



**Entergy Nuclear South**  
Entergy Operations, Inc  
17265 River Road  
Killona, LA 70066  
Tel 504 739 6660  
Fax 504 739 6678  
jvenabl@entergy.com

**Joseph E. Venable**  
Vice President, Operations  
Waterford 3

W3F1-2002-0073

August 19, 2002

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Attn: Document Control Desk  
Washington, DC 20555

**SUBJECT:** Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3  
Docket No. 50-382  
License Amendment Request NPF-38-242  
Application for Technical Specification Change Regarding Missed  
Surveillances Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process

**REFERENCES:** Federal Register Volume 66, Number 189, pages 49714-49717 dated  
September 28, 2001

Dear Sir or Madam:

Pursuant to 10CFR50.90, Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy) hereby requests the following amendment for Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford 3). The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specification requirements for missed surveillances in Specification 4.0.3.

Attachment 1 provides a description of the proposed change, the requested confirmation of applicability, and plant-specific verifications. Attachment 2 provides the existing Technical Specification page marked up to show the proposed change while Attachment 3 provides the revised (clean) Technical Specification page. The proposed change includes a new commitment as summarized in Attachment 4. Attachment 5 provides the existing Technical Specification Bases pages marked up to show the proposed change for information only.

The NRC has approved similar Technical Specification changes for other plants.

The proposed change has been evaluated in accordance with 10CFR50.91(a)(1) using criteria in 10CFR50.92(c) and it has been determined that this change involves no significant hazards considerations. The bases for these determinations are included in the attached submittal.

This application is made under the provisions of the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process (CLIIP) as stipulated in the referenced Federal Register Notice dated September 28, 2001. The proposed change meets the requirements and content of the model application published in the Federal Register.

A001

August 19, 2002

Entergy is respectfully requesting review and approval of this request by July 31, 2003. Once approved, the amendment will be implemented within 60 days.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact D. Bryan Miller at 504-739-6692.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on August 19, 2002.

Sincerely,



Joseph E. Venable  
Vice President, Operations  
Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3

JEV/DBM/cbh

Attachments:

1. Analysis of Proposed Technical Specification Change
2. Proposed Technical Specification Changes (mark-up)
3. Proposed Technical Specification Page
4. List of Regulatory Commitments
5. Changes to Technical Specification Bases Pages (Mark-up for Information Only)

cc: E.W. Merschoff, NRC Region IV  
N. Kalyanam, NRC-NRR  
J. Smith  
N.S. Reynolds  
NRC Resident Inspectors Office  
Louisiana DEQ/Surveillance Division  
American Nuclear Insurers

e-mail: Standard Distribution  
H.A. Brodt (W-GSB-320)  
SRC Secretary (C. E. Brooks)(M-ECH-414)

bcc: R.L. Williams (W-GSB-318)  
Waterford 3 Records Center (W-GSB-100)  
TSCR File (NPF-38-242)  
Licensing Green Folder File

**Attachment 1**

**W3F1-2002-0073**

**Analysis of Proposed Technical Specification Change**

## 1.0 DESCRIPTION

This letter is a request to amend Operating License NPF-38 for Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford 3).

The proposed amendment modifies Technical Specifications (TS) requirements for missed surveillances in Specification 4.0.3. The changes are consistent with Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved Industry/Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Standard TS (STS) change TSTF-358 Revision 5, as modified by Federal Register Notice 66FR32400, of June 14, 2001, and in response to public comments. The availability of this TS improvement was published in the Federal Register on September 28, 2001 as part of the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process (CLIIP). In conjunction with the TSTF-358 incorporation, the wording of Specification 4.0.3 and its associated Bases is modified to obtain consistency with the STS of NUREG 1432, Revision 2.

## 2.0 ASSESSMENT

### 2.1 Applicability of Published Safety Evaluation

Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy) has reviewed the safety evaluation dated June 14, 2001 as part of the CLIIP. This review included a review of the NRC staff's evaluation, as well as the supporting information provided to support TSTF-358. Entergy has concluded that the justifications presented in the TSTF proposal and the safety evaluation prepared by the NRC staff are applicable to Waterford 3 and justify this amendment for the incorporation of the changes into the Waterford 3 TS.

The modification of Specification 4.0.3 and the Specification 4.0.3 Bases wording to be consistent with that of NUREG 1432, Revision 2 provides for consistent incorporation of TSTF-358 and results in only a minor difference in the requirement. The current Waterford 3 TS requires that upon discovery of a missed surveillance the associated Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) be declared not met but delays implementation of the Action Statement requirements of the LCO. Modifying the wording to be consistent with NUREG-1432 allows the declaration of the LCO not being met to be delayed. Effectively, both wordings provide the same flexibility, i.e., the allowance to delay implementing actions required by a LCO when a surveillance has been missed.

### 2.2 Optional Changes and Variations

Entergy is not proposing any variations or deviations from the TS changes described in the fully modified TSTF-358 Revision 5 or the NRC staff's model safety evaluation dated June 14, 2001, except as required to incorporate terminology of the current Waterford 3 TS. Revising the current Specification 4.0.3 and Specification 4.0.3 Bases wording, to be consistent with NUREG 1432, Rev. 2, does not affect the incorporation of the approved TSTF.

### 3.0 REGULATORY ANALYSIS

#### 3.1 No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination

Entergy has reviewed the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination (NSHCD) published in the Federal Register as part of the CLIP. Entergy has concluded that the proposed NSHCD presented in the Federal Register notice is applicable to Waterford 3 and is hereby incorporated by reference to satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 50.91(a). The revision of the current Specification 4.0.3 and Specification 4.0.3 Bases wording to be consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) of NUREG 1432, Rev. 2 does not add or remove flexibility in station operation, except in the administrative application of the requirement and, therefore, is not evaluated under the NSHCD.

#### 3.2 Verification and Commitments

As discussed in the notice of availability published in the Federal Register on September 28, 2001 for this TS improvement, plant-specific verifications were performed as follows:

Entergy has established TS Bases for Specification 4.0.3 which state that use of the delay period established by Specification 4.0.3 is a flexibility which is not intended to be used as an operational convenience to extend surveillance intervals, but only for the performance of missed surveillances.

The modification will also include changes to the Bases for Specification 4.0.3 that provide details on how to implement the new requirements. The Bases changes provide guidance for surveillance frequencies that are not based on time intervals, but on specified unit conditions, operating situations, or requirements of regulations. In addition, the Bases changes state that Waterford 3 is expected to perform a missed surveillance test at the first reasonable opportunity, taking into account appropriate considerations, such as the impact on plant risk and accident analysis assumptions, consideration of unit conditions, planning, availability of personnel, and the time required to perform the surveillance. The Bases also state that the risk impact should be managed through the program in place to implement 10 CFR 50.65(a)(4) and its implementation guidance, NRC Regulatory Guide 1.182, "Assessing and Managing Risks Before Maintenance Activities at Nuclear Power Plants," and that the missed surveillance should be treated as an emergent condition, as discussed in Regulatory Guide 1.182. In addition, the Bases state that the degree of depth and rigor of the evaluation should be commensurate with the importance of the component and that missed surveillances for important components should be analyzed quantitatively. The Bases also state that the results of the risk evaluation determine the safest course of action. Furthermore, the Bases state that all missed surveillances will be placed in the licensee's Corrective Action Program. Finally, Waterford 3 has a Bases Control Program consistent with Section 5.5 of the STS.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Entergy has reviewed the environmental evaluation included in the model safety evaluation dated June 14, 2001 as part of the CLIP. Entergy has concluded that the staff's findings presented in that evaluation are applicable to Waterford 3 and the evaluation is hereby incorporated by reference for this application. The revision of the current Specification 4.0.3

and Specification 4.0.3 Bases wording to be consistent with NUREG 1432, Rev. 2 does not affect any environmental considerations.

**Attachment 2**

**W3F1-2002-0073**

**Proposed Technical Specification Changes (mark-up)**

APPLICABILITY

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.0.1 Surveillance Requirements shall be applicable during the OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions specified for individual Limiting Conditions for Operation unless otherwise stated in an individual Surveillance Requirement.

4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified surveillance interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed twenty-five percent of the specified surveillance interval.

4.0.3 ~~Failure to perform a Surveillance Requirement within the allowed surveillance interval defined by Specification 4.0.2, shall constitute a failure to meet the OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation. The time limits of the ACTION requirements are applicable at the time it is identified that a Surveillance Requirement has not been performed. The ACTION requirements may be delayed for up to 24 hours to permit the completion of the surveillance when the allowable outage time limits of the ACTION requirements are less than 24 hours. Surveillance Requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment.~~ *Replace with insert.*

4.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other specified condition shall not be made unless the Surveillance Requirement(s) associated with the Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the stated surveillance interval or as otherwise specified. This provision shall not prevent passage through or to operational modes as required to comply with ACTION requirements.

4.0.5 Surveillance Requirements for inservice inspection and testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components shall be applicable as follows:

- a. Inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components and inservice testing ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g)(6)(i).
- b. Surveillance intervals specified in Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda for the inservice inspection and testing activities required by the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda shall be applicable as follows in these Technical Specifications:

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION INSERT

If it is discovered that a Surveillance was not performed within its specified interval, then compliance with the requirement to declare the LCO not met may be delayed, from the time of discovery, up to 24 hours or up to the limit of the specified surveillance interval, whichever is greater. This delay period is permitted to allow performance of the Surveillance. A risk evaluation shall be performed for any Surveillance delayed greater than 24 hours and the risk impact shall be managed.

If the Surveillance is not performed within the delay period, the LCO must immediately be declared not met, and the applicable ACTION(s) must be entered.

When the Surveillance is performed within the delay period and the Surveillance is not met, the LCO must immediately be declared not met, and the applicable ACTION(s) must be entered.

**Attachment 3**

**W3F1-2002-0073**

**Proposed Technical Specification Page**

## APPLICABILITY

### SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

---

4.0.1 Surveillance Requirements shall be applicable during the OPERATIONAL MODES or other conditions specified for individual Limiting Conditions for Operation unless otherwise stated in an individual Surveillance Requirement.

4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified surveillance interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed twenty-five percent of the specified surveillance interval.

4.0.3 If it is discovered that a Surveillance was not performed within its specified interval, then compliance with the requirement to declare the LCO not met may be delayed, from the time of discovery, up to 24 hours or up to the limit of the specified surveillance interval, whichever is greater. This delay period is permitted to allow performance of the Surveillance. A risk evaluation shall be performed for any Surveillance delayed greater than 24 hours and the risk impact shall be managed.

If the Surveillance is not performed within the delay period, the LCO must immediately be declared not met, and the applicable ACTION(s) must be entered.

When the Surveillance is performed within the delay period and the Surveillance is not met, the LCO must immediately be declared not met, and the applicable ACTION(s) must be entered.

Surveillance Requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment.

4.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other specified condition shall not be made unless the Surveillance Requirement(s) associated with the Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the stated surveillance interval or as otherwise specified. This provision shall not prevent passage through or to operational modes as required to comply with ACTION requirements.

4.0.5 Surveillance Requirements for inservice inspection and testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components shall be applicable as follows:

- a. Inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components and inservice testing ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g)(6)(i).
- b. Surveillance intervals specified in Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda for the inservice inspection and testing activities required by the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda shall be applicable as follows in these Technical Specifications:

**Attachment 4**

**W3F1-2002-0073**

**List of Regulatory Commitments**

**List of Regulatory Commitments**

The following table identifies those actions committed to by Entergy in this document. Any other statements in this submittal are provided for information purposes and are not considered to be regulatory commitments.

COMMITMENT	TYPE (Check one)		SCHEDULED COMPLETION DATE (If Required)
	ONE- TIME ACTION	CONTINUING COMPLIANCE	
The modification will also include changes to the Bases for Specification 4.0.3 that provide details on how to implement the new requirements.	X		Implementation

**Attachment 5**

**W3F1-2002-0073**

**Changes to Technical Specification Bases Pages**

**(Mark-up for Information Only)**

BASES

*Replace with Insert*

Specification-4.0.3 establishes the failure to perform a Surveillance equipment within the allowed surveillance interval, defined by the provisions of Specification 4.0.2, as a condition that constitutes a failure to meet the OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation. Under the provisions of this specification, systems and components are assumed to be OPERABLE when Surveillance Requirements have been satisfactorily performed within the specified time interval. However, nothing in this provision is to be construed as implying that systems or components are OPERABLE when they are found or known to be inoperable although still meeting the Surveillance Requirements. This specification also clarifies that the ACTION requirements are applicable when Surveillance Requirements have not been completed within the allowed surveillance interval and that the time limits of the ACTION requirements apply from the point in time it is identified that a surveillance has not been performed and not at the time that the allowed surveillance interval was exceeded. Completion of the Surveillance Requirement within the allowable outage time limits of the ACTION requirements restores compliance with the requirements of Specification 4.0.3. However, this does not negate the fact that the failure to have performed the surveillance within the allowed surveillance interval, defined by the provisions of Specification 4.0.2, was a violation of the OPERABILITY requirements of a Limiting Condition for Operation that is subject to enforcement action. Further, the failure to perform a surveillance within the provisions of Specification 4.0.2 is a violation of a Technical Specification requirement and is, therefore, a reportable event under the requirements of 10 CFR 50.73(a)(2)(1)(B) because it is a condition prohibited by the plant's Technical Specifications.

If the allowable outage time limit of the ACTION requirements are less than 24 hours or a shutdown is required to comply with ACTION requirements, e.g., Specification 3.0.3, a 24-hour allowance is provided to permit a delay in implementing the ACTION requirements. This provides an adequate time limit to complete Surveillance Requirements that have not been performed. The purpose of this allowance is to permit the completion of a surveillance before shutdown is required to comply with ACTION requirements or before other remedial measures would be required that may preclude completion of a surveillance. The basis for this allowance includes consideration for plant conditions, adequate planning, availability of personnel, the time required to perform the surveillance, and the safety significance of the delay in completing the required surveillance. This provision also provides a time limit for the completion of Surveillance Requirements that become applicable as a consequence of MODE changes imposed by ACTION requirements and for completing Surveillance Requirements that are applicable when an exception to the requirements of Specification 4.0.4 is allowed. If a surveillance is not completed within the 24-hour allowance, the time limits of the ACTION requirements are applicable at that time. When a surveillance is performed within the 24-hour allowance and the Surveillance Requirements are not met, the time limits of the ACTION requirements are applicable at the time that the surveillance is terminated.

BASES

Surveillance Requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment because the ACTION requirements define the remedial measures that apply. However, the Surveillance Requirements have to be met to demonstrate that inoperable equipment has been restored to OPERABLE status.

Specification 4.0.4 establishes the requirement that all applicable surveillance must be met before entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other condition of operation specified in the Applicability statement. The purpose of this specification is to ensure that system and component OPERABILITY requirements or parameter limits are met before entry into a MODE or condition for which these systems and components ensure safe operation of the facility. This provision applies to changes in OPERATIONAL MODES or other specified conditions associated with plant shutdown as well as startup.

Under the provisions of this specification, the applicable Surveillance Requirements must be performed within the specified surveillance interval to ensure that the Limiting Condition for Operation are met during initial plant startup or following a plant outage.

When a shutdown is required to comply with ACTION requirements, the provisions of Specification 4.0.4 do not apply because this would delay placing the facility in a lower MODE of operation.

Specification 4.0.5 establishes the requirement that inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with a periodically updated version of Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50.55a. These requirements apply except when relief has been provided in writing by the Commission.

This specification includes a clarification of the frequencies for performing the inservice inspection and testing activities required by Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda. This clarification is provided to ensure consistency in surveillance intervals throughout these Technical Specifications and to remove any ambiguities relative to the frequencies for performing the required inservice inspection and testing activities.

Under the terms of this specification, the more restrictive requirements of the Technical Specifications take precedence over the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda. For example, the requirements of Specification 4.0.4 to perform surveillance activities prior to entry into an OPERATIONAL MODE or other specified applicability condition takes precedence over the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code provision which allows pumps to be tested up to one week after return to normal operation. And for example, the Technical Specification definition of OPERABLE does not grant a grace period before a device that is not capable of performing its specified function is declared inoperable and takes precedence over the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code provision which allows a valve to be incapable of performing its specified function for up to 24 hours before being declared inoperable.

### BASES INSERT

...flexibility to defer declaring affected equipment inoperable or an affected variable outside the specified limits when a Surveillance has not been completed within its specified interval. A delay period of up to 24 hours or up to the limit of the specified surveillance interval, whichever is greater, applies from the point in time that it is discovered that the Surveillance has not been performed in accordance with Specification 4.0.2, and not at the time that the specified interval was not met.

This delay period provides an adequate time to complete Surveillances that have been missed. This delay period permits the completion of a Surveillance before complying with required actions or other remedial measures that might preclude completion of the Surveillance.

The basis for this delay period includes consideration of unit conditions, adequate planning, availability of personnel, the time required to perform the Surveillance, the safety significance of the delay in completing the required Surveillance, and the recognition that the most probable result of any particular Surveillance being performed is the verification of conformance with the requirements. When a Surveillance with an interval based not on time intervals, but upon specified unit conditions, operational situations, or requirements of regulations (e.g , prior to entering MODE 1 after each fuel loading, or in accordance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, as modified by approved exemptions, etc.) is discovered to not have been performed when specified, Specification 4.0.3 allows the full delay period of up to the specified interval to perform the Surveillance. However, since there is not a time interval specified, the missed Surveillance should be performed at the first reasonable opportunity. Specification 4.0.3 provides a time limit for, and allowances for the performance of, Surveillances that become applicable as a consequence of MODE changes imposed by required actions.

Failure to comply with specified intervals for surveillance requirements is expected to be an infrequent occurrence. Use of the delay period established by Specification 4.0.3 is a flexibility which is not intended to be used as an operational convenience to extend Surveillance intervals. While up to 24 hours or the limit of the specified interval is provided to perform the missed Surveillance, it is expected that the missed Surveillance will be performed at the first reasonable opportunity. The determination of the first reasonable opportunity should include consideration of the impact on plant risk (from delaying the Surveillance as well as any plant configuration changes required or shutting the plant down to perform the Surveillance) and impact on any analysis assumptions, in addition to unit conditions, planning, availability of personnel, and the time required to perform the Surveillance. This risk impact should be managed through the program in place to implement 10 CFR 50.65(a)(4) and its implementation guidance, NRC Regulatory Guide 1.182, 'Assessing and Managing Risk Before Maintenance Activities at Nuclear Power Plants.' This Regulatory Guide addresses consideration of temporary and aggregate risk impacts, determination of risk management action thresholds, and risk management action up to and including plant shutdown. The missed Surveillance should be treated as an emergent condition as discussed in the Regulatory Guide. The risk evaluation may use quantitative, qualitative, or blended methods. The degree of depth and rigor of the evaluation should be commensurate with the importance of the component. Missed

Surveillances for important components should be analyzed quantitatively. If the results of the risk evaluation determine the risk increase is significant, this evaluation should be used to determine the safest course of action. All missed Surveillances will be placed in the licensee's Corrective Action Program.

If a Surveillance is not completed within the allowed delay period, then the equipment is considered inoperable or the variable is considered outside the specified limits and the allowed outage times of the required actions for the applicable LCO begin immediately upon expiration of the delay period. If a Surveillance is failed within the delay period, then the equipment is inoperable, or the variable is outside the specified limits and the allowed outage times of the required actions for the applicable LCO begin immediately upon the failure of the Surveillance.

Satisfactory completion of the Surveillance within the delay period allowed by this Specification, or within the allowed outage time of the actions, restores compliance with Specification 4.0.1.