



Steven D. Capps
Vice President
McGuire Nuclear Station

Duke Energy
MG01VP | 12700 Hagers Ferry Road
Huntersville, NC 28078

o: 980.875.4805
f: 980.875.4809

Steven.Capps@duke-energy.com

Serial: MNS-15-013

March 23, 2015

10 CFR 50.90

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject: Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy)
McGuire Nuclear Station (MNS), Units 1 and 2
Docket Numbers 50-369 and 50-370
Technical Specifications (TS) Section 1.1 Definitions
Removal of Superseded TS Requirement

References: Letter from R. T. Repko to NRC, License Amendment Request for Measurement
Uncertainty Recapture Power Uprate, dated March 5, 2012 (ML12082A210)

Letter from John P. Boska to Steven D. Capps, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1
and 2, Issuance of Amendments Regarding Measurement Uncertainty Recapture
Power Uprate, dated May 16, 2013 (ML13073A041)

Letter from S. D. Capps to NRC, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2,
Revision to a Response to a Request for Additional Information Regarding
License Amendment Request Related to Measurement Uncertainty recapture
Power Uprate, dated January 2, 2013 (ML13024A406)

Pursuant to Section 50.90 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Duke
Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) herein submits a license amendment request (LAR) for
the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses (FOL) and Technical Specifications (TS) for MNS
Units 1 and 2 to remove a superseded TS requirement.

By letter dated March 5, 2012, Duke Energy submitted a LAR to implement a measurement
uncertainty recapture (MUR) power uprate on MNS Units 1 and 2. Because the MUR power
uprates were implemented on a staggered basis for each MNS Unit, the modification of a TS
requirement was accomplished via the use of a temporary footnote. This allowed the TS
requirement to be applicable or non-applicable, depending upon whether the MUR power uprate
had been implemented or not implemented, respectively. The LAR, as supplemented by a letter
dated January 2, 2013, contained a commitment for Duke Energy to submit a follow-up
administrative LAR to delete the superseded temporary TS footnote within 180 days after
implementation of the MUR power uprate on the last MNS Unit.

A 001
MUR

By letter dated May 16, 2013, the NRC issued amendments regarding the TS changes requested in the March 5, 2012, LAR. Implementation of the MUR power uprate on the last MNS Unit was completed on September 24, 2014. This LAR satisfies the MNS commitment to delete the superseded temporary TS footnote described in the March 5, 2012, LAR, as supplemented by a letter dated January 2, 2013.

In accordance with Duke's administrative procedures and Quality Assurance Program, this LAR has been reviewed and approved by the McGuire Plant Operations Review Committee.

Attachment 1 provides an evaluation of the changes proposed in this LAR. Attachment 2 contains a marked-up version of the affected TS page. A reprinted (clean) TS page will be provided to the NRC prior to issuance of the approved amendment.

This LAR contains no regulatory commitments.

Implementation of this proposed LAR will not impact the MNS Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR).

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.91, a copy of this LAR is being sent to the designated official of the State of North Carolina.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Kay L. Crane at (980) 875-4306.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 23, 2015.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "SD Capps", written in a cursive style.

Steven D. Capps

Attachments

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Page 3

March 23, 2015

V.M. McCree, Region II Administrator
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Marquis One Tower
245 Peachtree Center Avenue NE, Suite 1200
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-1257

G. E. Miller, Project Manager (MNS and CNS)
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11555 Rockville Pike
Mail Stop O-8 G9A
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

J. Zeiler
NRC Senior Resident Inspector
McGuire Nuclear Station

W. L. Cox III, Section Chief
North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services
Division of Health Service Regulation
Radiation Protection Section
1645 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1645

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Page 4

March 23, 2015

bxw/attachment:

S.D. Capps (MG01VP)

C.J. Morris (MG01VP)

S.M. Snider (MG01VP)

J. I. Glenn (MG01VP)

J. N. Robertson (MG01RC)

MNS Master File (MG01DM)

ELL (EC2ZF)

Attachment 1

Evaluation of the Proposed Changes

1. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION
2. DETAILED DESCRIPTION
3. TECHNICAL EVALUATION
4. REGULATORY EVALUATION
 - 4.1 Applicable Regulatory Requirements/Criteria
 - 4.2 Significant Hazards Consideration
 - 4.3 Conclusions
5. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION
6. REFERENCES

1. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

Pursuant to Section 50.90 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) herein submits a license amendment request (LAR) for the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses (FOL) and Technical Specifications (TS) for McGuire Nuclear Station (MNS) Units 1 and 2 to remove a superseded TS requirement.

By letter dated March 5, 2012, Duke Energy submitted a LAR to implement a measurement uncertainty recapture (MUR) power uprate on MNS Units 1 and 2. Because the MUR power uprates were implemented on a staggered basis for each MNS Unit, the modification of a TS requirement was accomplished via the use of a temporary footnote. This allowed the TS requirement to be either applicable or non-applicable, depending upon whether the MUR power uprate had not been implemented or implemented, respectively. The LAR, as supplemented by a letter dated January 2, 2013, contained a commitment for Duke Energy to submit a follow-up administrative LAR to delete the superseded temporary TS footnote within 180 days after implementation of the MUR power uprate on the last MNS Unit.

By letter dated May 16, 2013, the NRC issued amendments and a Safety Evaluation Report (SER) regarding the TS changes requested in the March 5, 2012, LAR. Implementation of the MUR power uprate on the last MNS Unit was completed on September 24, 2014. This LAR satisfies the MNS commitment to delete the superseded temporary TS footnote described in the March 5, 2012, LAR, as supplemented by a letter dated January 2, 2013.

2. DETAILED DESCRIPTION

The proposed changes described below are administrative non-technical changes only. These changes are consistent with the proposed changes in Duke Energy's March 5, 2012, LAR and the subject commitment in that LAR, as supplemented by a letter dated January 2, 2013. In addition, these changes are consistent with the changes approved by the NRC in their SER issued on May 16, 2013. The proposed changes support the commitment to the NRC to delete the superseded temporary TS footnote within 180 days after implementation of the MUR power uprate on the last MNS Unit.

Proposed Changes (reference Attachment 2):

TS Section 1.1 Definitions

The asterisk contained in the definition of RATED THERMAL POWER (RTP) on TS Page 1.1-5 is removed and the RTP definition on that page is changed to read:

RATED THERMAL POWER (RTP)	RTP shall be a total reactor core heat transfer rate to the reactor coolant of 3469 MWt.
---------------------------	--

In addition, the asterisked temporary TS footnote near the bottom of TS Page 1.1-5 is deleted.

3. TECHNICAL EVALUATION

The proposed changes in Section 2 - "Detailed Description" are administrative non-technical changes which remove a temporary TS requirement added as part of the MNS March 5, 2012, LAR. This temporary requirement, which accommodated the staggered implementation of the associated MUR LAR on both MNS Units, is no longer necessary given that the associated MUR power uprate has been implemented on both units. Upon approval and implementation of the proposed changes in Section 2, the MNS TS will continue to reflect the changes justified in the Technical Evaluation associated with Duke Energy's March 5, 2012, LAR and approved by the NRC as part of their May 16, 2013 SER.

The proposed changes in Section 2 implement an administrative non-technical editorial correction.

Given the above, additional Technical Evaluation of the administrative non-technical changes proposed in this LAR is not necessary.

4. REGULATORY EVALUATION

4.1 Applicable Regulatory Requirements/Criteria

The changes proposed in this LAR are administrative and non-technical in nature. Upon approval and implementation of the proposed changes, the MNS TS will continue to comply with the applicable regulatory requirements and criteria discussed in the Regulatory Evaluation associated with Duke Energy's March 5, 2012, LAR and approved by the NRC as part of their May 16, 2013, SER. Therefore, additional discussion of the applicable regulatory requirements and criteria is not required.

4.2 Significant Hazards Consideration

The changes in Section 2 - Detailed Description are administrative non-technical changes only and are consistent with the commitment in Duke Energy's March 5, 2012, LAR, as supplemented by a letter dated January 2, 2013. In addition, these changes are consistent with the changes approved by the NRC in their May 16, 2013, SER. These changes support the commitment to the NRC to delete the superseded MNS temporary TS footnote within 180 days after implementation of the MUR power uprate on the last MNS Unit.

Duke Energy has evaluated whether or not a significant hazard consideration is involved with the proposed changes by analyzing the three standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c) as discussed below:

Criterion 1:

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

Response: No.

This LAR proposes administrative non-technical changes only. These proposed

changes do not adversely affect accident initiators or precursors nor alter the design assumptions, conditions, or configurations of the facility. The proposed changes do not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems and components (SSCs) to perform their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded the proposed amendment does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2:

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

Response: No.

This LAR proposes administrative non-technical changes only. The proposed changes will not alter the design requirements of any SSC or its function during accident conditions. No new or different accidents result from the changes proposed. The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant or any changes in methods governing normal plant operation. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3:

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

Response: No.

This LAR proposes administrative non-technical changes only. The proposed changes do not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by these changes. The proposed changes will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside the design basis. The proposed changes do not adversely affect systems that respond to safely shutdown the plant and to maintain the plant in a safe shutdown condition.

Given the above discussion, it is concluded the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

4.3 Conclusions

Based on the above, Duke Energy concludes that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10 CFR 50.92(c), and, accordingly, a finding of no significant hazards consideration is justified.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This LAR proposes administrative non-technical changes only. Duke Energy has determined that the proposed amendment does change requirements with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area, as defined by 10 CFR 20. Duke Energy has evaluated the proposed changes and has determined that they do not involve: (1) a significant hazards consideration, (2) a significant change in the types or a significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite, or (3) a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures. Accordingly, the proposed amendment meets the eligibility criterion for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment needs to be prepared in connection with the proposed amendment.

6. REFERENCES

1. Letter from R. T. Repko to NRC, License Amendment Request for Measurement Uncertainty Recapture Power Uprate, dated March 5, 2012 (ML12082A210)
2. Letter from John P. Boska to Steven D. Capps, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Issuance of Amendments Regarding Measurement Uncertainty Recapture Power Uprate, dated May 16, 2013 (ML13073A041)
3. Letter from S. D. Capps to NRC, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Revision to a Response to a Request for Additional Information Regarding License Amendment Request Related to Measurement Uncertainty recapture Power Uprate, dated January 2, 2013 (ML13024A406)

Attachment 2
Marked-Up TS Page

1.1 Definitions (continued)

QUADRANT POWER TILT RATIO (QPTR)

Replace with text in Insert 1

QPTR shall be the ratio of the maximum upper excore detector calibrated output to the average of the upper excore detector calibrated outputs, or the ratio of the maximum lower excore detector calibrated output to the average of the lower excore detector calibrated outputs, whichever is greater.

RATED THERMAL POWER (RTP)

~~RTP shall be a total reactor core heat transfer rate to the reactor coolant of 3411 MWt.*~~

REACTOR TRIP SYSTEM (RTS) RESPONSE TIME

The RTS RESPONSE TIME shall be that time interval from when the monitored parameter exceeds its RTS trip setpoint at the channel sensor until loss of stationary gripper coil voltage. The response time may be measured by means of any series of sequential, overlapping, or total steps so that the entire response time is measured. In lieu of measurement, response time may be verified for selected components provided that the components and the methodology for verification have been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC.

SHUTDOWN MARGIN (SDM)

SDM shall be the instantaneous amount of reactivity by which the reactor is subcritical or would be subcritical from its present condition assuming:

- a. All rod cluster control assemblies (RCCAs) are fully inserted except for the single RCCA of highest reactivity worth, which is assumed to be fully withdrawn. However, with all RCCAs verified fully inserted by two independent means, it is not necessary to account for a stuck RCCA in the SDM calculation. With any RCCA not capable of being fully inserted, the reactivity worth of the RCCA must be accounted for in the determination of SDM; and
- b. In MODES 1 and 2, the fuel and moderator temperatures are changed to the nominal zero power design level.

SLAVE RELAY TEST

A SLAVE RELAY TEST shall consist of energizing each slave relay and verifying the OPERABILITY of each slave relay. The SLAVE RELAY TEST shall include, as a minimum, a continuity check of associated testable actuation devices.

Delete asterisked note.

* Following implementation of MUR on the respective Unit, the value of RTP shall be 3469 MWt.

TS Markup Insert 1

INSERT 1:

RATED THERMAL POWER
(RTP)

RTP shall be a total reactor core heat transfer rate to the reactor coolant of 3469 MWt.