

INITIAL
NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION
AND NOTICING ACTION

Docket No. 50-298 Facility: Cooper Nuclear Station
 Licensee: Nebraska Public Power District Date of application: 08/05/80 as modified
05/06/82 & 08/05/82
 Request for:

(See attached.)

Initial Determination:

- () Proposed determination - amendment request involves no significant hazards considerations (NSHC).
 (XX) Final determination - amendment request involves significant hazards considerations (SHC).

Basis for Determination

- () Licensee's NSHC discussion has been reviewed and is accepted. See attached amendment request.
 (XX) Basis for this determination is presented in the attached.)
 () Other (state):

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)

Initial Noticing Action: (Attach appropriate notice or input for monthly FRN)

1. () Monthly FRN. Notice of opportunity for hearing (30 days) and request for comments on proposed NSHC determination - monthly FRN input is attached (Attachment 8).
2. () Individual FRN (30 days). Same notice matter as above. Time does not allow waiting for next monthly FRN (Attachments 9a and 9b).

(THIS FORM SHOULD BE TYPED EXCEPT FOR UNUSUAL, URGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.)

Request for:

Technical Specification changes and a license change to permit reactor operation at power levels of 50% of rated power with one recirculation loop out of service. Presently, the Cooper Nuclear Station operating license requires plant shutdown if an idle recirculation loop cannot be returned to service within 24 hours. The change proposed by the licensee would delete this license condition and modify the Technical Specifications (TSs) to provide for: appropriate Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) flux scram trip and rod block settings; an increase in the safety limit Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) value; revisions to the allowable Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (APLHR) values suitable for use with an idle recirculation loop; and the inclusion of APRM flux and core plate pressure drop limits during single loop operation.

Basis:

The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards considerations (48 FR 14870). One such amendment involves a relief granted upon demonstration of acceptable operation from an operating restriction that was imposed because acceptable operation was not yet demonstrated. This assumes that the operating restriction and the criteria to be applied to a request for relief have been established in a prior review and that it is justified in a satisfactory way that the criteria have been met.

The Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) license presently requires plant shutdown if an idle recirculation loop cannot be returned to service within 24 hours. This restriction was imposed because insufficient information existed to enable the staff to establish criteria for operation with an idle recirculation loop. Although such criteria have since been established, and analyses have indicated that it should be safe to operate BWRs on a single loop in the range of 85% power, operating experience with an idle recirculation loop at Browns Ferry 1 (BF-1) in late 1979 raised concerns about authorizing single loop operation for BWRs. When the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) tried to increase power at BF-1 above about 59% of rated power while operating on a single loop, variations in jet pump flow, neutron flux, and related parameters were noted. Neither the causes nor the potential effects of these variations have been determined or reviewed by the staff for operation with a single recirculation loop. Thus, it has not been justified in a satisfactory way that the criteria for operation with a single loop have been met.

Since CNS has not operated at 50% with an idle recirculation loop for even 24 hours as permitted by the current technical specifications, the application for amendment involves changes which do not satisfy the criteria of the applicable example of an amendment which would likely be found not to involve significant hazards considerations. Therefore, the staff has made a determination that the application for amendment may involve a significant hazards consideration.

3. Local media notice. Valid exigent circumstances exist (evaluated below). Local media notice requesting public comments on proposed NSHC determination is attached (Attachment 10).
4. No notice. A valid emergency situation exists (evaluated below) and there is no time for public notice on proposed NSHC determination. (No-attachment.)
5. () Individual FRN (30-days). Licensee's claim of exigent or emergency circumstances is invalid (evaluated below). Notice of opportunity for hearing (30 days) and request for comments on proposed NSHC determination is attached (Attachments 9a and 9b). Letter of explanation to licensee is also attached.
6. (X) Individual FRN (30-days). The amendment request involves SHC. Notice of opportunity for prior hearing is attached (Attachment 5). Letter to licensee also attached.
7. () Individual Short FRN. Valid emergency circumstances exist (evaluated below). There is no time for the usual 30-day FRN. (Attachment 16).

Evaluation of exigent or emergency circumstances (if applicable):

(attach additional sheets as needed)

Approvals:

Date:

- | | | |
|----|---|----------------|
| 1. | <u><i>Bruce L. Sued</i></u>
(Project Manager) | <u>8/18/83</u> |
| 2. | <u><i>J.P. Swalle</i></u>
(Branch Chief) | <u>8-26-83</u> |
| 3. | <u><i>L.C. [Signature]</i></u>
(Assistant Director) | <u>8-27-83</u> |
| 4. | <u>ELD concurred in attached Etr + Notice</u>
(OELD) | <u>9/1/83</u> |

Additional approval(for noticing action types 4 and 5):

5. _____
(Director, Division of Licensing)

Attachment: as indicated.

cc: Original, Docket File (with note "Docket File only")
Pit
LA