## REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:8404160041 DUC.DATE: 84/04/10 NOTARIZED: YES DOCKET # FACIL:50=331 Duane Arnold Energy Center, Iowa Electric Light & Pow 05000331 AUTH.NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION MCGAUGHY,R.W. Iowa Electric Light & Power Co. RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION DENTON.H. Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Director

SUBJECT: Application for amend to License DPR=49, consisting of proposed change RTS=154A, revised Tech Specs re RCIC automatic reset & automatic suction switchover, per NUREG 0737, Items II, K.3.13b & II.K.3.22.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A046S COPIES RECEIVED:LTR \_\_\_\_\_ENCL \_\_\_\_\_SIZE:\_\_\_\_\_ TITLE: OR Submittal: TMI Action Plan Rgmt NUREG-0737 & NUREG-0660

NOTES:

•	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME NRR ORB2 BC	01	COPIE LTTR 7		RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR ENCL	
INTERNAL:	ELD/HDS2		1	.0	IE/DEPER DIR	33	1	. <b>1</b> A
•1 ·	IE/DEPER/EPB		3	3	IE/DEPER/IRB		1	<b>1</b> - 1
	NRR ERICKSON,	P	1	. 1	NRR PAULSON,	N., .	1	1 -
	NRR/DHFS DEPY	29	1.1	. 1	NRR/DL DIR	14	1	1.
	NRR/DL/ORAB	18	3:	3	NRR/DSI/ADRS	27	1	. 1 .
	NRR/DSI/AEB		. <u>í</u> .	. 1	NRR/DSI/ASB	•	1	1 -
	NRR/DSI/RAB		. <b>1</b> -	1	NRR/DST DIR	30.	1	1.
Č	REGERE	04	1	-1	RGN3		1.	<b>1</b> •
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	34	10	10	LPDR	03	1.5	1.
	NRC PDR	02	1	1	NSIC	05	1	1
	NTIS		1	.1 .	¥ .		•	•

## Iowa Electric Light and Power Company April 10, 1984 NG-84-1466

Mr. Harold Denton, Director Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

> Subject: Duane Arnold Energy Center Docket No: 50-331 Op. License No: DPR-49 RCIC Automatic Reset and RCIC Automatic Suction Switchover from CST to Suppression Pool

Reference: Letter, R. McGaughy (IELP) to H. Denton (NRC) dated July 20, 1983 (NG-83-2294) - RTS-154

Dear Mr. Denton:

Transmitted herewith, in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59 and 10 CFR 50.90, is an application for amendment to Appendix A (Technical Specifications) of Operating License DPR-49 for the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC). The attached Technical Specification pages are identical to those submitted in RTS-154; however, page 3.5-7 supersedes the same page submitted under the referenced cover letter. The only difference is that the last word in paragraph E.1.a has been changed from "reset" to "restart" to clarify the test method.

This application, proposed change RTS-154A, has been reviewed by the DAEC Operations Committee and the DAEC Safety Committee. The proposed change has also been agreed to, in principle, by our NRC Project Manager. As this amendment request is identical to RTS-154, except for the aforementioned wording change, we believe an additional amendment fee is not required.

Pursuant to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.91, a copy of this submittal and analysis of no significant hazards considerations is being forwarded to our appointed state official.

This application, which consists of three signed originals and 37 copies with their enclosures, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

8404160041 840410 PDR ADOCK 05000331 IOWA ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY 部用也得 PDR end Wm Dawyh BY RWM/SLS/dmb\* Richard W. McGaughy Attachments: Manager, Nuclear Divisio cc: S. Swails Subscribed and sworn to Before Me on L. Liu 1984. this 10th day of choice S. Tuthill M. Thadani T. Houvenagle (ICC) HIRMAN Yh. (en) J. Keppler (NRC R-III) in and for the State of Iowa Public NRC Resident Office

General Office • PO. Box 351 • Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52406 • 319/398-4411

Proposed Change RTS-154A to the Duane Arnold Energy Center Technical Specifications

The holders of license DPR-49 for the Duane Arnold Energy Center propose to amend Appendix A (Technical Specifications) to said license by deleting current pages and replacing them with attached, new pages. A List of the Affected Pages is given below.

The proposed amendment, RTS-154A, changes Table 3.2-B and Section 4.5.E.1 to reflect RCIC suction switchover from CST to suppression pool. Section 4.5.E.1.a has been changed to include the RCIC restart test with the Simulated Automatic Actuation Test. This revised amendment (RTS-154A) is identical to RTS-154 except for a single word change on page 3.5-7. The last word in paragraph E.1.a. has been changed from "reset" to "restart." This is being done at the NRC's request.

## LIST OF AFFECTED PAGES

3.2-12 3.5-7 3.5-8

## Evaluation of Change In Response To NUREG-0737 Item II.K.13B With Respect to 10 CFR 50.92

The enclosed application is judged to involve no significant hazards based upon the following information:

(1) Does the proposed license amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The installation of automatic RCIC reset utilizes existing equipment as described in the FSAR. The modification consists of using the steam supply valve to shutoff steam to the RCIC turbine rather than the turbine trip valve which provides for automatic reset.

Operating experience, based on a study of past BWR LER's, has demonstrated that steam supply valve reliability is as good or better than that of the turbine trip valve.

Therefore, the probability or magnitude of an accident or malfunction of safety-related equipment is not increased.

(2) Does the proposed license amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

There has been no change in the RCIC initiation logic. RCIC is still initiated by a low level signal opening the steam supply valve (the turbine trip valve is already open). The high level trip signal for terminating RCIC operation has been switched from the turbine trip valve to the steam supply valve. These valves are in series; therefore, a malfunction of the steam supply valve or its trip system would have the same consequences as a malfunction of the turbine trip valve prior to this change.

Therefore, the possibility of an accident or a malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the FSAR is not created.

(3) Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

The RCIC system still operates between the same trip points using components at least as reliable as the components used prior to this change. The magnitude of the consequences of a malfunction have not been increased and the possibility of a new accident or malfunction has not been created.

Therefore, the margin of safety has not been reduced. Actually, the margin of safety has been increased because operator action is no longer required to reset the system after a high level trip.

In the April 6, 1983 Federal Register, the NRC published examples of amendments that are not likely to involve a significant hazards concern. Example number seven of that list states:

.(2)

"A change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations."

This amendment request is judged to fall into the above category.

Evaluation of Change In Response To NUREG-0737 Item II.K.3.22 In Respect to 10 CFR 50.92

(1) Does the proposed license amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No, the only change with respect to RCIC suction is to make an automatic switch from CST to suppression pool instead of a manual switch. There has been no change of equipment so the probability or consequence of a previously analyzed accident does not increase.

1

(2) Does the proposed license amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

There is the possibility of a component malfunction (the automatic switch), but because the manual switch is still available, there is no possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated.

(3) Is the margin of safety as defined in the basis of any technical specification reduced?

No, because the automatic switch has been added and the manual switch is still there; the margin of safety is increased.

In the April 6, 1983 Federal Register, the NRC published examples of amendments that are not likely to involve a significant hazards concern. Example number seven of that list states:

"A change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations."

This amendment request is judged to fall into the above category.