NOTE: SEE PREVIOUS WHITE FOR CONCURRENCE

OFFICE	DL:LB.#4	DL:LB.#4	LA:DL:LB.#4	ASB	DL:LB.#4	AD:L:DL	
SURNAME	*MThadani/hmc	*RBirkel	*MDuncan	*QParr	EAdensam	INoyak	
DATE	5/05/83	5/05/83	5/05/83	6/17/83	8/29/83	8/ /83	

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendments do not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendments involve an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered, do not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) 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.

Date:

Principal Contributors: T. Chan, Auxiliary Systems Branch, DSI
J. Werneil, Auxiliary Systems Branch, DSI
M. Thadani, Licensing Branch No. 4, DL

RL for

OFFICE	DL:LB #4	DL:LB #4	LA:DL:LB #4	ASB <i>ODA</i>	DL:LB #4	AD:L:DL	
SURNAME	MThadani/hmc	RBirkel	MDuncan	OParr	EAdensam	TNovak	
DATE	5/5/83	5/5/83	5/5/83	6/7/83	5/ /83	5/ /83	

July 6, 1983

DISTRIBUTION:
Docket Nos. 50-369/370
LB #4 r/f
EAdensam
RBirke
MDuncan

MEMORANDUM FOR: Robert A. Clark, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing

FROM: Elinor G. Adensam, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 4
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION IN MONTHLY FR NOTICE - NOTICE
OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY
OPERATING LICENSE AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A
HEARING

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station,
Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: February 18, 1983.

Description of amendment request: The amendments would allow spent fuel from
McGuire Unit 1 to be stored in the spent fuel pool (SFP) for Unit 2 and spent
fuel from Unit 2 to be stored in the SFP for Unit 1. Under the current licenses,
the licensee may have Unit 1 spent fuel only in the Unit 1 SFP and Unit 2 spent
fuel only in the Unit 2 SFP.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Com-
mission has provided guidance concerning the application of the above standards
by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions
likely to involve no significant hazards consideration relates to a change which
either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a
previously-analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where
the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect
to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. A review of
licensee's submittal, dated February 14, 1983, in accordance with the Standards
of 10 CFR 50.92, indicates that the transfer of spent fuel between the two

OFFICE	8310280056	831019					
SURN	PDR	ADOCK	05000369				
DATE	P	PDR					

McGuire Nuclear Station Units does not involve a significant hazards consideration. This conclusion is based upon the following.

Because the fuel to be used in Units 1 and 2 is of the same design, the proposed transfer of spent fuel between Units 1 and 2 does not involve any significant changes in the procedures for spent fuel handling, types of fuel handling accidents, and radiation hazards of fuel pool operations, provided that the anticipated heat load of the pools does not result in pool temperature in excess of 150°F. The proposed amendments have not changed these conclusions, which were found acceptable in the McGuire Units 1 and 2 Safety Evaluation Report, dated March 1978, and March 1979 Supplement to the Safety Evaluation Report. The above conclusions regarding the proposed amendments, therefore, are similar to the example cited above, and do not involve any significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident, do not create a possibility of a new or different kind of accident, do not significantly reduce the safety margin, and their consequences are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to systems or components specified in the Standard Review Plan.

Local Public Document Room location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina-Charlotte, UNCC Station, North Carolina 28223.

Attorney for Licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, P.O. Box 33189, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242.

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

15/ Carl Stahle

Elinor G. Adensam, Chief

Licensing Branch No. 4

Division of Licensing

OFFICE	LA:DL:B #4	DL:LB #4	DL:LB #4			
SURNAME	MDuncal/hmc	RBirkel	EAdensam			
DATE	8/6/83	7/6/83	7/6/83			

October 19, 1983

AMENDMENT NO. 25 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-9 - McGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1
AMENDMENT NO. 6 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-17 - McGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 2

DISTRIBUTION:

✓ Docket Nos. 50-369/370

NRC PDR

Local PDR

TERA

NSIC

LB #4 r/f

E. Adensam

R. Birkel

M. Duncan

Attorney, OELD

D. Eisenhut/R. Purple

R. Hartfield, MPA

R. Diggs, ADM

T. Barnhart (8)

J. Souder

A. Rosenthal, ASLAB

W. Jones, OA (10)

ACRS (16)

ASLBP

E. L. Jordan, DEQA:I&E

J. M. Taylor, DRP:I&E

L. J. Harmon, I&E File

D. Brinkman, SSPB

H. Denton