

October 1, 2002

Mr. G. R. Peterson
Site Vice President
Catawba Nuclear Station
Duke Energy Corporation
4800 Concord Road
York, South Carolina 29745-9635

SUBJECT: CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 RE: ISSUANCE OF
AMENDMENTS (TAC NOS. MB3343 AND MB3344)

Dear Mr. Peterson:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 202 to Facility Operating License NPF-35 and Amendment No. 195 to Facility Operating License NPF-52 for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) in response to your application dated October 7, 2001, as supplemented by letter dated August 7, 2002.

The amendments revise TS 5.6.5.a by adding a few parameter limits currently included in the Core Operating Limits Report. In addition to the license amendment request, you also submitted revisions to four previously approved topical reports for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff review and approval. The enclosed Safety Evaluation also address these topical reports.

A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Chandu P. Patel, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 202 to NPF-35
2. Amendment No. 195 to NPF-52
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

October 1, 2002

Mr. G. R. Peterson
Site Vice President
Catawba Nuclear Station
Duke Energy Corporation
4800 Concord Road
York, South Carolina 29745-9635

SUBJECT: CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 RE: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS RE: (TAC NOS. MB3343 AND MB3344)

Dear Mr. Peterson:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 202 to Facility Operating License NPF-35 and Amendment No. 195 to Facility Operating License NPF-52 for the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2. The amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated October 7, 2001, as supplemented by letter dated August 7, 2002.

The amendments revise TS 5.6.5.a by adding a few parameter limits currently included in the Core Operating Limits Report. In addition to the license amendment request, you also submitted revisions to four previously approved topical reports for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff review and approval. The enclosed Safety Evaluation also address these topical reports.

A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly *Federal Register* notice.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Chandu P. Patel, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No. 202 to NPF-35
- 2. Amendment No. 195 to NPF-52
- 3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

Package: ML022740698

TS Pages: ML022750206

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC ACRS
 PDII-1 R/F GHill (4)
 RHaag,RII OGC
 WBeckner
 CPatel
 CHawes

Amendment: ML022740677

***See previous concurrence**

OFFICE	PDII-1/PM	PDII-1/LA	OGC	PDII-1/SC
NAME	CPatel	CHawes	SUttal*	JNakoski
DATE	09/16/02	09/16/02	9/11/02	09/19/02

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION
NORTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION
SALUDA RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.
DOCKET NO. 50-413
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1
AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 202
License No. NPF-35

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (the facility) Facility Operating License No. NPF-35 filed by the Duke Energy Corporation, acting for itself, North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation and Saluda River Electric Cooperative, Inc. (licensees), dated October 7, 2001, as supplemented by letter dated August 7, 2002, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is hereby amended by page changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-35 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 202, which are attached hereto, are hereby incorporated into this license. Duke Energy Corporation shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

John A. Nakoski, Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Technical Specification
Changes

Date of Issuance: October 1, 2002

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION
NORTH CAROLINA MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY NO. 1
PIEDMONT MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY
DOCKET NO. 50-414
CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 2
AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 195
License No. NPF-52

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment to the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (the facility) Facility Operating License No. NPF-52 filed by the Duke Energy Corporation, acting for itself, North Carolina Municipal Power Agency No. 1 and Piedmont Municipal Power Agency (licensees), dated October 7, 2001, as supplemented by letter dated August 7, 2002, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is hereby amended by page changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and Paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-52 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 195, which are attached hereto, are hereby incorporated into this license. Duke Energy Corporation shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

John A. Nakoski, Chief, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Technical Specification
Changes

Date of Issuance: October 1, 2002

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 202

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-35

DOCKET NO. 50-413

AND LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 195

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-52

DOCKET NO. 50-414

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications and associated Bases with the attached revised pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove

5.6-3
B 3.2.1-11
B 3.2.3-4

Insert

5.6-3
B 3.2.1-11
B 3.2.3-4

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 202 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-35
AND AMENDMENT NO. 195 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-52

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION, ET AL.

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 7, 2001, as supplemented by letter dated August 7, 2002, Duke Energy Corporation, et al. (DEC, the licensee), submitted a request for changes to the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TS).

Revisions were proposed for TS 5.6.5.a, Item 1, to add the moderator temperature coefficient (MTC) 60 parts per million (ppm) surveillance limit. The specific value of the surveillance limit was previously relocated to the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR). Two new items were also proposed to be added to TS 5.6.5.a. These two items are (1) Item 12, "31 EFPD surveillance penalty factors for Specifications 3.2.1 and 3.2.2," and (2) Item 13, "Reactor makeup water pumps combined flow rates limit for Specifications 3.3.9 and 3.9.2."

The initial submittal, dated October 7, 2001, proposed to change the dates and revision numbers for three of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved analytical methods previously listed in TS 5.6.5.b, as listed below. The changes would reflect later versions of these topical reports that were also submitted with the October 7, 2001, submittal for NRC review and approval. As required by TS 5.6.5.b, only those methods listed within the TS as having been reviewed and approved by the NRC, can be used to determine the subject core operating limits. The subject core operating limits are listed in TS 5.6.5.a and their values are located in the COLR. A revision to a fourth report, DPC-NE-1003, was also submitted for NRC review and approval.

- DPC-NE-2009, Revision 1, "Duke Power Company Westinghouse Fuel Transition Report," August 2001.
- DPC-NF-2010, Revision 1, "Duke Power Company McGuire Nuclear Station and Catawba Nuclear Station Nuclear Physics Methodology for Reload Design," August 2001.
- DPC-NE-2011, Revision 1, "Duke Power Company Nuclear Design Methodology Report for Core Operating Limits of Westinghouse Reactors," August 2001.

- DPC-NE-1003, Revision 1, “McGuire Nuclear Station and Catawba Nuclear Station Rod Swap Methodology Report for Startup Physics Testing,” August 2001.

The licensee in its letter of October 7, 2001, stated that, once approved, the approved topical report revisions, except for DPC-1003, Revision 1, will be listed in Section 5.6.5.b of the Catawba TS, to replace their respective original versions, and that the approved version of DPC-NE-2011-P, Revision 1, will also be listed in the references for TS Bases 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 to replace the existing reference to the original version, DPC-NE-2011-P-A.

However, on July 2, 2002, the NRC issued amendments numbered 199 and 192 to the Catawba Unit 1 and 2 operating licenses that effectively relocated the topical report revision numbers and dates from the TS 5.6.5.b list of approved methodologies to the COLR. Amendments 199 and 192 were consistent with the NRC Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Standard TS Traveler TSTF-363, “Revise Topical Report References in ITS 5.6.5 COLR.” Accordingly, since this portion of its request is no longer needed in view of amendments 199 and 192, the licensee’s letter dated August 7, 2002, eliminated the requests to change TS 5.6.5.b and proposed revisions to BASES 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 to make its submittal consistent with the implementation of amendments 199 and 192 at the Catawba Nuclear Station. Nonetheless, this Safety Evaluation sets forth the NRC staff’s evaluation of the licensee’s proposed changes to the topical reports listed above.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulation* (10 CFR) Section 50.36 (c)(2)(ii)(B), Criterion 2 specifies that a process variable, design feature, or operating restriction that is an initial condition of a design basis accident or transient analysis that either assumes the failure of or presents a challenge to the integrity of a fission product barrier must be included in the TS limiting conditions for operation (LCO). Accordingly, the reactor operating parameters, which are the initial conditions for the safety analyses of the design basis transients and accidents, are included in the TS LCO.

Since many parameters limits, such as core physics parameters, generally change with each reload core, licensees need to request TS amendments to update these parameters for each refueling cycle. NRC Generic Letter (GL) 88-16 (Ref. 4) provides guidance for relocating the values of the cycle-specific core operating parameter limits from TS to the COLR, and thus eliminates the unnecessary burden on the licensees and the NRC to update these limits in the TS each fuel cycle. The guidance includes adding the COLR in the TS administrative reporting requirement that also specifies (1) the cycle-specific parameters included in the COLR, and (2) the analytical methods that the NRC has previously reviewed and approved to be used to determine the core operating parameters limits.

The Catawba TS 5.6.5, “Core Operating Limits Report (COLR),” conforms to the GL 88-16 guidance. TS 5.6.5.a lists a set of parameters, including the reference to the actual TS number for each specified parameter. TS 5.6.5.b specifies the topical reports that are used for the determination of the core operating limits.

The proposed TS changes in this license amendment request are to revise the parameters listed in TS 5.6.5.a. These revisions are based on the guidance of GL 88-16.

3.0 STAFF EVALUATION

In this section, the staff will discuss the review of the revised versions of the four previously approved topical reports submitted for staff review, and the proposed TS changes.

3.1 Topical Reports Revisions

The licensee requested the NRC to review revisions of four topical reports that were previously approved and listed in TS 5.6.5.b as the approved methodologies used for the determination of the parameter limits in the COLR. Since the staff has reviewed and approved the original versions of these topical reports, the staff review of these revised versions will concentrate on the revisions made to the approved reports.

3.1.1 DPC-NE-2009, Revision 1

Topical report, DPC-NE-2009-P-A, (Ref. 5), provides general information about the Robust Fuel Assembly (RFA) design and describes methodologies used for reload design analyses to support the licensing basis for use of the RFA design in the McGuire and Catawba reload cores. These methodologies include fuel rod mechanical reload analysis methodology and the core design, thermal-hydraulic analysis, and accident analysis methodologies. The NRC approved the report in September 1999.

Revision 1 of DPC-NE-2009-A, as amended by the August 7, 2002, letter (Ref. 2), consists of the following minor changes to Chapter 6, "UFSAR Accident Analyses:"

(A) Update of the reference list in Section 6.7 as follows:

- Update reference 6-25, WCAP-10054-P-A Addendum 2, to Revision 1, dated July 1997.
- Correct reference 6-35, WCAP-8354, with proprietary topical report number, and designate the second report as a non-proprietary report.
- Add reference 6-39 a Westinghouse letter NSD-NRC-99-5839, "1998 Annual Notification of Changes to the Westinghouse Small Break LOCA and Large Break LOCA ECCS Evaluation Models, Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.46(a)(3)(ii)," dated July 15, 1999 (Ref. 6).

(B) Addition of a paragraph to Section 6.5.1, "Small Break LOCA," to explain that the Westinghouse small break LOCA NOTRUMP Evaluation Model includes the error corrections and model enhancements described in a few Westinghouse annual notifications required by 10 CFR 50.46, including the 1998 annual notification referenced in Reference 39.

The first two changes in the reference list are editorial and merely provide the latest version of the approved topical report or identify the proprietary and non-proprietary versions of a topical report. Reference 6-39, the Westinghouse letter NSD-NRC-99-5839, is the annual notification of the changes to the LOCA evaluation models during 1998. This notification documented the following error corrections or model enhancements to the NOTRUMP small break LOCA Evaluation Model:

- A programming error correction on the SBLOCTA rod-to-rod radiation model that is not modeled in licensing basis analyses and therefore, has no impact on the small break LOCA results.
- A logic simplification to the NOTRUMP droplet fall model that produces insignificant differences in results.
- A change in the reactor coolant pump heat in NOTRUMP that is not used in the evaluation model and therefore, has no impact on the small break LOCA results.
- A modification of NOTRUMP steam generator tube condensation heat transfer logic to a foreign plant that does not affect standard Westinghouse Pressurized Water Reactor calculations.
- An extension of reactor coolant conditions to allow for the NOTRUMP point kinetics calculations to be performed for cases that experience core uncover conditions prior to reactor trip. For typical small break LOCA analyses, the reactor trips long before any threat of core uncover and therefore, the change has no impact on peak cladding temperature calculations.
- A programming change in SBLOCTA code to allow for modeling of variable length blankets on either ends of the rod that involves no changes to the thermal-hydraulic fuel rod model, nor the solution technique.

Since the changes documented in the Westinghouse annual notice have insignificant impact on the small break LOCA analyses, the staff concludes the addition of Reference 6-39 is acceptable. Therefore, Revision 1 of DPC-NE-2009-P-A, as modified in the August 7, 2002, letter, is acceptable.

3.1.2 DPC-NF-2010A, Revision 1

Topical Report DPC-NF-2010A, (Ref. 7), describes Duke Power Company's Nuclear Design Methodology for McGuire and Catawba Nuclear Stations. The nuclear design process consists of mechanical properties used as nuclear design input, the nuclear code system and methodology the licensee intends to use to perform design calculations and to provide operational support, and the development of statistical factors.

Revision 1 of DPC-NF-2010A, updates the report to permit the use of certain methods approved subsequent to the implementation of the original version, such as the use of CASMO-3/SIMULATE-3P reactor physics methods (Ref. 8). Other changes are made to reflect revisions to the core design parameters such as shutdown margin, boron and control rod worth, axial and radial peaking factors, and cycle length, as well as numerous editorial changes.

During the review, the staff also identified a few discrepancies associated with administrative changes. In response to the staff's request for additional information (Ref. 2), the licensee provided further changes to Revision 1 of the Topical report. These modifications include clarifications to revised sections and minor changes to equations. The NRC staff has reviewed the analyses associated with the changes to Topical Report DPC-NF-2010A and the responses to the requests for additional information pertaining to these changes. The staff has concluded

that the changes to this topical report consist mostly of administrative changes and clarifications to the original NRC approved topical report and that there are no unreviewed methodology or regulatory issues. Therefore, the staff finds the changes acceptable.

3.1.3 DPC-NE-2011, Revision 1

Topical Report DPC-NE-2011, (Ref. 9), describes the methodology for performing a maneuvering analysis for four-loop plants, such as McGuire and Catawba Nuclear Station. The licensee has developed this methodology as an alternate to the existing Relaxed Axial Offset Control Methodology. The licensee pointed out that this maneuvering analysis results in several advantages: more flexible and prompt engineering support for the operating stations, consistency with the methods of the licensee's nuclear design process, and potential increases in available margin through the use of three-dimensional monitoring techniques. The increase in margin occurs in limits on power distribution, control rod insertion, and power distribution inputs to the overpower delta-temperature and over-temperature delta-temperature reactor protection system trip functions.

Revision 1 of DPC-NE-2011, updates the report to include editorial changes, and to permit the use of certain methods approved subsequent to the implementation of the original version, such as the use of CASMO-3/SIMULATE-3P methodology (Ref. 8). Other changes are made to reflect revisions to the core design parameters such as power peaking factors, axial and radial power distributions, and cycle length, as well as numerous editorial changes.

In response to the NRC staff's request for additional information (Ref. 2), the licensee provided additional information to the staff regarding cycle depletion times to clarify issues associated with power peaking versus burnup as a function of cycle time. The licensee's amendment request also included clarifications to revised sections and minor changes to equations. The NRC staff has reviewed the analyses associated with the changes to Topical Report DPC-NE-2011-A and the responses to the requests for additional information pertaining to the requested changes. Since the changes to this topical report consists mostly of administrative changes and clarifications to the original NRC approved topical report, the staff find the changes acceptable.

3.1.4 DPC-NE-1003, Revision 1

Topical Report DPC-NE-1003 (Ref. 10) describes the measurement procedure used to determine the inferred bank worth and the calculation procedures used to develop the rod swap correction factor that accounts for the effect of a test bank on the partial integral worth of the reference bank. The NRC approved the report in May 1987 (Ref. 11) for rod worth measurement of reload cores for McGuire and Catawba Stations, Units 1 and 2.

Revision 1 of DPC-NE-1003 updates the report to permit the use of certain methods approved subsequent to the implementation of the original version, such as the use of CASMO-3/SIMULATE-3P reactor physics methods (Ref. 8). Other changes are made to reflect the revision of the rod swap measurement procedures, and various editorial changes. In response to staff questions, the licensee, in its letter of August 7, 2002, provided the current version of the control rod worth measurement rod swap procedures, PT/0/A/4150/11A, dated January 19, 1996. The staff review of this current control rod worth measurement procedure has found it acceptable. The licensee in the August 7, 2002, letter also modified the equation in Section 3

of the topical report for the calculation of the inferred rod bank worth from the measured reference bank worth and bank height. This change is consistent with the equation described in step 12.12.5 of the current measurement procedures of January 19, 1996. Therefore, Revision 1 of DPC-NE-1003, as modified in the August 7, 2002, letter, is acceptable.

3.2 Proposed TS Changes

This section addresses the staff's evaluation of the proposed changes to TS 5.6.5.a regarding the cycle-specific operating parameters specified in the COLR. The staff review of these TS changes are based on the guidance of GL 88-16.

TS 5.6.5.a provides a list of core operating limits that are established prior to each reload cycle, or prior to any remaining portion of a reload cycle. The values of the limits are in the COLR. For Catawba Units 1 and 2, the licensee proposed to revise the list by:

- (1) adding "60 ppm" to Item 5.6.5.a.1 regarding the moderator temperature coefficient (MTC) surveillance limit for Specification 3.1.3,
- (2) adding Item 5.6.5.a.12, "31 EFPD surveillance penalty factors for Specifications 3.2.1 and 3.2.2," and
- (3) adding Item 5.6.5.a.13, "Reactor makeup water pumps combined flow rates limit for Specifications 3.3.9 and 3.9.2."

These changes are evaluated below.

3.2.1 MTC 60 ppm Surveillance Limit

Catawba TS LCO 3.1.3 specifies that the MTC be maintained within the LCO limits, which are based on the safety analysis assumptions. For verification that these LCO limits are met, the Surveillance Requirements of TS 3.1.3 also places surveillance limits for conducting the end of cycle MTC measurement at 300 ppm and 60 ppm boron concentration. The LCO limits and the 300-ppm and 60-ppm surveillance limits are specified in the COLR. However, TS Item 5.6.5.a.1 operating limits does not currently identify the 60-ppm surveillance limit.

The proposed change to the Catawba TS would add the 60-ppm surveillance limit in Item 5.6.5.a.1. The new TS would read "Moderator Temperature Coefficients BOL and EOL limits and 60 ppm and 300 ppm surveillance limit for Specification 3.1.3." The NRC approved incorporating the 60-ppm surveillance limits into the COLR during the Improved Technical Specifications conversion in 1998 (Ref. 12 and 13); however, reference to this surveillance was not included in TS Item 5.6.5.a.1 at that time. The proposed TS change to include the 60-ppm surveillance limit in TS Item 5.6.5.a.1 provides consistency with previously approved requirements and, therefore, it is acceptable.

3.2.2 Relocation of Hot Channel Factors Surveillance Penalty Factors to COLR

Surveillance Requirements in TS 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, respectively, require that the heat flux hot channel factor, $F_q(x,y,z)$, and the enthalpy rise hot channel factor, $F_{\Delta h}(x,y)$, be measured every 31 effective full power days (EFPD) during equilibrium conditions using the incore detector

system to verify they are within the respective limits. To address the possibility that these hot channel factors may increase and exceed their allowable limits between surveillances, penalty factors are applied to these hot channel factors if their margins to the respective limits have decreased since the previous surveillance. These margin-decrease penalty factors are calculated by projecting the limiting hot channel factors over the 31 EFPD surveillance intervals with the maximum changes at the limiting core location, and are based on reload core design. In Section 8, "Improved Technical Specification Changes," of DPC-NE-2009, the licensee proposed to replace the penalty factors with tables of penalty value as functions of burnup in the COLR to facilitate cycle-specific updates. TS Item 5.6.5.b.14 lists topical report DPC-NE-2009-P-A that includes (in response to a staff question during the review of DPC-NE-2009) the approved methodology used to calculate these burnup-dependent penalty factors. The staff found the methodology and the inclusion of the burnup-dependent margin decrease penalty factors in the COLR acceptable as stated in the staff's safety evaluation supporting license amendment Nos. 180 and 172, respectively for Catawba Units 1 and 2 (Ref. 15).

The proposed changes to the Catawba TS would add Item 5.6.5.a.12, that reads: "31 EFPD surveillance penalty factors for Specifications 3.2.1 and 3.2.2." The addition of TS Item 5.6.5.a.12 would make it consistent with the previous staff approval of including these surveillance penalty factors in the COLR and, therefore, this proposed change is acceptable.

3.2.3 Reactor Makeup Water Pumps Combined Flow Rates Limit

The relocation of the reactor makeup water pumps combined flow rates limit for the boron dilution mitigation system from Catawba TS 3.3.9 and 3.9.2 to the COLR was approved by the NRC as described in a letter dated March 25, 1994 (Ref. 16). The reactor makeup water pumps flow rate limit is included in the Catawba COLR.

The proposed changes to the Catawba TS would add Item 5.6.5.a.13, "Reactor makeup water pumps combined flow rates limit for Specification 3.3.9 and 3.9.2," to TS 5.6.5.a. The addition of this item would make the TS 5.6.5.a list consistent with the core operating limits included in the Catawba COLR and is therefore, acceptable.

4.0 SUMMARY

The staff has reviewed the revisions of four previously approved topical reports described in Section 1.0 of this Safety Evaluation, and the proposed changes to Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, TS 5.6.5.a related to the COLR. Based on our evaluation described in Section 3 of this Safety Evaluation, the staff concludes that the these topical report revisions, as amended by the August 7, 2002, letter, and the TS changes are acceptable.

5.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the South Carolina State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change requirements with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and change surveillance requirements. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts and no significant change in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding [67 FR 54680]. Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendments.

7.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

8.0 REFERENCES

1. Letter from M. S. Tuckman, Duke Energy Corporation, to US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Duke Energy Corporation; Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2, Docket Nos. 50-413, 50-414; McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2, Docket Nos. 50-369, 50-370; License Amendment Request Applicable to Technical Specifications 5.6.5, Core Operating Limits Report; Revisions to BASES 3.2.1 and 3.2.3; and Revisions to Topical Reports DPC-NE-2009-P, DPC-NF-2010, DPC-NE-2011-P, and DPC-NE-1003," October 7, 2001.
2. Letter from M. S. Tuckman, Duke Energy Corporation, to US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "Duke Energy Corporation; McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 370; Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2, Docket Nos. 50-413 and 414; Response to NRC Request for Additional Information - TAC nos. MB3222, MB3223, MB3343 and MB3344) and License Amendment Request Supplement," August 7, 2002.
3. Letter from M. S. Tuckman, Duke Energy Corporation, to US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "License Amendment Request Applicable to the Technical Specifications Requirements for the Core Operating Limits Report - Oconee, McGuire, and Catawba Technical Specifications 5.6.5," December 20, 2001.
4. Letter from Dennis Crutchfield, USNRC, to All Power Reactor Licensees and Applicants, "Removal of Cycle-Specific Parameter Limits from Technical Specifications (Generic Letter 88-16)," October 4, 1988.

5. DPC-NE-2009-P-A, "Duke Power Company Westinghouse Fuel Transition Report," December 1999.
6. Letter from J. S. Galembush, Westinghouse Electric Company, to US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, "1998 Annual Notification of Changes to the Westinghouse Small Break LOCA and Large Break LOCA ECCS Evaluation Models, Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.46(a)(3)(ii)," NSD-NRC-99-5839, July 15, 1999.
7. DPC-NF-2010A, "Duke Power Company McGuire Nuclear Station and Catawba Nuclear Station Nuclear Physics Methodology for Reload Design," June 1985.
8. DPC-NE-1004A, Revision 1, "Nuclear Design Methodology Using CASMO-3/SIMULATE-3P," SER dated April 26, 1997.
9. DPC-NE-2011, "Nuclear Design Methodology Report for Core Operating Limits of Westinghouse Reactors," March 1990.
10. DPC-NE-1003, "Rod Swap Methodology Report for Startup Physics Testing," December 1986.
11. Letter from Darl Hood, USNRC, to H. B. Tucker, Duke Power Company, "Rod Swap Methodology Report for Startup Physics Testing, McGuire and Catawba Nuclear Stations, Units 1 and 2 (TACs 62981, 62982, 62983, 62984)," May 22, 1987.
12. Letter from Frank Rinaldi, USNRC, to H. B. Brown, McGuire Site, Duke Energy Corporation, "Issuance of Amendments - McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, (TAC Nos. M98964 and M98965)," September 30, 1998.
13. Letter from Peter Tam, USNRC, to G. R. Peterson, Catawba Nuclear Station, Duke Energy Corporation, "Issuance of Amendments - Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2 (TAC Nos. M95298 and M95299)," September 30, 1998.
14. Letter from Frank Rinaldi, USNRC, to H. B. Brown, McGuire Site, Duke Energy Corporation, "McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Re: Issuance of Amendments (TAC Nos. MA2411 and MA2412)," September 22, 1999.
15. Letter from Peter Tam, USNRC, to G. R. Peterson, Catawba Nuclear Station, Duke Energy Corporation, "Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Re: Issuance of Amendments (TAC Nos. MA2359 and MA2361)," September 22, 1999.
16. Letter from Robert F. Martin, USNRC, to David L. Rehn, Catawba Site, Duke Power Company, "Issuance of Amendments - Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2 Cycle Specific Parameters to the Core Operating Limits Report (TAC Nos. M85472 and M85473)," March 25, 1994.

Principal Contributor: Y. Hsii
A. Attard

Date: October 1, 2002

Catawba Nuclear Station

cc:

Mr. Gary Gilbert
Regulatory Compliance Manager
Duke Energy Corporation
4800 Concord Road
York, South Carolina 29745

Ms. Lisa F. Vaughn
Legal Department (PB05E)
Duke Energy Corporation
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Anne Cottingham, Esquire
Winston and Strawn
1400 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

North Carolina Municipal Power
Agency Number 1
1427 Meadowwood Boulevard
P. O. Box 29513
Raleigh, North Carolina 27626

County Manager of York County
York County Courthouse
York, South Carolina 29745

Piedmont Municipal Power Agency
121 Village Drive
Greer, South Carolina 29651

Ms. Karen E. Long
Assistant Attorney General
North Carolina Department of Justice
P. O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NCEM REP Program Manager
4713 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4713

North Carolina Electric Membership
Corporation
P. O. Box 27306
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
4830 Concord Road
York, South Carolina 29745

Virgil R. Autry, Director
Division of Radioactive Waste Management
Bureau of Land and Waste Management
Department of Health and Environmental
Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201-1708

Mr. C. Jeffrey Thomas
Manager - Nuclear Regulatory
Licensing
Duke Energy Corporation
526 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28201-1006

Saluda River Electric
P. O. Box 929
Laurens, South Carolina 29360

Mr. Peter R. Harden, IV
VP-Customer Relations and Sales
Westinghouse Electric Company
6000 Fairview Road
12th Floor
Charlotte, North Carolina 28210

Catawba Nuclear Station

cc:

Mr. T. Richard Puryear
Owners Group (NCEMC)
Duke Energy Corporation
4800 Concord Road
York, South Carolina 29745

Richard M. Fry, Director
Division of Radiation Protection
North Carolina Department of
Environment, Health, and
Natural Resources
3825 Barrett Drive
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721