Mr. Joseph E. Venable Vice President Operations Entergy Operations, Inc. 17265 River Road Killona, LA 70066-0751

SUBJECT: WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3 - PRE-APPLICATION

REVIEW FOR REMOVAL OF TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION 3.7.4 ACTION

STATEMENT "c" (TAC NO. MC1863)

Dear Mr. Venable:

By electronic mail dated January 20, 2004 (ADAMS Accession Number ML040640180), your staff had inquired the feasibility of submitting an amendment to the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 (Waterford 3) Technical Specifications (TSs), deleting ACTION "c" in TS 3.7.4, Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS) and deleting the note with single asterisk, "With a tornado watch in effect, all 9 DCT [dry cooling tower] fans under the missile protected portion of the DCT shall be OPERABLE." on Table 3.7-3, "ULTIMATE HEAT SINK MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS PER FAN." The justification for the amendment was that you would rely on the safety evaluation (SE) issued to Waterford 3 on September 15, 2000. The SE states that Waterford 3 had demonstrated that the probability of a tornado missile strike on certain components, including the DCT fans and motors and associated conduits and electrical boxes, is 6.4x10⁻⁷, which is below the acceptance criterion of 10⁻⁶ per year. You had indicated your plan to use this information to take credit for the DCT fans above the missile shield being operable essentially giving the plant an additional 6 DCT it can rely on.

In essence there were two questions posed in your electronic mail as listed below:

1. Can the plant licensing basis be changed under Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 50.59 to using the TORMIS Code as reference?

Response: No.

The regulation at 10 CFR 50.59(b)(2)(viii) allows changes that do not, "Result in a departure from a method of evaluation described in the FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] (as updated) used in establishing the design bases or in the safety analyses." In addition, 10 CFR 50.59(a)(2)(ii) further clarifies that the licensee can change from a method described in the FSAR if the new method has been approved by the NRC for the intended application.

The Waterford 3 SE dated September 15, 2000, states that the approved use of the TORMIS methodology is limited to the evaluation of specific plant features where additional costly tornado missile protective barriers are under consideration. Waterford 3 appears to be requesting the use of the results of the TORMIS methodology to remove a protective feature. This is not the intended application for which the TORMIS methodology is approved. The TORMIS methodology is currently

not approved for justifying the removal of existing barriers, the methodology is limited to the evaluation of specific plant features where additional costly tornado missile protective barriers are under consideration.

2. Does the NRC concur with Entergy's interpretation of the September 15, 2000, SE that the dry cooling tower fans which are not under the tornado missile shield will survive a tornado?

Response: No.

It may be that the likelihood of the DCT surviving the a tornado is high or even very high, but it is not in the nature of probabilistic analyses to categorically state that the DCT will survive.

If you have any questions, please call me at (301) 415-1480.

Sincerely,

/RA/

N. Kalyanam, Project Manager, Section 1 Project Directorate IV Division of Licensing Project Management Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-382

cc: See next page

not approved for justifying the removal of existing barriers, the methodology is limited to the evaluation of specific plant features where additional costly tornado missile protective barriers are under consideration.

3. Does the NRC concur with Entergy's interpretation of the September 15, 2000, SE that the dry cooling tower fans which are not under the tornado missile shield will survive a tornado?

Response: No.

It may be that the likelihood of the DCT surviving the a tornado is high or even very high, but it is not in the nature of probabilistic analyses to categorically state that the DCT will survive.

If you have any questions, please call me at (301) 415-1480.

Sincerely,

/RA/

N. Kalyanam, Project Manager, Section 1 Project Directorate IV Division of Licensing Project Management Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-382

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

PUBLIC PDIV-1 r/f Rids OgcRp
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter RidsNrrDlpmLpdiv1 (RGramm) RidsNrrLADBaxley
RidsNrrLADJohnson RidsNrrPMNKalyanam SDinsmore

RHernandez-Figueroa RidsRgn4MailCenter (AHowell)

Accession No.:ML041490149

*Minor editorial changes from input provided

OFFICE	PDIV-1/PM	PDIV-1/LA	DSSA/SPLB*	DSSA/SPSB*	PDIV-1/SC
NAME	NKalyanam	DBaxley	Raul Hernandez- Figueroa	Stephen Dinsmore	RGramm
DATE	5/20/04	5/20/04	05/17/04	05/17/04	5/27/04

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML041490149.wpd
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3

CC:

Mr. Michael E. Henry, State Liaison Officer Department of Environmental Quality Permits Division P.O. Box 4313 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-4313

Vice President, Operations Support Entergy Operations, Inc. P. O. Box 31995 Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Director Nuclear Safety Assurance Entergy Operations, Inc. 17265 River Road Killona, LA 70066-0751

Wise, Carter, Child & Caraway P. O. Box 651 Jackson, MS 39205

General Manager Plant Operations Waterford 3 SES Entergy Operations, Inc. 17265 River Road Killona, LA 70066-0751

Licensing Manager Entergy Operations, Inc. 17265 River Road Killona, LA 70066-0751

Winston & Strawn 1400 L Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3502

Resident Inspector/Waterford NPS P. O. Box 822 Killona, LA 70066-0751 Regional Administrator, Region IV U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000 Arlington, TX 76011

Parish President Council St. Charles Parish P. O. Box 302 Hahnville, LA 70057

Executive Vice President & Chief Operating Officer Entergy Operations, Inc. P. O. Box 31995 Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Chairman Louisiana Public Services Commission P. O. Box 91154 Baton Rouge, LA 70825-1697