



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

March 9, 1992

Docket No. 50-445

Mr. William J. Cahill, Jr.  
Group Vice President  
TU Electric  
400 North Olive Street, L.B. 81  
Dallas, Texas 75201

Dear Mr. Cahill:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT - PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING - COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT NO. 1 (TAC NO. M82902)

The Commission has requested the Office of the Federal Register to publish the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for Hearing." This notice relates to your application for amendment dated February 28, 1992, which requested a change to the Technical Specifications to remove the Boron Dilution Mitigation System (BDMS) from the Technical Specifications.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Thomas A. Bergman".

Thomas A. Bergman, 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

9203160111 920309  
PDR ADDCK 05000445  
P PDR

NRG FILE CENTER COPY

110019

DF01

March 9, 1992

Docket File No. 50 445

Mr. William J. Cahill, Jr.  
Group Vice President  
TU Electric  
400 North Olive Street, L.B. 81  
Dallas, Texas 75201

Dear Mr. Cahill:

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT - PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING - COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT NO. 1 (TAC NO. M82902)

The Commission has requested the Office of the Federal Register to publish the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for Hearing." This notice relates to your application for amendment dated February 28, 1992, which requested a change to the Technical Specifications to remove the Boron Dilution Mitigation System (BDMS) from the Technical Specifications.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By

Thomas A. Bergman, 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	TBergman
NRC/PDR	EPeyton
Local PDR	ACRS (10)
PDIV-2 Rdg File	OGC
PDIV-2 Plt File	DHagan
BBoger	PA
MVirgilio	LYandell, RGN-IV

OFFICE	PDIV-2/LA	PDIV-2/PM	PDIV-2/DC <i>WDR For</i>		
NAME	<i>esp</i> EPeyton	<i>TBergman</i> TBergman:nb	SBlack		
DATE	3/9/92	3/9/92	3/9/92	/ /	/ /

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONTU ELECTRIC COMPANYDOCKET NO. 50-445NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS  
CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-87 issued to TU Electric Company (the licensee) for operation of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, (CPSES) located in Somervell County, Texas.

The proposed amendment would revise the CPSES Technical Specifications (TS) by removing the Boron Dilution Mitigation System (BDMS) from the TS.

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 does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated.

The CPSES Unit 1 safety analyses were reviewed to determine the impact of removing the surveillance requirements and actions related to the BDMS from the CPSES Unit 1 Technical Specifications. This review concluded that the proposed changes to the CPSES Unit 1 Technical Specifications do not affect the failure scenarios leading to an inadvertent boron dilution event, but instead affect the transient response for an inadvertent boron dilution event initiated from MODE 3, 4, or 5. Furthermore, no additional failure scenario were identified that result in an inadvertent boron dilution event. Therefore, the probability of initiating an inadvertent boron dilution event is unaffected by the proposed changes.

The consequences of an inadvertent boron dilution event initiated from MODE 3, 4, or 5 are not increased by the proposed Technical Specification changes. These analyses provide reasonable confidence that the reactor operators have sufficient time to identify and mitigate an inadvertent boron dilution event prior to a return to critical. In addition, the inadvertent boron dilution event has been analyzed by both Westinghouse and the NRC. The results of these analyses have concluded that the consequences of an inadvertent boron dilution event are not severe enough to jeopardize the health and safety of the public, i.e., no fuel failure or system overpressurization is expected following a return to critical.

Thus, the proposed Technical Specification changes do not involve an increase in the probability of consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The CPSES Unit 1 safety analyses were reviewed to determine the impact of removing the surveillance requirements and actions related to the BDMS from the CPSES Unit 1 Technical Specifications. This review concluded that the proposed changes to the CPSES Unit 1 Technical Specifications affect only the transient response of an inadvertent boron dilution event initiated from MODE 3, 4, or 5. This review also concluded that the proposed changes do not create the possibility of an accident that is different than any accident previously evaluated. Furthermore, the proposed changes do not affect any equipment important to safety in such a way as to increase the probability of a previously evaluated malfunction or to create the possibility of a malfunction different than previously evaluated.

Therefore, the proposed Technical Specification changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

(3) The proposed change does not involve significant reductions in the margin of safety.

The CPSES Unit 1 safety analyses were reviewed to determine the impact of removing the surveillance requirements and actions related to the BDMS from the CPSES Unit 1 Technical Specifications. As described in the FSAR and the SER, the margin of safety is established by precluding a return to critical

for a postulated boron dilution event initiated from MODE 3, 4, or 5. The inadvertent boron dilution event has been analyzed for CPSES Unit 1 to demonstrate that at least 15 minutes are available, from the initiation of the event, for the reactor operators to detect and mitigate an inadvertent boron dilution during MODE 3, 4, or 5. These analyses incorporate CPSES Unit 1 plant-specific requirements for available shutdown margin and administrative procedures to restrict the maximum dilution flow rate. Conservative assumptions with respect to active RCS volume for dilution, boron worth, and critical boron concentration are also incorporated into the analyses. These analyses provide reasonable confidence that the reactor operators have sufficient time to identify and mitigate an inadvertent boron dilution event. In addition, TU Electric will continue to implement controls equivalent to existing procedures, operator guidelines, and surveillance requirements for the BDMS and associated circuitry and subsystems. The use of the BDMS during CPSES Unit 1 operation provides additional assurance that an inadvertent boron dilution event will be detected and mitigated.

In addition, analyses of the inadvertent boron dilution event have been conducted by both Westinghouse and the NRC. These analyses have concluded that the consequences of an inadvertent boron dilution event are not severe enough to jeopardize the health and safety of the public, i.e., no fuel failures or system overpressurization is expected following a return to critical.

Due to the increased reliance on operator action the proposed change results in a reduction in the margin on safety. However, based on the analyses above and the controls established by TU Electric, it is concluded that the reduction in margin of safety is not significant.

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 thirty (30) days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination. The Commission will not normally make a final determination unless it receives a request for a hearing.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Regulatory Publications 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. 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 13, 1992, 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 University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 701 South Cooper, P. O. Box 19497, Arlington, Texas 76019. 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 Panel, 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 Panel 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 fifteen (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 fifteen (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.

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.

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 ten (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) 325-6000 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to Suzanne C. Black: 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 George L. Edgar, Esq., Newman and Holtzinger, 1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20036, 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 Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel 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 28, 1992, 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 University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 701 South Cooper, P. O. Box 19497, Arlington, Texas 76019.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of March 1992.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Thomas A. Bergman, Project Manager  
Project Directorate IV-2  
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV/V  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation