

October 30, 1986

Dockets Nos. 50-269, 50-270
and 50-287

Mr. Hal B. Tucker
Vice President - Nuclear Production
Duke Power Company
P. O. Box 33189
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Dear Mr. Tucker:

SUBJECT: USE OF LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE INCINERATOR

Reference: Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3

In your letter dated June 10, 1985, you requested approval, pursuant to 10 CFR Part 20, Sections 20.302 and 20.305, to operate a low-level radioactive waste incinerator at the Oconee Nuclear Station. The incinerator is one component in the radwaste facility. In your letter, you stated that the safety evaluation modifications of the design, construction and operation of other plant systems and components related to the use of this facility were handled by you under the auspices of 10 CFR 50.59.

Your original submittal described the design and operation of the low-level radioactive waste incinerator and was supplemented with information in letters dated October 9, December 13, 1985, May 9, August 18 and September 11, 1986. The December 13, 1985 letter revised the original June 10, 1985 submittal.

We have reviewed this information and conclude that the operation of the incinerator will not present an undue hazard to either the safe operation of the Oconee Nuclear Station or the public health and safety. However, Technical Specification changes incorporating limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for the radiation monitors covering the releases of radioactive materials in airborne effluents from the incinerator will be required to ensure adequate control of releases from the system before the system may be actually operated.

We have received your August 27, 1986 application to amend the Oconee licenses and add Technical Specifications on the monitoring of the gaseous effluents from the system. If we find them acceptable, the amendments will be issued after the expiration of the 30-day notice period. We have enclosed a copy of our Federal Register notice and proposed determination of no significant hazards considerations. The notice was published in the Federal Register on October 8, and the 30-day notice period expires on November 7, 1986.

8611050087 861030
PDR ADOCK 05000269
X PDR

Mr. H. B. Tucker

-2-

Pursuant to 10 CFR Part 51, the Commission has caused to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER the enclosed "Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact" for the low-level radioactive waste incinerator (51 FR 39719). Our Safety Evaluation approving the design of the incinerator is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

**"ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
JOHN F. STOLZ"**

John F. Stolz, Director
PWR Project Directorate #6
Division of PWR Licensing-B

Enclosures:

- 1. Notice
- 2. Environmental Assessment
- 3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

<u>DISTRIBUTION</u>	ACRS-10	CMcCracken
<u>Docket File</u>	BGrimes	GEdison
NRC PDR	JPartlow	DCrutchfield
L PDR	HPastis	EJordan
PBD-6 Rdg	RIngram	SWest
FMiraglia	Gray File	NThompson
OGC-MNBB 9604		

PBD-6
RIngram
10/13/86

PBD-6
HPastis;jak
10/16/86

PBD-6
SWest
10/15/86

PBD-6
CMcCracken
10/17/86

PBD-6
GEdison
10/17/86

PBD-6
JStolz
10/17/86

AD-PWRB
DCrutchfield
10/17/86

Revisions made 10/24/86
OGC
JOHNSON
10/24/86
for w/ revisions made

Mr. H. B. Tucker
Duke Power Company

Oconee Nuclear Station
Units Nos. 1, 2 and 3

cc:

Mr. William L. Porter
Duke Power Company
P. O. Box 33189
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

Mr. Paul F. Guill
Duke Power Company
Post Office Box 33189
422 South Church Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

J. Michael McGarry, III, Esq.
Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Robert B. Borsum
Babcock & Wilcox
Nuclear Power Generation Division
Suite 220, 7910 Woodmont Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Manager, LIS
NUS Corporation
2536 Countryside Boulevard
Clearwater, Florida 33515

Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Route 2, Box 610
Seneca, South Carolina 29678

Regional Administrator
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta Street, N.W.
Suite 3100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Heyward G. Shealy, Chief
Bureau of Radiological Health
South Carolina Department of Health
and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Office of Intergovernmental Relations
116 West Jones Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

Honorable James M. Phinney
County Supervisor of Oconee County
Walhalla, South Carolina 29621

consistent with 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B, Table II by existing TS 3/4.11.1.1. The dose or dose commitment to a member of the public from radioactive materials in liquid effluents released from each McGuire unit is limited consistent with 10 CFR 50, Appendix I by existing TS 3/4.11.1.2. These TSs (3/4.11.1.1, 3/4.11.1.2, and 3/4.11.1.5) would apply to both the CWWTS and the Lake Norman discharge points. The change would also not decrease the existing monitoring requirements (TS 3.3.3.8 and referenced TS Table 3.3-12) which assure that instantaneous radioactive release rates remain within 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B limits, and that radioactive liquid effluent monitoring instrumentation remains operable or appropriate compensatory action taken. Rather, the change provides for consistency of TS Figure 5.1-4 with these other existing TSs which assure that such discharges, concentrations and doses are consistent with the Commission's regulations. Therefore, as noted in the licensee's submittal, the change more accurately reflects station design and practice when operating with a primary-to-secondary leak in steam generators.

The Commission has provided certain examples (51 FR 7744) of actions likely to involve no significant hazards considerations. One of the examples (i) relates to amendments for a purely administrative change to Technical Specifications. Removal of the obsolete footnote has no safety implication and matches this example. The remainder of the change, which designates the river as a liquid waste discharge point, does not match any of those examples. However, the staff has reviewed the licensee's request for the above amendments and has determined that should this portion of the change be implemented, it would not involve: (1) A significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated or (2) a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The change does not increase the radioactive waste produced by or released from the station. The concentrations of radioactivity in the CWWB are maintained low in accordance with existing TS requirements and the potential accidental radioactive releases from the CWWB are bounded by the releases from the postulated design-basis liquid tank failures evaluated by the Commission in the McGuire Safety Evaluation Report, Section 15.3.10, and found to result in acceptable radionuclide concentrations in the Catawba River. This part of the change also would not (3) increase the

probability of an accident previously evaluated or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. Because the change does not involve any new or novel changes in equipment, design, operating procedures and limits, setpoints, or limiting conditions for operation, it has no effect on accident causal mechanisms.

On the above bases, the Commission proposes to determine that these proposed amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room

location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223;

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, P.O. Box 33189, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242.

NRC Project Director: B.J. Youngblood.

Duke Power Company, Dockets Nos. 50-289, 50-270 and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units Nos. 1, 2 and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: August 27, 1986, as supplemented with additional information on September 29, 1986.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise the Station's common Technical Specifications (TSs) to add operability requirements of monitors and surveillance items required by the addition of the radwaste facility at the Oconee Nuclear Stations (ONS). The proposed amendments would also delete certain outdated footnotes with the gaseous process and effluent monitoring instrumentation.

In a letter dated June 10, 1985, and supplements, the licensee requested approval under 10 CFR Part 20, § 20.305, to treat or dispose of licensed material by incineration. The incinerator is one major integral component of the new volume reduction radwaste facility.

The licensee will monitor the process exhaust from the volume reduction system as it is mixed with normal facility heat, ventilation and air condition (HVAC) exhaust before release. An isokinetic sampling system is provided to obtain representative exhaust duct air samples for radiological monitoring and analyses. A continuous noble gas activity monitor and sample cartridge for continuous collection of iodine and particulate samples are provided.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the

standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (51 FR 7750). Example (i) of the types of amendments not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is an amendment considered to be a purely administrative change to the TSs; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the TSs, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature.

One of the proposed changes to the TSs has been determined to contain only administrative changes. The requested changes are required so that the TSs are updated and no longer note obsolete footnotes. Also, some typing format changes have been proposed.

For the other proposed revision to the TSs, i.e., to add operability requirements of monitors and surveillance items required by the addition of the radwaste facility, the Commission has provided guidance concerning the determination of significant hazards considerations by providing certain standards (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards considerations if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not:

- (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or
- (2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or
- (3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

These requested amendments will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The licensee states that the amendments constitute operability requirements of monitors and surveillance requirements for the incinerator. Appropriate accident analyses for the incinerator were provided in the June 10, 1985 submittal. The activity release by nuclide and the dose estimated for each of the accident cases analyzed are provided in the June 10, 1985 submittal. The doses calculated were derived with conservative assumptions and were found to be below 10 CFR Part 20 annual dose limits. Therefore, the consequences of these accidents analyzed will not be significantly increased. The proposed changes include additional operability requirements of monitors and surveillance requirements associated with the incinerator. As such, this change is not considered to be an initiator of the accidents analyzed. We agree with the licensee's analysis.

The proposed amendments do not create the possibility of a new or

different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes do not involve any physical changes to the plant. These amendments result from the addition of the radwaste facility at ONS. No new or different kind of accident can be created since these amendments only add additional sampling points for surveillance and define the operability requirements for the radwaste facility monitors.

The proposed amendments do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Operation of the radwaste facility including the incinerator will still be within Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50 numerical guides for the three unit site, and accordingly the margin of safety is unchanged.

Based on the above, the Commission's staff proposes to determine that these proposed amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Oconee County Library, 501 West Southbroad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina 29691.

Attorney for licensee: J. Michael McGarry, III, Bishop, Lieberman, Cook, Purcell and Reynolds, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz.

Florida Power Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-302, Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, Citrus County, Florida

Date of amendment request: February 17, 1986.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the expiration date for Facility Operating License No. DPR-72 from September 25, 2006, to December 3, 2016, 40 years from the issuance of the operating license.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The currently licensed term for the Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant is 40 years commencing with issuance of the Construction Permit (September 25, 1968). Accounting for the time required for plant construction, this represents an effective operating license term of 31 years and 10 months. The licensee's application requests a 40-year operating license term.

The licensee's request for extension of the operating license is in accordance with 10 CFR 50.51 and is based on the fact that a 40-year service life was considered during the design and construction of the plant. Although this does not mean that some components will not wear out during the plant lifetime, design features were

incorporated to maximize the inspectability of structures, systems, and equipment. Surveillance and maintenance practices which have been implemented in accordance with the ASME code and the facility Technical Specifications provide assurance that any unexpected degradation in plant equipment will be identified and corrected.

The design of the reactor vessel and its internals considered the effects of a 40-year design life (32 Effective Full Power Years), and a comprehensive vessel material surveillance program is maintained in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix H. Analyses showing compliance with the NRC pressurized thermal shock screening criteria have demonstrated that the expected neutron fluence will not be a limiting consideration. In addition to these calculations, surveillance capsules placed inside the reactor vessel provide a means of monitoring the cumulative effects of power operation.

Aging analyses have been performed for all safety-related electrical equipment in accordance with 10 CFR 50.49, "Environmental qualification of electrical equipment important to safety for nuclear power plants," identifying qualified lifetimes for this equipment. These lifetimes will be incorporated into plant equipment maintenance and replacement practices to ensure that all safety-related electrical equipment remain qualified and available to perform all safety functions regardless of the overall age of the plant.

The licensee has reviewed the Final Environmental Statement (FES) to determine if its calculations will be materially affected by the proposed extension and has determined that there will be no significant increase in annual risk to the public and that assurances to protect the environment will continue throughout the proposed plant operating life. The ALARA program is expected to offset any tendency for increased occupational exposure due to plant age. In addition, considerable financial benefits to the local population and to the utility's customers would continue to accrue from continued operation of the facility.

The licensee has concluded, and we agree, that the proposed extension will not modify any operating parameters and restrictions except to allow continued operation for a longer period of time. This is consistent with current regulatory practice under the requirements of 10 CFR 50.51. Based on the above, this amendment will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated. No

operational restrictions are modified by changing the duration of the license.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The proposed change introduces no new mode of plant operation nor does it require physical modification to the plant.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety. Any reduction in the margin of safety will be maintained within acceptable bounds by continued implementation of the referenced ongoing programs (Qualification Maintenance Program, Reactor Vessel Materials Surveillance Program, environmental monitoring, etc.). These programs are designed to assure there would be no significant reduction in the associated margin(s) of safety.

Based upon the above, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendment, which provides for a 40-year operating life for the Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant, involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room
location: Crystal River Public Library, 608 N.W. First Avenue, Crystal River, Florida 32629.

Attorney for licensee: R.W. Neiser, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, Florida Power Corporation, P.O. Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida - 33733.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz.

General Public Utilities Nuclear Corporation Docket No. 50-320, Three Mile Nuclear Station Unit No. 2, Londonderry Township Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendments request: August 15, 1986.

Description of amendments request: The proposed change would revise Section 6.3.2 of the Appendix A Technical Specifications by changing the title of the Radiological Controls Director at Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2. Section 6.3.2 specifies the qualifications for radiological controls personnel. The change is a change in title only, and there is no change in the required qualifications of the individual filling the position. The change is requested by the licensee to achieve consistency with the corporate organizational structure.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (51 FR 7751)