

March 3, 1994

Docket No. 50-458

Entergy Operations, Inc.
River Bend Station
ATTN: Mr. John R. McGaha, Jr.
Vice President - Operations
Post Office Box 220
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Dear Mr. McGaha:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY
OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION,
AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING (TAC NO. M88314)

The Commission has requested the Office of the Federal Register to publish the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration and Opportunity for a Hearing." This notice relates to your application dated February 22, 1994, to revise the River Bend Station (RBS) Technical Specifications for the main steam-positive leakage control system (MS-PLCS) and the penetration valve leakage control system (PVLCS) to be consistent with the requirements contained in NUREG-1434, "Standard Technical Specifications, General Electric Plants (BWR/6)."

Sincerely,

Original Signed By

Robert G. Schaaf, Acting Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV/V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
Notice

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File OGC
NRC & Local PDRs DHagan
PDIV-2 R/F ACRS (10)
JRoe OPA
EAdensam OC/LFDCB
EPeyton JGagliardo, RG-IV
RSchaaf

9403100112 940303
PDR ADOCK 05000458
P PDR

OFFICE	PDIV-2/LA	PDIV-2/PM	PDIV-2/D		
NAME	EPeyton	RSchaaf	SBlack		
DATE	3/1/94	3/3/94	3/3/94	1/1	1/1

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY/ FILENAME: b:\rb_88832.ind

FILE CENTER COPY

090035

CP-1
FOI
11

Mr. John R. McGaha

- 2 -

cc w/enclosure:

Winston & Strawn
ATTN: Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esq.
1400 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3502

Mr. Otto Bulch
Director - Nuclear Licensing
Entergy Operations, Inc.
River Bend Station
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Mr. Philip G. Harris
Cajun Electric Power Coop, Inc.
10719 Airline Highway
P. O. Box 15540
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70895

Senior Resident Inspector
P. O. Box 1051
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

President of West Feliciana
Police Jury
P. O. Box 1921
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000
Arlington, Texas 76011

Mr. J. David McNeill, III
William G. Davis, Esq.
Department of Justice
Attorney General's Office
P. O. Box 94095
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9095

Ms. H. Anne Plettinger
3456 Villa Rose Drive
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806

Administrator
Louisiana Radiation Protection Division
P. O. Box 82135
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70884-2135

Mr. Harold W. Keiser
Executive Vice President and
Chief Operating Officer
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box 31995
Jackson, Mississippi 39286

Mr. Michael B. Sellman
Plant Manager
Entergy Operations, Inc.
River Bend Station
Post Office Box 220
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Mr. James J. Fisicaro
Manager - Safety Assessment and Quality
Verification
Entergy Operations, Inc.
River Bend Station
Post Office Box 220
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC.DOCKET NO. 50-458NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-47 issued to Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee) for operation of the River Bend Station, Unit 1, located in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana.

The proposed amendment would revise the technical specifications (TS) for the main steam-positive leakage control system (MS-PLCS) and the penetration valve leakage control system (PVLCS) to be consistent with the requirements contained in NUREG-1434, "Standard Technical Specifications, General Electric Plants (BWR/6)."

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant

reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed change would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

This change request would allow 30 days of continued operation with one penetration valve leakage control system (PVLCS) subsystem inoperable. The PVLCS is required to mitigate the consequences of a design basis accident (DBA). The proposed change would increase the allowed outage time with one OPERABLE PVLCS.

Based on the RBS Level 1 and Level 2 Individual Plant Examination (IPE), the loss of one train of PVLCS, concurrent with a DBA and subsequent radionuclide release, is an extremely low probability event (e.g., less than $1E-7$ per year). This probability is less than NRC Safety Goal of $1E-6$ per year for large releases following a core damage event. Because of the extremely low probability of the event, the increase in allowed outage time from seven days to 30 days does not represent a significant increase in the probability or consequences of the DBA which PVLCS is intended to mitigate.

The PVLCS is not an initiator of any previously analyzed accident. The configuration of one system inoperable is presently addressed by the specification and will not change an allowed operation. Because the operation is no different than previously allowed, the consequences of an event previously evaluated has not been increased. The probability of an event requiring the system has been evaluated and determined to be very low.

In addition, the proposed changes address two subsystems inoperable. This change would allow seven days of continued operation with both main steam positive leakage control (MS-PLCS) and PVLCS subsystems inoperable. The MS-PLCS and PVLCS are not initiators of any previously analyzed accident. Therefore, these changes do not significantly increase the frequency of such accidents. This proposed change would allow temporary operation with no OPERABLE PVLCS or MS-PLCS. Minor increases in containment leakage, such as the leakage through the MSIVs, have been found to have no significant impact on the risk to the public.

Consequently, this change does not significantly increase the consequences of any previously analyzed accident.

The increase to the probability of core damage as a result of the loss of long term ADS air supply backup has been evaluated and determined to be less than the NRC safety goal of $1E-6$ and the NUMARC goal of $1E-7$ for evaluation. Therefore there is not a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed change would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to increase the allowed outage time from seven days to 30 days for one subsystem inoperable does not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. This change does not result in any changes to the equipment design or capabilities. Since the PVLCS mitigates the consequences of an accident and failure of this system cannot create an accident. Therefore, this proposed

change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed accident.

The change to allow two systems out of service has been proposed for PVLCS and MS-PLCS of 7 days and is consistent with the allowable out-of-service time specified in LCO 3.6.1.8 and 3.6.1.9 of NUREG-1434, "Standard Technical Specification General Electric Plants, BWR/6" for these systems. This allowance is based on the low safety significance as discussed in NUREG-1273, "Technical Findings and Regulatory Analysis for Generic Safety Issue II.E.4.3, "Containment Integrity Check," and NUREG/CR-3539, "Impact of Containment Building Leakage on LWR Accident Risk."

Although the proposed change allows further operation of the plant with equipment not capable of performing its safety function, they do not result in any changes to the equipment design or capabilities. Loss of the containment function does not impact the reactor coolant pressure boundary or its support systems; therefore, does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed accident.

Since the change to the long term air supply for ADS has been evaluated and the increase in core damage is below the NRC safety goal of $1E-6$ and the NUMARC goal of $1E-7$ for evaluation, this proposal should not be considered as a new event.

3. The proposed change would not involve a reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed change to increase the allowed outage time from seven days to 30 days for one subsystem inoperable does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. The PVLCS is not an initiator of any

previously analyzed accident. As stated above, the proposed change increases the allowed outage time for a system that is used to mitigate the consequences of an accident. The system continues to perform its intended safety function and the change in allowed outage time has a very small impact on plant risk. The configuration of one system inoperable is presently addressed by the specification and therefore will not change the previous margin of safety of an allowed operation. Because the operation is no different than previously allowed, the results of an event previously evaluated have not been increased. Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change would also allow seven days of continued operation with both MS-PLCS and PVLCS inoperable. Minor increases in containment leakage such as the leakage through the MSIVs, as identified in NUREG-1273 and NUREG/CR-3539, have been found to have no significant impact on the risk to the public. Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The change to the long term ADS air supply has been determined not to add significant risk to the general public; therefore, the change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of

publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the FEDERAL REGISTER a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room P-223, Phillips Building, 7920 Norfolk Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By April 11, 1994 , the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555 and at the local public document room located at the Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other

interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a

supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification

Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Suzanne C. Black, Director, Project Directorate IV-2: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated February 22, 1994, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555 and at the local public document room located at Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of March 1994.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Robert G. Schaaf, Acting Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV/V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation