

Entergy Operations, Inc.

Gerald W. Muench

'90 OCT 17 P2:46

BOOKE THIS TEDAL AT A

October 12, 1990

Mr. Samuel J. Chilk Secretary of the Commission U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Docketing and Service Branch

Subject: Proposed Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Rule, 55 Federal Register No. 137, July 17, 1990 and 55

Federal Register No. 141, July 23, 1990

Dear Mr. Chilk:

Entergy Operations, Inc., the licensee for Arkansas Nuclear One, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station and Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, has reviewed the proposed License Renewal Rule, and are pleased to provide the comments delineated in Attachment One.

We have discussed with the Nuclear Management and Resources Council (NUMARC) the proposed License Renewal Rule as well as evaluated the comments prepared by NUMARC on behalf of the nuclear industry. Entergy Operations endorses the comments prepared by NUMARC on the proposed rule.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this matter. Please contact me or Robert J. Murillo, (504) 595-2831, should there be any questions concerning our comments.

Sincerely,

GWM/RJM/sep Attachment

CC: S. D. Ebneter, NRC Region II, R. D. Martin, NRC Region IV, G. Sege, NRC-NRR, D. P. Cheary, NRC-NRR, D. L. Wigginton, NRC-NRR, T. W. Alexion, NRC-NRR, C. Poslusny, NRC-NRR, L. L. Kintner, NRC-NRR, NRC Resident Inspectors Office (W-3), NRC Resident Inspectors Office (ANO)

9010240056 901012 PDR PR 2 55FR29043 PDR

J111012.NRC/JNAFLR-1

## ATTACHMENT ONE

## ENTERGY OPERATIONS COMMENTS ON PROPOSED RULEMAKING FOR LICENSE RENEWAL

 Proposed Revisions to 10CFR2.109(a) and (b) - "Effect of Timely Renewal Application" and Proposed Revision to 10CFR50.54(bb) - "Conditions of License"

These revisions introduce the terminology "sufficient application". This terminology should be defined to give a clear indication of what constitutes "sufficient". Replacement of this terminology with "acceptable for docketing" is suggested.

 Proposed Revision to 10CFR50.82(a)(1)(ii) - "Application for Termination of License"

This section states that if "application for a renewed license is disapproved, an application for termination of license must be submitted within 1 year..." This should only apply to those facilities which had ceased operations greater than 1 year prior to disapproval, those which are within 1 year of license expiration, and those whose licenses have already expired. There is no reason to require this provision for a facility that may have applied well before the expiration of the original license.

3. Proposed 10CFR54.17(c) - "Filing of Application"

The maximum renewal term is 20 additional years of operation beyond the expiration of existing licenses, but not to exceed 40 years from date of issuance. These limitations in and of themselves will limit when an application is submitted, which could be as early as 22 years before the expiration of current license (assuming that NRC will take two years for review, which is consistent with the assumption used in 2.109 proposed revisions).

We do not see any benefits to be gained by regulating the date of applying for license renewal as proposed in 54.17(c). Rather, the date of issuance of the renewed license is the date to be regulated.

We recommend that 54.17(c) to be changed to state that a renewal application can not be submitted before 22 years of the expiration of the original license (that is if there is a need to regulate that date) and a renewed license will not be issued before at least 20 years of the expiration of the original license.

4. Proposed 10CFR54.21(a)(2) - "Contents of Application - Technical Information"

The term "constituent elements" needs to be defined.

5. Proposed 10CFR54.23 - "Contents of Application - Environmental Information"

This section should be deferred until 10CFR51 is amended for license renewal.