July 17, 1997

Mr. William T. Cottle
Group Vice-President, Nuclear
Houston Lighting & Power Company
South Texas Project Electric
Generating Station
P. O. Box 289
Wadsworth, TX 77483

SUBJECT: SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - AMENDMENT NOS. 88 AND 75 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. NPF-76 AND NPF-80 (TAC NOS. M96413 AND M96414)

Dear Mr. Cottle:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. 88 and 75 to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-76 and NPF-80 for the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2. The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated August 15, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated October 31, 1996, and May 29, 1997.

The amendments remove a requirement for performance of a surveillance incorporating a high toxic gas test signal.

A copy of our related Safety Evaluation is enclosed. The Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,
ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:
Thomas W. Alexion, Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 88 to NPF-76
2. Amendment No. 75 to NPF-80
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File	GHill (4)	PUBLIC	OGC
CHawes	TAlexion (2)	MReinhart	PDIV-1 r/f
ACRS	JRoe	LHurley, RIV	JKilcrease, RIV f/r
TGwynn, RIV	EAdensam (EGA1)		

DF01/1

Document Name: STP96413.AMD

OFC	PM/PD4-1	LA/PD4-1	(A)BC/TSB	OGC	(A)D/PD4-1
NAME	TAlexion/TW	CHawes/MN	~~MReinhart~~ W BECKNER WDB	R Bachmann	JClifford
DATE	6/5/97	6/5/97	6/23/97	6/26/97	7/16/97
COPY	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9707210067 970717
PDR ADOCK 05000498
P PDR

CP-1

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

July 17, 1997

Mr. William T. Cottle
Executive Vice-President &
General Manager, Nuclear
Houston Lighting & Power Company
South Texas Project Electric
Generating Station
P. O. Box 289
Wadsworth, TX 77483

SUBJECT: SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - AMENDMENT NOS. 88 AND 75 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. NPF-76 AND NPF-80 (TAC NOS. M96413 AND M96414)

Dear Mr. Cottle:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. 88 and 75 to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-76 and NPF-80 for the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2. The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated August 15, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated October 31, 1996, and May 29, 1997.

The amendments remove a requirement for performance of a surveillance incorporating a high toxic gas test signal.

A copy of our related Safety Evaluation is enclosed. The Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

Thomas W. Alexion

Thomas W. Alexion, Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 88 to NPF-76
2. Amendment No. 75 to NPF-80
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

Mr. William T. Cottle
Houston Lighting & Power Company

South Texas, Units 1 & 2

cc:

Mr. David P. Loveless
Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 910
Bay City, TX 77414

Mr. J. C. Lanier/M. B. Lee
City of Austin
Electric Utility Department
721 Barton Springs Road
Austin, TX 78704

Mr. M. T. Hardt
Mr. W. C. Gunst
City Public Service Board
P. O. Box 1771
San Antonio, TX 78296

Mr. G. E. Vaughn/C. A. Johnson
Central Power and Light Company
P. O. Box 289
Mail Code: N5012
Wadsworth, TX 74483

INPO
Records Center
700 Galleria Parkway
Atlanta, GA 30339-3064

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400
Arlington, TX 76011

Dr. Bertram Wolfe
15453 Via Vaquero
Monte Sereno, CA 95030

Judge, Matagorda County
Matagorda County Courthouse
1700 Seventh Street
Bay City, TX 77414

Jack R. Newman, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5869

Mr. Lawrence E. Martin
General Manager, Nuclear Assurance Licensing
Houston Lighting and Power Company
P. O. Box 289
Wadsworth, TX 77483

Rufus S. Scott
Associate General Counsel
Houston Lighting and Power Company
P. O. Box 61867
Houston, TX 77208

Joseph R. Egan, Esq.
Egan & Associates, P.C.
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

Office of the Governor
ATTN: Andy Barrett, Director
Environmental Policy
P. O. Box 12428
Austin, TX 78711

Arthur C. Tate, Director
Division of Compliance & Inspection
Bureau of Radiation Control
Texas Department of Health
1100 West 49th Street
Austin, TX 78756

Texas Public Utility Commission
ATTN: Mr. Glenn W. Dishong
7800 Shoal Creek Blvd.
Suite 400N
Austin, TX 78757-1024

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY

CITY PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD OF SAN ANTONIO

CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

DOCKET NO. 50-498

SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 88
License No. NPF-76

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Houston Lighting & Power Company* (HL&P) acting on behalf of itself and for the City Public Service Board of San Antonio (CPS), Central Power and Light Company (CPL), and City of Austin, Texas (COA) (the licensees), dated August 15, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated October 31, 1996, and May 29, 1997, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations 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 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;

   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; 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.

---

*Houston Lighting & Power Company is authorized to act for the City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company and City of Austin, Texas and has exclusive responsibility and control over the physical construction, operation and maintenance of the facility.

9707210071 970717
PDR ADOCK 05000498
P PDR

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by 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-76 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   2. Technical Specifications

   The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 88, and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. The license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Thomas W. Alexion

Thomas W. Alexion, Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the Technical Specifications

Date of Issuance: July 17, 1997

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY

CITY PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD OF SAN ANTONIO

CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

DOCKET NO. 50-499

SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT, UNIT 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 75
License No. NPF-80

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Houston Lighting & Power Company* (HL&P) acting on behalf of itself and for the City Public Service Board of San Antonio (CPS), Central Power and Light Company (CPL), and City of Austin, Texas (COA) (the licensees), dated August 15, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated October 31, 1996, and May 29, 1997, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations 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 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;

   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; 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.

---

*Houston Lighting & Power Company is authorized to act for the City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company and City of Austin, Texas and has exclusive responsibility and control over the physical construction, operation and maintenance of the facility.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by 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-80 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   2. Technical Specifications

   The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 75, and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. The license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Thomas W. Alexion

Thomas W. Alexion, Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the Technical Specifications

Date of Issuance: July 17, 1997

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NOS. 88 AND 75

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. NPF-76 AND NPF-80

DOCKET NOS. 50-498 AND 50-499

Replace the following page of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the attached page. The revised page is identified by Amendment number and contains marginal lines indicating the areas of change. The corresponding overleaf page is also provided to maintain document completeness.

REMOVE	INSERT
3/4 7-18	3/4 7-18

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

c. At least once per 18 months or (1) after any structural maintenance on the HEPA filter or charcoal adsorber housings, or (2) following painting, fire, or chemical release in any ventilation zone communicating with the system by:

1) Verifying that the makeup and cleanup systems satisfy the in-place penetration and bypass leakage testing acceptance criteria of less than 0.05% for HEPA filter banks and 0.10% for charcoal adsorber banks and uses the test procedure guidance in Regulatory Positions C.5.a, C.5.c, and C.5.d of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 2, March 1978, and the system flow rate is 6000 cfm ± 10% for the cleanup units and 1000 cfm ± 10% for the makeup units;

2) Verifying, within 31 days after removal, that a laboratory analysis of a representative carbon sample obtained in accordance with Regulatory Position C.6.b of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 2, March 1978, meets the laboratory testing criteria of Regulatory Position C.6.a of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 2, March 1978, for a methyl iodide penetration of less than 1.0% when tested at a temperature of 30°C and a relative humidity of 70%; and

3) Verifying a system flow rate of 6000 cfm ± 10% for the cleanup units and 1000 cfm ± 10% for the makeup units during system operation when tested in accordance with ANSI N510-1980.

d. After every 720 hours of charcoal adsorber operation, by verifying, within 31 days after removal, that a laboratory analysis of a representative carbon sample obtained in accordance with Regulatory Position C.6.b of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 2, March 1978, meets the laboratory testing criteria of Regulatory Position C.6.a of Regulatory Guide 1.52, Revision 2, March 1978, for a methyl iodide penetration of less than 1.0% when tested at a temperature of 30°C and a relative humidity of 70%;

e. At least once per 18 months by:

1) Verifying that the pressure drop across the combined HEPA filters and charcoal adsorber banks is less than 6.1 inches Water Gauge for the makeup units and 6.0 inches Water Gauge for the cleanup units while operating the system at a flow rate of 6000 cfm ± 10% for the cleanup units and 1000 cfm ± 10% for the makeup units;

2) Verifying that on a control room emergency ventilation test signal (High Radiation and/or Safety Injection test signal), the system automatically switches into a recirculation and makeup air filtration mode of operation with flow through the HEPA filters and charcoal adsorber banks of the cleanup and makeup units;

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

3) Verifying that the system maintains the control room envelope at a positive pressure of greater than or equal to 1/8 inch Water Gauge at less that or equal to a pressurization flow of 2000 cfm relative to adjacent areas during system operation; and

4) Verifying that the makeup filter unit heaters dissipate 4.5 ± 0.45 kW when tested in accordance with ANSI N510-1980.

f. After each complete or partial replacement of a HEPA filter bank, by verifying that the HEPA filter bank satisfies the in-place penetration and bypass leakage testing acceptance criteria of less than 0.05% in accordance with ANSI N510-1980 for a DOP test aerosol while operating the system at a flow rate of 6000 cfm ± 10% for the cleanup units and 1000 cfm ± 10% for the makeup units; and

g. After each complete or partial replacement of a charcoal adsorber bank, by verifying that the charcoal adsorber bank satisfies the in-place penetration and bypass leakage testing acceptance criteria of less than 0.10% in accordance with ANSI N510-1980 for a halogenated hydrocarbon refrigerant test gas while operating the system at a flow rate of 6000 cfm ± 10% for the cleanup units and 1000 cfm ± 10% for the makeup units.

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 88 AND 75 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. NPF-76 AND NPF-80

HOUSTON LIGHTING & POWER COMPANY

CITY PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD OF SAN ANTONIO

CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

DOCKET NOS. 50-498 AND 50-499

SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT, UNITS 1 AND 2

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application dated August 15, 1996, as supplemented by letters dated October 31, 1996, and May 29, 1997, Houston Lighting & Power Company, et.al., (the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) (Appendix A to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-76 and NPF-80) for the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2 (STP). The proposed changes would remove a requirement for performance of a surveillance incorporating a high toxic gas test signal.

The October 31, 1996, and May 29, 1997, supplements provided clarifying information and did not change the initial no significant hazards consideration determination.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The licensee requested to remove Surveillance Requirement 4.7.7.e.5. Surveillance Requirement 4.7.7.e.5 verifies that on a high toxic gas test signal, the control room makeup and cleanup filtration system automatically switches into a recirculation mode of operation by isolating the normal supply and exhaust flow within 5 seconds. The reason for this amendment is that the capability for monitoring toxic gases was eliminated from the plant and consequently, the surveillance requirements are not needed. The toxic gas monitoring capability was removed from the plant as a result of an analysis performed by the licensee which indicated that an accidental release of any toxic chemical that is stored inside the plant or stored or transported within five mile radius from the plant would not incapacitate control room operators.

The licensee performed this plant modification under 10 CFR 50.59 because on July 6, 1995, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved relocation of

9707210074 970717
PDR ADOCK 05000498
P PDR

the specification dealing with the toxic gas monitoring system (TS 3/4.3.3.7) from the plant's TSs to the licensee-controlled Technical Requirements Manual. Following the relocation, the licensee was able to demonstrate that the removal of the toxic gas monitoring system does not involve an unreviewed safety question.

The October 31, 1996, supplement provided the 10 CFR 50.59 evaluation that addressed removal of the toxic gas monitoring system. The May 29, 1997, supplement provided administrative changes to the affected page of the TSs that was initially proposed in the August 15, 1996, application to ensure punctuation and organization consistency.

3.0 EVALUATION

The following two toxic chemicals are stored in the plant: ethanolamine and hydrazine. The licensee's analysis has indicated that their accidental release could not result in buildup of the concentrations in the control room which could incapacitate plant operators.

There are several potentially toxic chemicals which are either stored or transported within five mile radius from the plant. In accordance with the recommendations of Regulatory Guide 1.78, some of them were eliminated from consideration because of their very small quantities present, or their low volatility. However, the licensee found that the effect on habitability of the control room had to be evaluated for six of them. The original number was eventually reduced to four because anhydrous ammonia and hydrochloric acid were not stored or transported any more near the plant.

The evaluation of these four chemicals (acetic acid, vinyl acetate, acetaldehyde and naphta) was performed by the licensee using dispersion analysis to calculate the concentration inside the control room and probabilistic analysis to determine the probabilities of building up the concentrations which could incapacitate the control room operators. Using the results of these analyses, the licensee demonstrated that either the concentrations in the control room were below the values which could incapacitate the operators, or the probabilities of reaching these concentrations were below the permissible values, specified in Section 2.2.3 of the Standard Review Plan. It concluded, therefore, that these chemical did not pose any safety concern. The licensee's evaluations were reviewed by the staff and found to be acceptable.

4.0 SUMMARY

The staff has evaluated the proposed amendment to eliminate the surveillance requirement for performance of a surveillance incorporating a high toxic gas test signal. The staff finds that the technical bases used by the licensee in removing the toxic gas monitors from STP are acceptable, and also finds, therefore, that elimination of TS 4.7.7.e.5 is justified.

5.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Texas State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and change surveillance requirements. The NRC 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 (61 FR 50344). 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 amendments.

7.0 CONCLUSION

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

Principal Contributor: K. Parczewski

Date: July 17, 1997