March 5, 19

Secretary of the Commission United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention:

Docketing and Service Branch

Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Regarding Acceptance Criteria for Emergency Core Cooling

Gentlemen:

Commonwealth Edison appreciates the additional time for comment provided by the Commission and supplements its comments of February 5, 1979, with an additional procedural recommendation for consideration in Phase 1. We urge the Commission to replace the present provisions of subsections a(2) and a(3) of section 50.46 with provisions which will facilitate implementation of the rule under current circumstances.

Subsections a(2) and a(3) were largely designed to facilitate the original implementation of Appendix K. With the exception of exemption provisions which are unnecessary in view of section 50.12, they have become irrelevant. However several years of experience with section 50.46 and Appendix K have shown the need for new implementation provisions.

Specifically, from time to time new information reveals deficiencies or a need for modifications with respect to approved evaluation models. Under the current procedures the applicant or licensee reports those changes and modifies its technical specifications to reflect the unfavorable implications of the new information. It cannot promptly take credit for the beneficial impacts of new information and is considered not to have calculated ECCS performance "in accordance with an acceptable evaluation model" until a complete new analysis has been performed. This action may require nearly a year. The resulting situation is unfair to the utility and unnecessarily burdensome to the Staff.

790706034/

## Commonwealth Edison

Secretary of the Commission March 5, 1979 Page Three

reactor in accordance with existing license conditions and technical specifications or such more stringent administrative limitations as the report and supporting analyses indicate are necessary to provide reasonable assurance that peak cladding temper ture would not exceed the limitation set forth in Paragraph (b) by more than 10 percent.

- (iii) Upon receipt of a report pursuant to paragraph (a)(2)(i) the Director of Regulation shall promptly determine whether interim restrictions must be imposed upon the operation of the reactor to protect the public health and safety, taking into account any offsetting information supplied by the Applicant and the conservatism inherent in Appendix K. The Director of Regulation may impose such interim restrictions as are deemed necessary.
  - (iv) The Director of Regulation may declare the ECCS performance calculation modified in accordance with any analyses submitted in connection with a report pursuant to paragraph (a)(2)(i), require additional sensitivity or perturbation analyses or require a new ECCS performance calculation. Unless the Director of Regulation requires a new ECCS performance calculation, none shall be deemed necessary.

Secretary of the Commission March 5, 1979 Page Five

deficiency or modification which may take the form of sensitivity or perturbation analyses showing the effect of any necessary adjustments upon the analysis. To the extent that such information is not available at the time of the initial report, it may be supplied later. The applicant may include in its analyses information with respect to factors which may offset the effect of the required modification.

(ii) The Director of Regulation may declare the ECCS performance calculation modified in accordance with any analyses submitted in connection with a report pursuant to paragraph (a)(3)(i), require additional sensitivity or perturbation analyses or require a new ECCS performance calculation. Unless the Director of Regulation requires a new ECCS performance calculation, none shall be deemed necessary.

In view of the detail of these suggestions, we would be pleased to discuss their application with the Staff.

Respectfully submitted,

Cordell Reed

Assistant Vice President

300 257

cc: Mr. Scinto Mr. Malsch