March 19, 1996

MEMORANDUM TO: NRR Project Directors
NRR Project Managers
NRR Licensing Assistants

THRU: /s/ Eugene V. Imbro, Director (Lead PD)
Project Directorate II-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II

FROM: /s/ Daniel H. Dorman, Project Manager (Lead PM)
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE LETTER (AL) 95-06, "RELOCATION OF TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS RELATED TO QUALITY ASSURANCE"

Attachment 1 provides a copy of the subject AL 95-06, dated December 12, 1995. AL 95-06 addresses potential amendment requests which reference the criteria of 10 CFR 50.36 as a basis for relocating portions of the administrative controls related to quality assurance from the TS to other documents. Attachment 2 provides a model safety evaluation (SE) which Project Managers should use as a guide to prepare a plant specific SE for such amendment requests. This model is available on the R-drive as R:\AL95-06.SE. Precedent SEs which pre-date the issuance of AL 95-06 may not reflect current staff positions and guidance and should not be used. If there is any question whether a proposed amendment satisfies the guidance, the issue should be discussed with Bob Gramm (415-1010) or Larry Campbell (415-2976) of the Quality Assurance and Maintenance Branch (HQMB) at the earliest opportunity. HQMB should be included on concurrence for any amendments related to the quality assurance requirements in TS or changes to the licensee's quality assurance program.

If you have any questions on this guidance, please call me at 415-1429.

Attachments: 1. Administrative Letter 95-06
2. Model Safety Evaluation

cc w/atts: S. Black, HQMB
R. Gramm, HQMB
L. Campbell, HQMB

DISTRIBUTION:
Central File
PUBLIC
PDI-3 Memo

96-08 LF03 1/1

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DORMAN\95061LPM

OFFICE	LA:DRPE		PM:PDI-1		D:PDII-1					
NAME	SNorris		DDorman:bf		EImbro					
DATE	03/11/96		03/11/96		03/19/96		03/ /96		03/ /96	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

030153

IDBR-5 administrative Letters

L-4-1 PTSO QUALITY ASSURANCE

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 19, 1996

MEMORANDUM TO: NRR Project Directors
NRR Project Managers
NRR Licensing Assistants

THRU: Eugene V. Imbro, Director (Lead PD)
Project Directorate II-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II

FROM: Daniel H. Dorman, Project Manager (Lead PM)
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE LETTER (AL) 95-06, "RELOCATION OF TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS RELATED TO QUALITY ASSURANCE"

Attachment 1 provides a copy of the subject AL 95-06, dated December 12, 1995. AL 95-06 addresses potential amendment requests which reference the criteria of 10 CFR 50.36 as a basis for relocating portions of the administrative controls related to quality assurance from the TS to other documents. Attachment 2 provides a model safety evaluation (SE) which Project Managers should use as a guide to prepare a plant specific SE for such amendment requests. This model is available on the R-drive as R:\AL95-06.SE. Precedent SEs which pre-date the issuance of AL 95-06 may not reflect current staff positions and guidance and should not be used. If there is any question whether a proposed amendment satisfies the guidance, the issue should be discussed with Bob Gramm (415-1010) or Larry Campbell (415-2976) of the Quality Assurance and Maintenance Branch (HQMB) at the earliest opportunity. HQMB should be included on concurrence for any amendments related to the quality assurance requirements in TS or changes to the licensee's quality assurance program.

If you have any questions on this guidance, please call me at 415-1429.

Attachments: 1. Administrative Letter 95-06
2. Model Safety Evaluation

cc w/atts: S. Black, HQMB
R. Gramm, HQMB
L. Campbell, HQMB

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

December 12, 1995

NRC ADMINISTRATIVE LETTER 95-06: RELOCATION OF TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS RELATED TO QUALITY ASSURANCE

Addressees

All holders of operating licenses or construction permits for nuclear power reactors.

Purpose

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing this administrative letter to inform licensees about recent experiences involving the relocation of technical specification administrative controls related to quality assurance. Any license amendment request related to the content of this Administrative Letter is voluntary. This Administrative Letter does not transmit or imply any new or changed requirements or staff positions. No specific action or written response is required.

Background

Among U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission efforts related to technical specification improvements are the issuance of a revision to 10 CFR 50.36, revisions to the Standard Technical Specifications, some generic communications, and many individual license amendments. The revision of 10 CFR 50.36 included specific criteria for determining those design conditions that warrant inclusion in technical specifications as limiting conditions for operation. The staff has reviewed and approved many recent amendment requests that involved incorporating parts of the improved Standard Technical Specifications, relocating requirements that do not satisfy the criteria of 10 CFR 50.36 for inclusion as limiting conditions for operation, and relocating requirements that are controlled directly by regulations and related licensee programs. The relocation of technical specification requirements has included administrative controls as well as limiting conditions for operations and related surveillance requirements.

Increasingly, licensees are requesting amendments to technical specifications that are located in the "administrative controls" section and are related to quality assurance programs. Licensees have frequently requested amendments to these specifications because they contain detailed information that is affected by organizational and process changes. Many licensees have revised their technical specifications to remove excessive detail, thereby gaining flexibility in making organizational changes without the need for a license amendment. Recent amendment requests related to quality assurance have also followed the trend for other technical specifications and have included

moving requirements to licensee controlled documents and programs. The quality assurance program is a logical candidate for such relocations due to the controls imposed by such regulations as Appendix B to 10 CFR Part 50, the existence of U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission-approved quality assurance plans and commitments to industry quality assurance standards, and the established quality assurance program change control process in 10 CFR 50.54(a). The relocation of technical specification requirements in cases where adequate controls are provided by such other methods can reduce the resources spent by licensees and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff in preparing and reviewing license amendment requests.

Discussion

The staff has reviewed the content of typical technical specification administrative controls related to quality assurance requirements, for those plants that have not converted to the improved Standard Technical Specifications, and compared them to established staff positions and recent amendment requests. On the basis of this review, the staff offers the following observations (which do not go beyond established staff positions) in order to assist those licensees considering amendment requests related to quality assurance requirements:

Independent Safety Engineering Group

The existing technical specification requirements related to an independent safety engineering group function may be relocated. The review of any license amendments related to the relocation of the independent safety engineering group function can be facilitated by licensee references to an existing quality assurance plan commitment or the simultaneous submittal of a revision of the quality assurance plan which incorporates the independent safety engineering group functions. As a minimum, the quality assurance plan should contain a commitment related to the functions of the independent safety engineering group organization to a level of detail comparable to that previously contained in the technical specifications. The review process becomes simpler if the existing independent safety engineering group requirements presently in the technical specifications are relocated intact to the quality assurance plan. Any subsequent changes to the independent safety engineering group provisions incorporated into the quality assurance plan would be controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a).

Reviews and Audits

The technical specification requirements related to review and audit requirements may be relocated to the quality assurance plan. The review of any license amendments related to the relocation of the review and audit functions can be facilitated by licensee references to an existing quality assurance plan commitment or the simultaneous submittal of a revision to the quality assurance plan including the relocated requirements. Commitments may be incorporated into the quality assurance plan by relocating the existing technical specifications intact or by capturing existing structural and administrative requirements by a description of the review and audit

organizations and referencing appropriate industry quality assurance standards such as American National Standards Institute standard N18.7, "Administrative Controls and Quality Assurance for the Operational Phase of Nuclear Power Plants," that explicitly duplicate current technical specification provisions. Subsequent changes to the relocated requirements would be controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a).

The commitments incorporated into the quality assurance plan may revise existing technical specification audit frequencies by implementation of a performance-based schedule (schedule adjusted according to objective evaluation of plant functional area performance) provided that the maximum audit interval does not exceed the 2-year interval specified in ANSI N18.7. Exceptions to the allowable use of performance-based audit frequencies are: (1) those audit intervals defined by regulations, such as for emergency and security plans, and (2) triennial audits of fire protection plans, conducted by outside qualified fire consultants, which should be maintained in accordance with current technical specification requirements. In addition to changing existing "annual" fire protection audits to a "maximum interval of 24 months," if justified by performance reviews, ongoing U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and industry initiatives may lead to additional changes in the audit practices related to fire protection. In the interim, however, triennial audits conducted by outside qualified fire consultants are being maintained in accordance with the staff positions expressed at various meetings and in correspondence.

Procedure Review Process

Existing technical specifications typically contain requirements for the processes related to the review and approval of procedures and changes to procedures. These requirements may be relocated to the quality assurance plan. The review of license amendments related to the relocation of the procedure review processes can be facilitated by licensee references to an existing quality assurance plan commitment or the simultaneous submittal of a revision of the quality assurance plan including a commitment related to the relocated technical specification requirements. As a minimum, the quality assurance plan should contain a commitment to process procedures and procedure changes in accordance with an accepted standard such as ANSI N18.7. Site-specific aspects currently in technical specifications, that do not duplicate ANSI N18.7 provisions, should be relocated to the quality assurance plan. Relocation of the technical specification requirements in this manner, basically relocating them intact to the quality assurance plan, simplifies the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission license amendment review. Any subsequent changes to these provisions would be controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a).

Records and Record Retention

Technical specification administrative controls typically contain record requirements for particular specifications (such as independent safety engineering group and review and audit functions), as well as a section on general requirements for record retention. These sections may be removed from the technical specifications and placed in the quality assurance plan. The

review of any license amendments related to the relocation of requirements related to records or record retention can be facilitated by licensee references to an existing quality assurance plan commitment or by the simultaneous submittal of a revision of the quality assurance plan that incorporates the relocated technical specification requirements. As mentioned above, the review process is less complicated if the requirements are moved intact to the quality assurance plan. For those current technical specification requirements that are explicitly duplicated in accepted industry standards, reference to those standards is sufficient. Any subsequent changes to these provisions would be controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a).

Other Changes

The current 10 CFR 50.54(a) change control process requires prior U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission review and approval of reductions in commitments contained in the quality assurance plan. In response to a recent petition for rulemaking, the staff is evaluating the 10 CFR 50.54(a) threshold at which U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval of quality assurance plan changes is required. In addition to the 50.54(a) petition, licensees and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff have recently discussed proposed changes to quality assurance provisions that go beyond those discussed in this administrative letter. Although such proposed changes may ultimately be found to be acceptable, this administrative letter is limited to existing staff positions and lessons learned related to the relocation of technical specification requirements.

This administrative letter requires no specific action or written response. If you have any questions about this letter, please contact the person listed below or the appropriate Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation project manager.

/s/'d by DMCrutchfield

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Director
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Contact: William Reckley, NRR
(301) 415-1314

Attachment:
List of Recently Issued NRC Administrative Letters

review of any license amendments related to the relocation of requirements related to records or record retention can be facilitated by licensee references to an existing quality assurance plan commitment or by the simultaneous submittal of a revision of the quality assurance plan that incorporates the relocated technical specification requirements. As mentioned above, the review process is less complicated if the requirements are moved intact to the quality assurance plan. For those current technical specification requirements that are explicitly duplicated in accepted industry standards, reference to those standards is sufficient. Any subsequent changes to these provisions would be controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a).

Other Changes

The current 10 CFR 50.54(a) change control process requires prior U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission review and approval of reductions in commitments contained in the quality assurance plan. In response to a recent petition for rulemaking, the staff is evaluating the 10 CFR 50.54(a) threshold at which U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission approval of quality assurance plan changes is required. In addition to the 50.54(a) petition, licensees and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff have recently discussed proposed changes to quality assurance provisions that go beyond those discussed in this administrative letter. Although such proposed changes may ultimately be found to be acceptable, this administrative letter is limited to existing staff positions and lessons learned related to the relocation of technical specification requirements.

This administrative letter requires no specific action or written response. If you have any questions about this letter, please contact the person listed below or the appropriate Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation project manager.

orig /s/'d by DMCrutchfield
Dennis M. Crutchfield, Director
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Technical contact: William Reckley, NRR
(301) 415-1314

Attachment:
List of Recently Issued NRC Administrative Letters

DOCUMENT NAME: 95-06.AL

TechEd reviewed this document 10/25/95

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box C = Copy w/o attachment/enclosure E = Copy with attachment/enclosure N = No copy

OFFICE	NRR	E	SC/HQMB:NRR		C/OTSB:NRR		C/PECB:NRR	
NAME	Contact*		SCBlack*		CIGrimes*		AEChaffee*	
DATE	10/19/95		10/20/95		10/24/95		11/22/95	

OFFICE	D/DRPM	
NAME	DMCrutchfield	
DATE	12/07/95	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

LIST OF RECENTLY ISSUED NRC ADMINISTRATIVE LETTERS

Administrative Letter No.	Subject	Date of Issuance	Issued to
95-05	Revisions to Staff Guidance for Implementing NRC Policy on Notices of Enforcement Discretion	11/07/95	All holders of OLs or CPs for nuclear power reactors.
95-04	NRC Program Office responsibilities for Decommissioning Activities and Planning for Dry Cask Storage of Spent Fuel	11/07/95	All holders of OLs & CPs for nuclear power reactors.
95-03	Availability of Reactor Vessel Integrity Database	08/04/95	All holders of OLs or CPs for nuclear power reactors.
94-13, Rev. 1	Access to Nuclear Regulatory Commission Bulletin Board Systems	06/29/95	All NRC licensees.
95-02	Cost Beneficial Licensing Actions	02/23/95	All holders of OLs or CPs for nuclear power reactors.
95-01, Supp. 1	Change in Commercial Telephone and Facsimile Numbers at Nuclear Regulatory Commission Headquarters	02/02/95	All NRC licensees.
95-01	Change in Commercial Telephone and Facsimile Numbers at Nuclear Regulatory Commission Headquarters	01/23/95	All NRC licensees.
94-17	Addressing Correspondence to the NRC	12/15/94	All holders of OLs or CPs for nuclear power reactors.
94-16	Revision of NRC Core Inspection Program for Annual Emergency Preparedness Exercise	11/30/94	All holders of OLs or CPs for nuclear power reactors.

OL = Operating License
CP = Construction Permit

THIS IS A SAMPLE AND IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE. EACH LETTER AND SAFETY EVALUATION WILL BE UNIQUE. IF THERE ARE QUESTIONS, SEE HQMB OR TS BRANCH.
FOR ALL TS CHANGES INVOLVING CHANGES TO OR RELOCATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS, CONCURRENCE BY HQMB IS TO BE OBTAINED.
THIS DOES NOT COVER ALL ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES, BUT SOME OF THE MORE FREQUENT ONES.

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATING TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS
DETROIT EDISON COMPANY
FERMI UNIT 2
DOCKET NO. 50-341

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 15, 1994, Detroit Edison Company (the licensee) proposed changing the Fermi Unit 2 Technical Specifications by modifying the Administrative Controls specifications, removing requirements that are adequately controlled by existing regulations and relocating other details which are not otherwise needed to satisfy 10 CFR 50.36. Guidance on the proposed changes was developed by NRC and provided in the Standard Technical Specifications for General Electric Plants, BWR/4, NUREG-1433.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Section 182a of the Atomic Energy Act (the "Act") requires applicants for nuclear power plant operating licenses to state technical specifications (TS) to be included as part of the license. The Commission's regulatory requirements related to the content of technical specifications are set forth in 10 CFR 50.36. That regulation requires that the TS include items in five specific categories, including (1) safety limits, limiting safety system settings and limiting control settings; (2) limiting conditions for operation (LCOs); (3) surveillance requirements; (4) design features; and (5) administrative controls. However, the regulation does not specify the particular requirements to be included in a plant's TS.

The Commission has provided guidance for the contents of TS in its "Final Policy Statement on Technical Specifications Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors" ("Final Policy Statement"), 58 Fed. Reg. 39132 (July 22, 1993), in which the Commission indicated that compliance with the Final Policy Statement satisfies § 182a of the Act. In particular, the Commission indicated that certain items could be relocated from the TS to licensee-controlled documents, consistent with the standard enunciated in *Portland General Electric Co.* (Trojan Nuclear Plant), ALAB-531, 9 NRC 263, 273 (1979). In that case, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board indicated that "technical specifications are to be reserved for those matters as to which the imposition of rigid conditions or limitations upon reactor operation is deemed necessary to obviate the possibility of an abnormal situation or event giving rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety."

Consistent with this approach, the Final Policy Statement identified four criteria to be used in determining whether particular safety functions are required to be included in the TS, as follows: (1) Installed instrumentation that is used to detect, and indicate in the control room, a significant abnormal degradation of the reactor coolant pressure

boundary; (2) a process variable, design feature, or operating restriction that is an initial condition of a Design Basis Accident or Transient analysis that either assumes the failure of or presents a challenge to the integrity of a fission product barrier; (3) a structure, system, or component that is part of the primary success path and which functions or actuates to mitigate a Design Basis Accident or Transient that either assumes the failure of or presents a challenge to the integrity of a fission product barrier; (4) a structure, system, or component which operating experience or probabilistic safety assessment has shown to be significant to public health and safety. The Commission recently adopted amendments to 10 CFR 50.36, pursuant to which the rule was revised to codify and incorporate these criteria. See Final Rule, "Technical Specifications," 60 FR 36593 (July 19, 1995). As a result, TS requirements which fall within or satisfy any of the criteria in the Final Policy Statement must be retained in the TS, while those TS requirements which do not fall within or satisfy these criteria may be relocated to other, licensee-controlled documents.

The Commission's policy statement provides that those existing TS LCOs which do not satisfy these four specified criteria may be relocated to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), such that future changes could be made to these provisions pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59. Other requirements may be relocated to more appropriate documents (e.g. Security Plan, Quality Assurance (QA) Plan, and Emergency Plan) and controlled by the applicable regulatory requirement. Similarly, while the required content of TS administrative controls is specified in 10 CFR 50.36(c)(5), particular details of administrative controls may be relocated to licensee-controlled documents where §50.54, §50.59, or other regulations provide adequate regulatory control.

While the criteria specifically apply to LCOs, in adopting the revision to the rule the Commission indicated that the intent of these criteria can be utilized to identify the optimum set of administrative controls in the TS, (60 FR 36958). Addressing administrative controls 10 CFR 50.36 states that they "are the provisions relating to organization and management, procedures, recordkeeping, review and audit, and reporting necessary to assure safe operation of the facility in a safe manner." The specific content of the administrative controls section of the TS is therefore that information that the Commission deems essential for the safe operation of the facility that is not already adequately covered by other regulations. Accordingly, the staff has determined that requirements that are not specifically required under §50.36(c)(5) and which are not otherwise necessary to obviate the possibility of an abnormal situation or event giving rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety, can be removed from administrative controls.

3.0 EVALUATION

The following discussions detail the staff's conclusions regarding the removal or relocation of selected Administrative Controls from the Fermi-2 TS. The changes were reviewed in accordance with the guidance provided in, or planned for, the applicable standard technical specifications, NUREG-1433. In addition, these changes were reviewed in accordance with the guidance provided in Administrative Letter 95-06, "Relocation of Technical Specification Administrative Controls Related to Quality Assurance" issued on December 12, 1995.

a. Security Plan Implementation and Emergency Plan Implementation

The licensee proposed to remove the requirements, in existing TS 6.8.1.e and 6.8.1.f, related to the implementation and audit of the Security Plan and Emergency Plan.

The removal of the administrative control TS for the implementation and audit of the Security Plan and the Emergency Plan is addressed in GL 93-07. Since the Security Plan requirements are specified in 10 CFR 50.54, 73.40, 73.55 and 73.56, and the Emergency Plan requirements are specified in 10 CFR 50.54 and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E, Section V, the staff recommended removal of these requirements from the STS and relocated to their respective plans.

Future changes in the audit review requirements must be made in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(p) for the Security Plan and 10 CFR 50.54(q) for the Emergency Plan. The staff concludes that, in conjunction with this change to the plans, the sufficient requirements for emergency planning in 10 CFR 50.47, and 50.54, and for security in 10 CFR 50.54 and 73.55 for drills, exercises, testing, and maintenance of the program, will be met. The staff concludes that these regulatory requirements are sufficient and, therefore, removing these duplicate provisions from the TS is acceptable.

b. Independent Safety Engineering Group

The TS related to ISEG resulted from the NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," requirements to establish an on-site independent safety engineering group to perform independent reviews of plant operations. The current TS requirements reflect the NUREG-0737 requirements defining the function, composition, responsibilities and records associated with the ISEG organization. The licensee has proposed to relocate these TS requirements to the QAP and control any subsequent changes in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a). The licensee provided a revised QAP as part of this request and the staff has verified that the commitments incorporated into the QAP adequately address the relocated TS requirements.

The staff has concluded that the relocation of ISEG requirements is acceptable because (1) their inclusion in TS is not specifically required by 10 CFR 50.36 or other regulations, (2) the ISEG requirements are not required to avert an immediate threat to the public health and safety and (3) changes to the ISEG provisions, as incorporated into the QAP, are adequately controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a). On this basis, the staff finds the proposed relocation of ISEG requirements to the QAP to be acceptable. At the present time, the QAP does not include the ISEG provisions. This amendment cannot be accepted until the ISEG provisions are appropriately incorporated into the QAP]

c. Review and Audits

The licensee proposed that the existing requirements in TS 6.5 related to review and audit functions be relocated to the Quality Assurance (QA) Program implementing 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, except with respect to those associated with the security and emergency plans which, as previously described are being relocated to their respective plans.

Given that the requirements in the QA program implement the Commission's regulations pertaining to the review and audit functions, inclusion of these particular provisions in TS is not necessary to assure safe operation of the facility, The review and audit functions define an administrative framework to confirm that plant activities have been properly conducted in a safe manner. The reviews and audits serve also to provide a cohesive program that provides senior level utility management with assessments of facility operation and recommends actions to improve nuclear safety and reliability. However, the staff has determined that the review and audit functions are adequately addressed by existing regulations and the related QAP commitments. Based upon the relocation of the review and audit provisions to the QAP, it is not necessary to include redundant or additional requirements in the TS administrative controls.

The licensee will continue to implement a QA program in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, and commitments to ANSI N18.7, which provides appropriate controls for the approval of changes to the audit functions and frequencies. Changes to the QA program are controlled in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a) and include requirements for prior NRC review and approval if a change constitutes a reduction in a QAP commitment. The staff concludes that this regulatory requirement provides sufficient control for the audit functions and frequencies, so that removing these requirements from the TS is acceptable.

Audit requirements are specified in the QA Program to satisfy 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, Criterion XVIII. Audits are also covered by ANSI N18.7, ANSI N45.2, 10 CFR 50.54(t), 10 CFR 50.54(p), and 10 CFR Part 73.

The licensee has proposed to relocate the provisions in the existing TS to the Quality Assurance (QA) Program. The licensee has committed to incorporate a two-year limit on performance-based audit schedules, in accordance with ANSI N-18.7, and retain the existing [annual] frequency for audits of the fire protection program on a fixed basis in accordance with GL 88-12, "Removal of Fire Protection Requirements from Technical Specifications." [Based on recent discussion with Steve West, SPLB will accept extensions of the annual fire protection audit frequency if the licensee has a sufficiently robust performance based approach to audit scheduling, not to exceed 2 years]

The staff concludes that sufficient regulatory controls exist under 10 CFR 50, Appendix B for the implementation of the functions specified in the QA Program, and sufficient controls exist under 10 CFR 50.54(a) for subsequent changes to the QA Program such that moving these review and audit requirements to the QA Program is acceptable. [At the present time, the QAP does not include the performance based audit provisions. This amendment cannot be accepted until the audit provisions are appropriately incorporated into the QAP]

d. <u>Review and Approval Process and Temporary Change Process</u>

The licensee proposed to relocate the requirements for both the review and approval process in TS 6.8.2 and the temporary change process for procedures in TS 6.8.4 to the QA Program. [The NRC letter to the Owners

groups dated October 25, 1993 indicated that certain provisions on procedure controls had to be maintained in the TSs, were those kept intact?]

The revised TS will include a specific requirement that written procedures be established, implemented and maintained, and a requirement for procedure control is mandated by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, Criterion II and Criterion V. ANSI N18.7-1976, which is an NRC staff-endorsed document used in the development of many licensee QA plans, also contains specific requirements related to procedures. The licensee has committed to follow ANSI N18.7-1976 as a means to comply with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B. ANSI N18.7-1976, Section 5.2.2 discusses procedure adherence. This section clearly states that procedures shall be followed, and the requirements for use of procedures shall be prescribed in writing. ANSI N18.7-1976 also discusses temporary changes to procedures, and requires review and approval of procedures to be defined. ANSI N18.7-1976, Section 5.2.15, describes the review, approval, and control of procedures. This section describes the requirements for the licensee's QA Program to provide measures to control and coordinate the approval and issuance of documents, including changes thereto, which prescribe all activities affecting quality. The section further states that each procedure shall be reviewed and approved prior to initial use. The required reviews are also described. ANSI N45.2-1971, Section 6, also specifies that the QA Program describe procedure requirements. [The above paragraph seems to portray that ANSI 18.7 in of itself is adequate, I'm not sure that a one for one correlation exists between the current TS provisions and the content of the ANSI. They will probably have to add some language into the QAP, at least on temporary procedure changes]

The provisions in the QA program implement the Commission's regulations pertaining to the control of documents such as instructions, procedures, and drawings, including changes thereto. The procedure review and approval functions currently in TS define an administrative framework to ensure that documents are reviewed for adequacy and approved for release by authorized personnel. The required control of these processes in the regulations and revised QAP is considered to be redundant and functionally equivalent to the provisions currently in TS. The staff has determined that the procedure review and approval functions are adequately addressed by existing regulations and the related QAP commitments. Based upon the relocation of the procedure review provisions to the QAP, it is not necessary to include redundant or additional requirements in the TS administrative controls.

The licensee will continue to implement a QA Program in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, which provides appropriate controls for the review and approval of procedure changes. The staff concludes that these regulatory requirements provide sufficient control of these provisions and removing them from the TS is acceptable. Future changes to the review and approval process for procedure changes can be adequately controlled under 10 CFR 50.54(a).

e. <u>Record Retention</u>

The licensee proposed that the requirements for record retention in TS 6.10 be relocated because they are adequately addressed by the QA Program (10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, Criteria XVII).

The provisions in the QA program implement the Commission's regulations pertaining to the maintenance of records related to activities affecting quality. The required controls related to record retention specified in various regulations and the provision incorporated into the QAP are considered to be redundant to the requirements currently in TS. The staff has determined that record retention requirements are adequately addressed by existing regulations and the related QAP commitments. Based upon the relocation of the record retention provisions to the QAP, it is not necessary to include redundant or additional requirements in the TS administrative controls.

The staff concludes that the regulatory requirements under 10 CFR 50, Appendix B provide sufficient control of the plant records, and sufficient regulatory controls exist for future changes to the program pursuant to 10 CFR 50.54(a), such that removing these provisions from the TS is acceptable. [At the present time, the QAP does not include the performance based audit provisions. This amendment cannot be accepted until the audit provisions are appropriately incorporated into the QAP]

In conclusion, the above relocated requirements relating to administrative controls are not required to be in the TS under 10 C.F.R. §50.36 or §182a of the Atomic Energy Act, and are not required to obviate the possibility of an abnormal situation or event giving rise to an immediate threat to the public health and safety. In addition, the Staff finds that the resulting new administrative controls provides all of the requirements needed to satisfy
10 CFR 50.36(c)(5), and sufficient regulatory controls exist under 10 CFR 50.59 and 50.54(a), or other applicable regulation to assure continued protection of the public health and safety. Accordingly, the staff has concluded that these requirements may be relocated from the TS to the above specified documents.

4. State Consultation

[PM insert applicable finding]

5. Environmental Consideration

[PM insert applicable finding]

6. Conclusion

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor:

Date: **NOTE: THERE IS AN ATTACHMENT**

SUCH A SECTION AS THE FOLLOWING MAY BE APPROPRIATE BASED ON THE SCOPE OF THE AMENDMENT AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO TS AND QA PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

ATTACHMENT

ACTIONS REQUIRED OF DETROIT EDISON COMPANY
TO COMPLY WITH SER ON ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

Detroit Edison Company will have to modify their license amendment to change their proposed Administrative Controls to be consistent with the improved STS or pending changes to the improved STS, as described below. The review of the license amendment relative to the relocation of QA requirements can be facilitated by licensee references to an existing QAP commitment that explicitely addresses the current TS provisions or the simultaneous submittal of a revision of the QAP that incorporates the relocated TS requirements. The review process is less complicated if the requirements are relocated intact to the QAP. The licensee shall submit an updated QAP simultaneously with the submittal of a revised administrative controls license amendment request. For those current TS requirements that are duplicated in accepted industry standards, reference to those standards is sufficient. Any future changes to these requirements proposed after their relocation to the QA Program may then be performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a).

1) Independent Safety Engineering Group (ISEG):

Detroit Edison should revise their proposal to relocate the ISEG requirements (SER paragraph 3h in Attachment 1), from the UFSAR to the QAP. As a minimum, the quality assurance plan (QAP) should include a commitment related to the functions of the ISEG organization described in the relocated TS to a level of detail comparable to that previously contained in the TS. The review process is less complicated if the existing TS ISEG requirements are relocated intact to the QAP. The review of any license amendments related to the relocation of the ISEG function will be facilitated by licensee's simultaneous submittal of a revision of the QAP which incorporates the ISEG functions. Any subsequent changes to the ISEG provisions incorporated into the QAP would be performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a). [HQMB can respond to any question on the ISEG relocation]

2) Review and Audit:

The licensee must relocate the existing technical specification provisions related to review and audit function (SER paragraph 3i in Attachment 1) intact, or capture existing structural and administrative requirements with a description of the review and audit organizations and reference the appropriate industry QA standards such as American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard N18.7 that explicitely address the current TS provisions. The licensee must also commit to incorporate a two-year limit on performance-based audit schedules, in accordance with ANSI N-18.7, and retain the existing [annual] frequency for audits of the fire protection program on a fixed basis. HQMB can respond to any questions related to the associated changes to the QA Program.

3) Review and Approval Process and Temporary Change Process:

As a minimum, the QAP should include a commitment to process procedures and procedure changes in accordance with an accepted standard such as ANSI N18.7. Site specific aspects currently in TS, that do not duplicate ANSI N18.7 provisions, should be relocated to the QAP (SER paragraphs 3j in Attachment 1). Relocation of the TS requirements intact to the QAP simplifies the NRC license amendment review. Any subsequent changes to these provisions may then be performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(a). [HQMB can respond to any questions related to the associated changes to the QA Program]

4) Record Retention:

The existing TS sections related to record retention are to be relocated from the TS to the QAP (SER paragraph 3l in Attachment 1). As mentioned above, the review process is less complicated if the existing TS requirements related to records retention are relocated intact to the QAP. [HQMB can respond to any questions related to the associated changes to the QA Program]