Nebraska Public Power District

GENERAL OFFICE
P.O. BOX 499, COLUMBUS, NEBRASKA 68602-0499
TELEPHONE (402) 564-8561
FAX (402) 563-5551

NSD930449
June 14, 1993

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

Subject: Revision to Proposed Change No. 103 to Technical Specifications
Cooper Nuclear Station
NRC Docket No. 50-298, DPR-46

Reference: 1) Letter, G. R. Horn to USNRC dated February 25, 1992, "Proposed Change No. 103 to the Cooper Nuclear Station Technical Specifications Clarification of DC Power System".

2) Telephone Conversation between T. J. Arlt (NPPD) and Harry Rood (USNRC) on NRC recommended revisions to Proposed Change 103 "Clarification of DC Power Systems".

Gentlemen:

In Reference 1, the Nebraska Public Power District (the District) submitted a proposed change to the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) Technical Specifications that would provide clarification to the DC System performance criteria, appropriate surveillance requirements, and the actions to be taken following determination of unsatisfactory surveillance results. Additionally, the District submitted on June 9, 1992 a revision to this proposed change which modified some intercell inter-rack resistance values due to CNS battery rack configuration.

During subsequent NRC review of this application the NRC has suggested that the District revise this proposed change to more closely image the terminology found in the Standard Technical Specifications for DC Power Systems as discussed in reference 2. The District has reviewed the suggested revisions against the DC power system design basis for the CNS, and has concluded that the suggested NRC revisions could be incorporated into proposed change 103 of the CNS Technical Specifications.

Therefore, the following five revisions to Proposed Change No. 103 are submitted for your review;

1) Specification 4.9.A.3.b.3 (Page 194) remove the portion "consisting of at least every sixth cell, are within ±5°F"., and replace this statement with "has an average temperature of at least 70°F".

2) Specification 4.9.A.3.c.2 (Page 194) add the phrase "and coated with anti-corrosion material" to the last sentence of this specification.

180053

A001 1/1

3) Specification 4.9.A.3.d.2 (Page 195) change the battery capacity from 85% to 90% of the manufacturer's rating.

4) Revise the Bases Section 4.9 third paragraph (Page 200) to read "Degradation is indicated ... , or is below 90% of the manufacturer's rating". This originally read as 85% of the manufacturer's rating.

5) Revise the Bases Section 4.9 fourth paragraph (Page 200) to read "Replacement criteria for the 125V and 250V station batteries is ≤80% capacity factor....". This originally read as ≤85% capacity factor.

The revised pages incorporating these changes are attached for consideration. Due to the fact the five changes are minor in nature and have no impact on the technical basis for DC power operation at CNS the District considers that the no significant hazards determination contained in reference 1 to still be valid. Additionally, in order to facilitate an orderly revision of the affected plant procedures, the District requests that the amendment associated with this proposed change including revisions, be effective 30 days after date of issuance.

If you have any questions, please call.

Sincerely,

G. R. Horn
Nuclear Power Group Manager

GRH/tja:pc-103.r2
Attachment

cc: Regional Administrator
USNRC - Region IV
Arlington, TX

NRC Resident Inspector Office
Cooper Nuclear Station

H. R. Borchert
Department of Health
State of Nebraska