

April 16, 1997

Mr. C. Charles M. Dugger
Vice President Operations
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box B
Killona, LA 70066

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY
OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION
DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING - WATERFORD STEAM
ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3 (TAC NO. M98376)

Dear Mr. Dugger:

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice that relates to your application for
amendment dated April 11, 1997. The proposed amendment would change Technical
Specification 3.6.2.2 and Surveillance Requirement 4.6.2.2 for the Containment
Cooling System for Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3.

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

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:

Chandu P. Patel, Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-382

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File PUBLIC
PDIV-1 r/f JRoe
EAdensam (EGA1) WBeckner
CPatel CHawes
OGC ACRS
TGwynn, RIV

Document Name: WAT98376.IND

OFC	PM/PD4-1	LA/PD4-1
NAME	CPatel/vw	CHawes <i>cmh</i>
DATE	4/16/97	4/16/97
COPY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES/NO	YES/NO

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

210038

9704210102 970416
PDR ADOCK 05000382
P PDR



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

April 16, 1997

Mr. C. Charles M. Dugger
Vice President Operations
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box B
Killona, LA 70066

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY
OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION
DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING - WATERFORD STEAM
ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3 (TAC NO. M98376)

Dear Mr. Dugger:

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice that relates to your application for amendment dated April 11, 1997. The proposed amendment would change Technical Specification 3.6.2.2 and Surveillance Requirement 4.6.2.2 for the Containment Cooling System for Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3.

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

Sincerely,

Chandu P. Patel

Chandu P. Patel, Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-382

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

Mr. Charles M. Dugger
Entergy Operations, Inc.

Waterford 3

cc:

Administrator
Louisiana Radiation Protection Division
Post Office Box 82135
Baton Rouge, LA 70884-2135

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

Vice President, Operations
Support
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box 31995
Jackson, MS 39286

Resident Inspector/Waterford NPS
Post Office Box 822
Killona, LA 70066

Director
Nuclear Safety & Regulatory Affairs
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box B
Killona, LA 70066

Parish President Council
St. Charles Parish
P. O. Box 302
Hahnville, LA 70057

Wise, Carter, Child & Caraway
P. O. Box 651
Jackson, MS 39205

Executive Vice-President
and Chief Operating Officer
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box 31995
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

General Manager Plant Operations
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box B
Killona, LA 70066

Chairman
Louisiana Public Service Commission
One American Place, Suite 1630
Baton Rouge, LA 70825-1697

Licensing Manager
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P. O. Box B
Killona, LA 70066

Winston & Strawn
1400 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3502

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC.DOCKET NO. 50-382NOTICE 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-38 issued to Entergy Operations Inc., (the licensee) for operation of the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, (Waterford 3) located in St. Charles Parish, Louisiana.

The proposed amendment would change Waterford 3 Technical Specifications by revising Technical Specification 3.6.2.2 and Surveillance Requirement 4.6.2.2 for the Containment Cooling System. The purpose of this amendment is to make the Technical Specification 3.6.2.2 and Surveillance Requirement 4.6.2.2 consistent with the containment cooling assumptions in the Waterford 3 containment analysis. Additionally, a Surveillance Requirement has been added to verify valves actuate on a Safety Injection Actuation Signal. A change to the Technical Specification Bases 3/4.3.6.2.2 has been included to support this change.

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. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No

The results of the reanalysis show that the consequences of an accident are not increased by this change to the required number of operable fan coolers and [Component Cooling Water] CCW flow to each fan cooler. Specifically, the acceptance criteria for peak containment pressure during an accident and pressure reduction at 24 hours after the accident are met. The calculated peak pressure for the limiting [Main Steam Line Break] MSLB is less than the containment design pressure of 44 psig. The pressure at 24 hours after the start of the limiting [Loss of Coolant Accident] LOCA is less than one half of the peak pressure.

Therefore, revising the containment fan cooler Technical Specification to require two fan coolers per train operable with a lower CCW flow rate of 1200 gpm to each will not adversely impact the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The flow rate of 1200 gpm is conservatively greater than the assumed flow rate in the analysis (1100 gpm). Furthermore, since the fan coolers are not an initiator of any event, the proposed change will not impact the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated.

An [Ultimate Heat Sink] UHS analysis has been performed of the effect of the lower CCW flows to the [Containment Fan Coolers] CFC

and shutdown cooling heat exchanger used in this [Technical Specification Change Request] TSCR. The analysis has shown that the peak accident heat load and wet cooling tower basin water consumption is bounded by the existing UHS analysis.

An analysis has been performed to determine the impact on environmentally qualified equipment based on the lower flows to the CFCs and shutdown cooling heat exchanger. The current temperature profile and containment peak pressure used to determine post accident operability on environmentally qualified equipment bounds this analysis.

Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

2. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No

The proposed change does not alter the operation of the fan coolers in a manner that would create a new or different accident. Although both CFCs per train are now required to be operable with a lower CCW flow to each CFC, the manner in which the CFCs perform their safety function is not changed. There are no new system interactions that could lead to a different kind of accident. This change serves to clarify the specification with respect to the Waterford 3 safety analysis and provide further information in the Bases. The configuration required by the proposed specification is permitted by the existing specification.

Therefore, the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Will operation of the facility in accordance with this proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No

The proposed change revises Technical Specification 3.6.2.2 and Surveillance Requirement 4.6.2.2 for the Containment Cooling System. This change revises the required number of fan coolers from one fan cooler per train to two fan coolers per train. This change also revises the surveillance flow requirement from 1325 gpm to a value consistent with containment cooling assumptions in Waterford 3 containment analyses. This flow rate will be tested

with the CCW system in the accident lineup to be consistent with the analysis assumptions.

The containment cooling system is designed, as described in the containment depressurization and cooling system Technical Specification Bases, to maintain the post accident containment peak pressure below its design value of 44 psig. The system is also designed to reduce the containment pressure by a factor of 2 from its post-accident peak within 24 hours.

The revised analyses done to support this Technical Specification change has shown that the peak containment pressure remains below 44 psig and the 24 hour pressure is less than half the peak. Therefore, the proposed change does not adversely impact margin of safety.

The revised analysis has also shown that the containment peak temperature remains below the temperature provided in the Technical Specification 3.6.2.1 and 3.6.2.2 Bases.

An UHS analysis has been performed of the effect of the lower CCW flows to the CFC and shutdown cooling heat exchanger used in this TSCR. The analysis has shown that the peak accident heat load and wet cooling tower basin water consumption is bounded by the existing UHS analysis.

An analysis has been performed to determine the impact on environmentally qualified equipment based on the lower flows to the CFCs and shutdown cooling heat exchanger. The current temperature profile and containment peak pressure used to determine post accident operability on environmentally qualified equipment bounds this analysis.

Therefore, the proposed change will not involve a significant reduction in a 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 Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this FEDERAL REGISTER notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, 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, N.W., Washington, DC.

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

By May 22, 1997 , 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, N.W., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70122. 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 20555-0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC, 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 William D. Beckner: 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 20555-0001, and to Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC, attorney for the licensee.

Non-timely 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 April 11, 1997, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70122.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of ~~April~~ ^{April} 1997.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Chandu P. Patel

Chandu P. Patel, Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-1
Division of Reactor Projects -III/IV
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation