

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

November 20, 1998

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING - COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M97809 AND M97810)

Dear Mr. Terry:

The Commission has requested the Office of the Federal Register to publish the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for Hearing." This notice relates to your application for amendment dated August 2, 1996 (TXX-96434), as supplemented by letters dated October 2, 1998 (TXX-98215), and November 13, 1998 (TXX-98241 and TXX-98244).

The initial notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for hearing was originally published in the Federal Register (62 FR 50011) on September 24, 1997. The supplemental information included in the supplemental letter dated November 13, 1998, was beyond the scope of the original notice and requires re-notice in the Federal Register.

The proposed amendment would increase the allowed outage time (AOT) for a centrifugal charging pump from 72 hours to 7 days and adds a Configuration Risk Management Program.

Sincerely,

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

9811270093 981120  
PDR ADOCK 05000445  
P PDR

Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446

Enclosure: Notice of Consideration

cc w/encl: See next page

**DISTRIBUTION:**

~~Public File~~ OGC PUBLIC GHill (4)  
ACRS TPolich (2) TGwynn, RIV PDIV-1 r/f  
CHawes JHannon EAdensam (EGA1)

1/1  
DFD/

Document Name: CP97809.IND

OFC	PM/PD4-1	LA/PD4-1	PD/PD4-1
NAME	TPolich/vw	CHawes	JHannon
DATE	11/20/98	11/20/98	11/20/98
COPY	YES/NO	YES/NO	YES/NO

NOV 20 1998

DF-1

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY



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

November 20, 1998

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

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING - COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M97809 AND M97810)

Dear Mr. Terry:

The Commission has requested the Office of the Federal Register to publish the enclosed "Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for Hearing." This notice relates to your application for amendment dated August 2, 1996 (TXX-96434), as supplemented by letters dated October 2, 1998 (TXX-98215), and November 13, 1998 (TXX-98241 and TXX-98244).

The initial notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for hearing was originally published in the Federal Register (62 FR 50011) on September 24, 1997. The supplemental information included in the supplemental letter dated November 13, 1998, was beyond the scope of the original notice and requires re-notice in the Federal Register.

The proposed amendment would increase the allowed outage time (AOT) for a centrifugal charging pump from 72 hours to 7 days and adds a Configuration Risk Management Program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Timothy J. Polich".

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

Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446

Enclosure: Notice of Consideration

cc w/encl: See next page

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 COMMISSIONTEXAS UTILITIES ELECTRIC COMPANYCOMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2DOCKET NOS. 50-445 AND 50-446NOTICE 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 Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89 issued to Texas Utilities Electric Company (the licensee) for operation of Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2 located in Somervell County, Texas.

The proposed amendment would increase the allowed outage time (AOT) for a centrifugal charging pump from 72 hours to 7 days and add a Configuration Risk Management Program.

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. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

There is no effect on the probability of an event; the only potential effect is on the capability to mitigate the event. The centrifugal charging pumps are credited in the Final Safety Analysis Report Chapter 15 LOCA analysis for ECCS injection and for the containment sump recirculation mode for the design-basis LOCA. Increasing the AOT for the centrifugal charging pumps does not affect analysis assumptions regarding functioning of required equipment designed to mitigate the consequences of accidents. Further, the severity of postulated accidents and resulting radiological effluent releases will not be affected by the increased AOT.

A reliability analysis of the charging system found the change to have no significant impact on normal operation or on the RCP seal cooling function. Therefore, the change would not significantly increase in the probability of a seal LOCA.

The increase in the AOT potentially affects only the availability of the charging system for accident mitigation and has no effect on the ability of other ECCS systems to perform their functions. Through the use of a probabilistic risk assessment, it was determined that the proposed change would have an insignificant effect on the core damage frequency.

The proposed changes to the Technical Specification BASES are administrative in nature and do not change the specific Technical Specifications requirements. The changes to the BASES sections of the Technical Specifications ensure that when the centrifugal charging pumps are taken out of service, administrative controls are in place to consider and manage risk associated with the specific configuration of the plant. Changes to the Administrative Controls section of the Technical Specifications are administrative in nature and reflect addition of a configuration risk management program. These administrative changes provide additional assurance that risk is appropriately considered and managed during changing plant configurations in order to assure that intended plant design/safety functions will be maintained. No design basis accidents are affected by these proposed administrative changes as they do not impact nor affect accident analysis assumptions.

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

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Unavailability of one centrifugal charging pump for a finite period of time is currently allowed by the Technical Specifications. Increasing the AOT from 72 hours to 7 days would not change the method that TU Electric operates CPSES, thus would not create a new condition. Further, the proposed change would not result in any physical alteration to any plant system, and there would not be a change in the method by which any safety related system performs its function. The ECCS would still be capable of mitigating the consequences of the design-basis accident LOCA with the one centrifugal charging pump operable. No new unanalyzed accident would be created.

The proposed changes to add a configuration risk management program and reference to that program in the BASES section of the Technical Specifications for the Centrifugal Charging pumps will not delete any specification requirement or function already designated in the Technical Specifications. The administrative changes retain adequate regulatory basis to ensure that intended plant design/safety functions will be maintained. These changes are administrative in nature and do not affect the design or operation of any system, structure, or component in the plant. Accordingly, no new failure modes have been defined for any plant system or component important to safety, nor have any new initiating events been identified as a result of the proposed changes.

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

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

The proposed increase in the AOT does not impact either the physical protective boundaries or performance of safety systems for accident mitigation. There is no safety analysis impact since the extension of the centrifugal charging pump AOT interval will have no effect on any safety limit, protection system setpoint, or limiting condition of operation. There is no hardware change that would impact existing safety analysis acceptance criteria, therefore there is no significant change in the margin of safety.

The proposed changes involve the addition of a configuration risk management program and reference to that program in the BASES section of the Technical Specifications for the Centrifugal Charging pumps affected by License Amendment Request 96-06. These changes are administrative in nature and do not directly affect any protective boundaries nor impact the safety limits for the protective boundaries. The addition of the configuration risk management program provides additional assurance that adequate regulatory basis for continued proper administrative review and plant configuration control to ensure that actions prescribed in plant operating procedures are maintained so as not to impact the plant's margin of safety. Therefore, there is no significant reduction in the margin of safety.

In summary, the proposed change would not have a significant impact on the 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 and Directives Branch, Division of Administrative 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 6D59, 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 December 28, 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 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 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 George L. Edgar, Esq., Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, 1800 M 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 August 2, 1996 (TXX-96434), originally noticed in the FEDERAL REGISTER (62FR50011). The application has been supplemented by letters dated October 2, 1998 (TXX-98215), and November 13, 1998 (TXX-98241 and TXX-98244), which are 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 20th day of November 1998.

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