

September 29, 1998

Mr. Garry L. Randolph  
Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer  
Union Electric Company  
Post Office Box 620  
Fulton, Missouri 65251

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY  
OPERATING LICENSE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING, CALLAWAY  
PLANT (TAC NO. M98803)

Dear Mr. Randolph:

Enclosed is a copy of a "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing," for your information. This notice relates to your application for amendment dated May 15, 1997, and the supplemental letters responding to requests for additional information, in which you proposed to convert the current Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Callaway Plant to a set of improved TSs based on NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants," Revision 1, dated April 1995. As explained in your application, this conversion is a joint effort in concert with three other utilities: Pacific Gas & Electric Company for Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 (Docket Nos. 50-275 and 323); TU Electric for Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2 (Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446); and Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation for Wolf Creek Generating Station (Docket No. 50-482).

This notice has been forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,  
Original Signed By  
Kristine M. Thomas, Project Manager  
Project Directorate IV-2  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-483

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket PUBLIC OGC  
PDIV-2 Reading PGwynn, RIV  
EAdensam (EGA1) WJohnson, RIV  
WBateman EPeyton  
KThomas  
JDonohew  
ACRS

Document Name: SHOLLY.CW

OFC	PM/PD4-2	LA/PD4-2	PM/PD4-1
NAME	KThomas	EPeyton	JDonohew
DATE	9/29/98	9/28/98	9/29/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9810060250 980929  
PDR ADOCK 05000483  
P PDR

ENC FILE CONTROL COPY

DF01

CP-1

cc w/encl:

Professional Nuclear  
Consulting, Inc.  
19041 Raines Drive  
Derwood, Maryland 20855

John O'Neill, Esq.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge  
2300 N. Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mr. H. D. Bono  
Supervising Engineer  
Quality Assurance Regulatory Support  
Union Electric Company  
Post Office Box 620  
Fulton, Missouri 65251

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Resident Inspector Office  
8201 NRC Road  
Steedman, Missouri 65077-1302

Mr. J. V. Laux, Manager  
Quality Assurance  
Union Electric Company  
Post Office Box 620  
Fulton, Missouri 65251

Manager - Electric Department  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
301 W. High  
Post Office Box 360  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Harris Tower & Pavilion  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400  
Arlington, Texas 76011-8064

Mr. Ronald A. Kucera, Deputy Director  
Department of Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 176  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Mr. Otto L. Maynard  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation  
Post Office Box 411  
Burlington, Kansas 66839

Mr. Dan I. Bolef, President  
Kay Drey, Representative  
Board of Directors Coalition  
for the Environment  
6267 Delmar Boulevard  
University City, Missouri 63130

Mr. Lee Fritz  
Presiding Commissioner  
Callaway County Court House  
10 East Fifth Street  
Fulton, Missouri 65151

Mr. Alan C. Passwater, Manager  
Licensing and Fuels  
Union Electric Company  
Post Office Box 66149  
St. Louis, Missouri 63166-6149

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONUNION ELECTRIC COMPANYDOCKET NO. 50-483NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE 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-30, issued to the Union Electric Company (UE or the licensee), for operation of the Callaway Plant (CW), located in Callaway County, Missouri.

The proposed amendment, requested by the licensee in a letter dated May 15, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated June 26, August 4, August 27, and September 24, 1998, would represent a full conversion from the current Technical Specifications (CTS) to a set of improved Technical Specifications (ITS) based on NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants," Revision 1, dated April 1995. NUREG-1431 has been developed by the Commission's staff through working groups composed of both NRC staff members and industry representatives, and has been endorsed by the staff as part of an industry-wide initiative to standardize and improve the Technical Specifications for nuclear power plants. As part of this submittal, the licensee has applied the criteria contained in the Commission's "Final Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors (Final Policy Statement)," published in the Federal Register on July 22, 1993 (58 FR 39132), to the CTS, and, using NUREG-1431 as a basis, proposed an ITS for CW. The criteria in the Final Policy

Statement were subsequently added to 10 CFR 50.36, "Technical Specifications," in a rule change that was published in the Federal Register on July 19, 1995 (60 FR 36953) and became effective on August 18, 1995.

This conversion is a joint effort in concert with three other utilities: Pacific Gas & Electric Company for Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 (Docket Nos. 50-275 and 323); TU Electric for Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2 (Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446); and Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation for Wolf Creek Generating Station (Docket No. 50-482). It is a goal of the four utilities to make the ITS for all the plants as similar as possible. This joint effort includes a common methodology for the licensees in marking-up the CTS and NUREG-1431 Specifications, and the NUREG-1431 Bases, that has been accepted by the staff. This includes the convention that, if the words in the CTS specification are not the same as the words in the ITS specification but they mean the same or have the same requirements as the words in the ITS specification, the licensee does not indicate or describe a change to the CTS.

This common methodology is discussed at the end of Enclosure 2, "Mark-Up of Current TS"; Enclosure 5a, "Mark-Up of NUREG-1431 Specifications"; and Enclosure 5b, "Mark-Up of NUREG-1431 Bases, for each of the 14 separate ITS sections that were submitted with the licensee's application. For each of the 14 ITS sections, there is also the following: Enclosure 1, the cross reference table connecting each CTS specification (i.e., limiting condition for operation, required action, or surveillance requirement) to the associated ITS specification, sorted by both CTS and ITS Specifications; Enclosure 3, the description of the changes to the CTS section and the comparison table showing which plants (of the four licensees in the joint effort) that each change applies to; Enclosure 4, the no significant hazards consideration

(NHSC) of 10 CFR 50.91 for the changes to the CTS with generic NHSCs for administrative, more restrictive, relocation, and moving-out-of-CTS changes, and individual NHSCs for less restrictive changes and with the organization of the NHSC evaluation discussed in the beginning of the enclosure; and Enclosure 6, the descriptions of the differences from NUREG-1431 specifications and the comparison table showing which plants (of the four licensees in the joint effort) that each difference applies to. Another convention of the common methodology is that the technical justifications for the less restrictive changes are included in the NHSCs.

The licensee has categorized the proposed changes to the CTS into four general groupings. These groupings are characterized as administrative changes, relocated changes, more restrictive changes and less restrictive changes.

Administrative changes are those that involve restructuring, renumbering, rewording, interpretation and complex rearranging of requirements and other changes not affecting technical content or substantially revising an operating requirement. The reformatting, renumbering and rewording process reflects the attributes of NUREG-1431 and does not involve technical changes to the existing TS. The proposed changes include (a) providing the appropriate numbers, etc., for NUREG-1431 bracketed information (information that must be supplied on a plant-specific basis, and which may change from plant to plant), (b) identifying plant-specific wording for system names, etc., and (c) changing NUREG-1431 section wording to conform to existing licensee practices. Such changes are administrative in nature and do not impact initiators of analyzed events or assumed mitigation of accident or transient events.

Relocated changes are those involving relocation of requirements and surveillances for structures, systems, components, or variables that do not meet the criteria for inclusion in TS. Relocated changes are those current TS requirements that do not satisfy or fall within any of

the four criteria specified in the Commission's policy statement and may be relocated to appropriate licensee-controlled documents.

The licensee's application of the screening criteria is described in Attachment 2 to its June 2, 1997, submittal, which is entitled, "General Description and Assessment." The affected structures, systems, components or variables are not assumed to be initiators of analyzed events and are not assumed to mitigate accident or transient events. The requirements and surveillances for these affected structures, systems, components, or variables will be relocated from the TS to administratively controlled documents such as the quality assurance program, the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), the ITS BASES, the Technical Requirements Manual (TRM) that is incorporated by reference in the FSAR, the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR), the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (ODCM), the Inservice Testing (IST) Program, or other licensee-controlled documents. Changes made to these documents will be made pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59 or other appropriate control mechanisms, and may be made without prior NRC review and approval. In addition, the affected structures, systems, components, or variables are addressed in existing surveillance procedures that are also subject to 10 CFR 50.59. These proposed changes will not impose or eliminate any requirements.

More restrictive changes are those involving more stringent requirements compared to the CTS for operation of the facility. These more stringent requirements do not result in operation that will alter assumptions relative to the mitigation of an accident or transient event. The more restrictive requirements will not alter the operation of process variables, structures, systems, and components described in the safety analyses. For each requirement in the CTS that is more restrictive than the corresponding requirement in NUREG-1431 that the licensee proposes to retain in the ITS, they have provided an explanation of why they have concluded

that retaining the more restrictive requirement is desirable to ensure safe operation of the facility because of specific design features of the plant.

Less restrictive changes are those where CTS requirements are relaxed or eliminated, or new plant operational flexibility is provided. The more significant "less restrictive" requirements are justified on a case-by-case basis. When requirements have been shown to provide little or no safety benefit, their removal from the TS may be appropriate. In most cases, relaxations previously granted to individual plants on a plant-specific basis were the result of (a) generic NRC actions, (b) new NRC staff positions that have evolved from technological advancements and operating experience, or (c) resolution of the Owners Groups' comments on the Improved Standard Technical Specifications. Generic relaxations contained in NUREG-1431 were reviewed by the staff and found to be acceptable because they are consistent with current licensing practices and NRC regulations. The licensee's design will be reviewed to determine if the specific design basis and licensing basis are consistent with the technical basis for the model requirements in NUREG-1431, thus providing a basis for these revised TS, or if relaxation of the requirements in the current TS is warranted based on the justification provided by the licensee.

These administrative, relocated, more restrictive, and less restrictive changes to the requirements of the CTS do not result in operations that will alter assumptions relative to mitigation of an analyzed accident or transient event.

In addition to the proposed changes solely involving the conversion, there are also changes proposed that are different than the requirements in both the CTS and the improved Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1431). These proposed beyond-scope issues to the ITS conversion are as follows:

1. ITS Surveillance Requirement (SR) 3.2.1.2 - add frequency of once within 24 hours for verifying the axial heat flux hot channel factor is within limit after achieving equilibrium conditions.
2. ITS SR 3.2.2.1 note - revise the allowance to increase power until a power distribution is obtained after equilibrium is achieved.
3. ITS LCO 3.3.1 - revise operability and actions for steam generator low-low level instrumentation in ITS Table 3.3.1-1 to not include Mode 3 in operability and to allow 12 hours in Mode 3 in actions instead of entry into ITS 3.0.3 for inoperable steam generator instrumentation.
4. ITS LCO 3.3.9 - revise Action B to increase the verification interval for unborated water source isolation valve position from 14 days to 31 days.
5. ITS LCOs 3.4.5, 3.4.10, 3.4.11, and 3.4.12 - revise applicability and add a note (to ITS 3.4.5) to add reactor coolant pump start restrictions for low temperature overpressure protection for the reactor coolant system.
6. ITS LCO 3.4.7 and SRs 3.4.5.2, 3.4.6.2, and 3.4.7.2 - revise steam generator level requirements in Modes 3, 4, and 5 to ensure tubes are covered.
7. ITS LCO 3.4.1.2 - revise applicability note to allow a longer time, up to 4 hours, for injecting into the reactor coolant system.
8. ITS SR 3.6.3.7 - note added to not require leak rate test of containment purge valves with resilient seals when penetration flow path is isolated by leak-tested blank flange.
9. Actions and table for ITS LCO 3.7.1 - changes to main steam safety valves (MSSVs) to reflect Westinghouse Nuclear Safety Letter 94-01, revising acceptable power levels when MSSVs are inoperable.

10. ITS LCO 3.7.15 - changes reference for the spent fuel pool level from that above top of fuel stored in racks to that above the top of racks.

11. ITS LCO 3.7.13 - adds note to applicability and new actions on test capability of emergency exhaust system to maintain a negative building pressure while in safety injection signal lineup.

12. ITS LCO 3.8.6 - revise float voltage in Table 3.8.6-1 and add an allowed voltage variation.

13. ITS 5.6.5 - adds refueling boron concentration and shutdown margin limits to the core operating limits report.

14. ITS 5.7 - changes limits for high radiation areas to reflect the requirements of revised 10 CFR Part 20.

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.

By November 4, 1998, 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, and at the local public document room located at the Elmer Ellis Library, University of

Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, 65201. 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 a 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.

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 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to Mr. John O'Neill, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20037, 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).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated May 15, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated June 26, August 4, August 27, and September 24, 1998, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Elmer Ellis Library, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, 65201.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of September 1998.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Kristine M. Thomas, Project Manager  
Project Directorate IV-2  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation