

Gary R. Peterson Vice President Catawba Nuclear Station

 Duke Power

 4800 Concord Rd.

 York, SC 29710

 (803) 831-4251
 OFFICE

 (803) 831-3221
 FAX

 grpeters@duke-energy.com

February 14, 2002

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555-0001 ATTENTION: Document Control Desk

SUBJECT: Duke Energy Corporation

Catawba Nuclear Station Unit (s) 1 and 2

Docket Numbers 50-413 and 50-414

Planned Revision to Proposed Amendment for Partial Scope Implementation of the Alternate

Source Term

REFERENCE: Duke Energy Corporation

Catawba Nuclear Station Unit (s) 1 and 2
Docket Numbers 50-413 and 50-414
Proposed Amendment for Partial Scope
Implementation of the Alternate Source Term and
Proposed Amendment to Technical Specifications
(TS) 3.7.10, Control Room Area Ventilation
System, TS 3.7.11, Control Room Area Chilled
Water System, TS 3.7.13, Fuel Handling
Ventilation Exhaust System, and TS 3.9.3,

Containment Penetrations

On December 20, 2001, Duke Energy Corporation submitted a License Amendment Request for the Catawba Nuclear Station Facility Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications. The changes being proposed in the License Amendment Request are based on a revised radiological dose consequence analysis of a postulated fuel handling accident and weir gate drop accident. Partial implementation of an alternate source term was requested in accordance with the

No Vo

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission February 14, 2002 Page 2

requirements of 10 CFR 50.67 and relevant guidance provided in Regulatory Guide 1.183.

In the original submittal, Duke Energy Corporation used separate decontamination factors for elemental and organic species of iodine, based on our interpretation of the regulatory positions in Regulatory Guide 1.183, Appendix B, Assumptions for Evaluating the Radiological Consequences of a Fuel Handling Accident. Additionally, Duke Energy Corporation has supported the assumption of an elemental iodine decontamination factor of 500 based on our fuel pool specific evaluation of vendor research results. This approach is consistent with the guidance values specified in Appendix B regarding iodine release fractions from the pool.

However, as a result of subsequent conversations with the NRC Staff, we have concluded that the review of our submittal could be expedited if our analyses used a more conservative overall effective iodine decontamination factor of 200, also described in Appendix B of Regulatory Guide 1.183. This approach would eliminate the need for a detailed review of our supporting calculations and analyses as part of the approval process for this License Amendment Request.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that Duke Energy Corporation intends to re-calculate the radiological consequences of the fuel handling accident and the weir gate drop accident using the overall effective decontamination factor of 200. Based on a preliminary evaluation, the revised consequences are expected to be within guideline values, and the conclusions in the No Significant Hazards Consideration previously submitted remain valid. The results of the final calculation will be submitted as a supplement to the original License Amendment Request in early March 2002.

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission February 14, 2002 Page 3

Inquiries on this matter should be directed to M.H. Chernoff at (803) 831-3414.

Very truly yours,

G.R. Peterson

Attachments

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission February 14, 2002 Page 4

xc:

L. A. Reyes
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Regional Administrator, Region II
Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth St., SW, Suite 23T85
Atlanta, GA 30303

C. P. Patel (Addressee only)
NRC Senior Project Manager (CNS)
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop O-8 H12
Washington, DC 20555-0001

D. J. Roberts
Senior Resident Inspector (CNS)
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Catawba Nuclear Site

R. Wingard, Director Division of Radioactive Waste Management Department of Health and Environmental Control 2600 Bull Street Columbia, SC 29207