

October 22, 1998

Docket

Mr. C. Lance Terry  
TU Electric  
Senior Vice President & Principal Nuclear Officer  
ATTN: Regulatory Affairs Department  
P.O. Box 1002  
Glen Rose, Texas 76043

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING, COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M98778 AND M98779)

Dear Mr. Terry:

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 amendments 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 Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, 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 50-323); Union Electric Company for Callaway Plant (Docket No. 50-483); 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

Timothy J. Polich, Project Manager  
Project Directorate IV-1  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

9811020232 981022  
PDR ADOCK 05000445  
P PDR

Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File	PUBLIC	PD4-1 r/f	J. Donohew
C. Hawes	ACRS	OGC (15B18)	E. Adensam (EGA1)
T. Gwynn, RIV	T. Polich	J. Hannon	S. Bloom
K. Thomas			

Document Name: G:\CPFINAL\CP98778.BWN

OFC	PM/PD4-1	PM/PD4-1	LA/PD4-1	PD/PDIV-1
NAME	TPolich <i>TP</i>	JDonohew <i>JW</i>	CHawes <i>CMH</i>	JHannon <i>JH</i>
DATE	10/22/98	10/22/98	10/21/98	10/22/98

REG FILE CERTIFIED COPY

DF01

CP-1

Mr. C. Lance Terry  
TU Electric Company

Comanche Peak, Units 1 and 2

cc:

Senior Resident Inspector  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 2159  
Glen Rose, TX 76403-2159

Honorable Dale McPherson  
County Judge  
P. O. Box 851  
Glen Rose, TX 76043

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400  
Arlington, TX 76011

Office of the Governor  
ATTN: John Howard, Director  
Environmental and Natural  
Resources Policy  
P. O. Box 12428  
Austin, TX 78711

Mrs. Juanita Ellis, President  
Citizens Association for Sound Energy  
1426 South Polk  
Dallas, TX 75224

Arthur C. Tate, Director  
Division of Compliance & Inspection  
Bureau of Radiation Control  
Texas Department of Health  
1100 West 49th Street  
Austin, TX 78756-3189

Mr. Roger D. Walker  
TU Electric  
Regulatory Affairs Manager  
P. O. Box 1002  
Glen Rose, TX 76043

Jim Calloway  
Public Utility Commission of Texas  
Electric Industry Analysis  
P. O. Box 13326  
Austin, TX 78711-3326

George L. Edgar, Esq.  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius  
1800 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036-5869

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONTU ELECTRICDOCKET NOS. 50-445 AND 50-446NOTICE 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 Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89, issued to the TU Electric (TUE or the licensee), for operation of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2 (CPSES), located in Somervell County, Texas.

The proposed amendment, requested by the licensee in a letter dated May 15, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated June 26, August 5, August 28, and September 24, and October 21, 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 CPSES. The criteria in the Final Policy Statement were subsequently added to 10 CFR 50.36, "Technical

9811020238 981022  
PDR ADDCK 05000445  
P PDR

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 50-323); Union Electric Company for Callaway Plant (Docket No. 50-483); and Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation for Wolf Creek Generating Station (Docket No. 50-482). 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 an 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 licensees do 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, sorted by 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 May 15, 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 differences to 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 3.1.7, a new action added for more than one digital rod position indicator per group inoperable.
2. ITS surveillance requirement (SR) 3.2.1.2, frequency, within 24 hours for verifying the axial heat flux hot channel factor is within limit after achieving equilibrium conditions.
3. ITS LCO 3.5.5, Action A, increases the reactor coolant pump seal injection flow completion time from 4 to 72 hours for the action.
4. 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.

5. 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.

6. ITS 5.6.5, adds refueling boron concentration limits to the core operating limits report.

7. 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 amendments, 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 30, 1998, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating licenses 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 Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 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, 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. George L. Edgar, Esq., Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 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 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 March 27, 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 Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of October.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Timothy J. Polich, Project Manager  
Project Directorate IV-1  
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation