

October 8, 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. M99739)

Dear Mr. Dugger:

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice that relates to your application for  
amendment dated October 7, 1997. The proposed amendment would change  
Technical Specification 3.3.3.7.3 and Surveillance Requirement 4.3.3.7.3 for  
the broad range gas detection system for Waterford Steam Electric Station,  
Unit 3.

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

Sincerely,

Orig. 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	EAdensam (EGAI)
WBeckner	CPatel	CHawes	OGC
ACRS	TGwynn, RIV		

Document Name: WAT99739.IND

OFC	PM/PD4-1	LA/PD4-1
NAME	CPatel/vw <i>cp</i>	CHawes <i>cmH</i>
DATE	10/8/97	10/8/97
COPY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES/NO	YES/NO

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

*DF01/1*

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

*110045*



9710220044 971008  
PDR ADOCK 05000382  
P PDR



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

October 8, 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. M99739)

Dear Mr. Dugger:

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice that relates to your application for amendment dated October 7, 1997. The proposed amendment would change Technical Specification 3.3.3.7.3 and Surveillance Requirement 4.3.3.7.3 for the broad range gas detection 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, located in St. Charles Parish, Louisiana.

The proposed amendment would change Waterford 3 Technical Specifications 3.3.3.7.3 (TSs) and Surveillance Requirement 4.3.3.7.3 for the broad range gas detection system. A change to the TS Basis 3/4.3.3.7 has been included to support this change. This change to the TSs is necessary due to a potential unreviewed safety question identified during final review prior to installation of a new broad range gas detection system approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff on August 19, 1997 (Amendment 133). In effect, Entergy Operations is requesting that the TSs and associated Basis for the broad range gas detection system that were in effect prior to Amendment 133 be retained instead of implementing the approved Amendment 133.

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 broad range gas detection system has no effect on the accidents analyzed in Chapter 15 of the Final Safety Analysis Report. The habitability of the control room will be unchanged by use of the currently installed monitoring system and this change to the Technical Specifications. Since this proposed change will make operation of the facility the same as before Amendment 133, the probability and consequences of an accident associated with this change have been previously evaluated.

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 Technical Specification change in itself does not change the design or configuration of the plant. Since this proposed change will make operation of the facility the same as it was before Amendment 133, no new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated will be created.

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 broad range gas detection system has no effect on a margin of safety as defined by Section 2 of the Technical Specifications. The habitability of the control room will be unchanged from the configuration of the currently installed detection system and this change to the Technical Specifications. The margin of safety remains unchanged from the original licensing basis of the plant.

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

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 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, NW., Washington, DC.

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

By November 14, 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, NW., 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: 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 N. S. Reynolds, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC, 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 October 7, 1997, 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 University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, LA 70122.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of October 1997.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Chandu P. Patel*

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