July 20, 1992

Docket Nos. 50-445
and 50-446

Mr. William J. Cahill, Jr.
Group Vice President, Nuclear
TU Electric Company
400 North Olive Street, L.B. 81
Dallas, Texas 75201

Dear Mr. Cahill:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, FINAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT (FSAR) CHAPTERS 4 AND 15, AMENDMENTS 83 AND 84 (TAC Nos. M82075 AND M82076)

The NRC staff has completed a preliminary review of Chapters 4 and 15 of your FSAR submittals through Amendment 84, in accordance with NUREG-0800, "Standard Review Plan." In order to complete these reviews, the staff requires additional information as indicated in the enclosure to this letter.

The reporting requirements contained in this letter affect fewer than ten respondents, therefore OMB clearance is not required under Public Law 96-511.

We request your response to the enclosed items within 30 days of the receipt of this letter to enable the staff to complete its review in a timely manner.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By

Brian Holian, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate IV-2
Division of Reactor Projects III/IV/V
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File	PDIV-2 R/F	RSchaaf
Local/NRC PDR	PDIV-2 P/F	TBergman
BBoger	EJordan	OGC
MVirgilio	ACRS (10)	
BHolian	LYandell, RIV	

OFFICE	PDIV-2/LA	PDIV-2	PDIV-2/PM	PDIV-2/D	
NAME	EPeyton	RSchaaf RSS	BHolian BEH	SBlack	
DATE	7/15/92	7/15/92	7/15/92	7/16/92	/ /

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
FILENAME: B:\CPM82075

A01
1/1

cc w/enclosure:
Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P. O. Box 1029
Granbury, Texas 76048

Regional Administrator, Region IV
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000
Arlington, Texas 76011

Mrs. Juanita Ellis, President
Citizens Association for Sound Energy
1426 South Polk
Dallas, Texas 75224

Owen L. Thero, President
Quality Technology Company
Lakeview Mobile Home Park, Lot 35
4793 East Loop 820 South
Fort Worth, Texas 76119

Mr. Roger D. Walker, Manager
Regulatory Affairs for Nuclear
Engineering Organization
Texas Utilities Electric Company
400 North Olive Street, L.B. 81
Dallas, Texas 75201

Texas Utilities Electric Company
c/o Bethesda Licensing
3 Metro Center, Suite 610
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

William A. Burchette, Esq.
Counsel for Tex-La Electric
Cooperative of Texas
Jorden, Schulte, & Burchette
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

GDS Associates, Inc.
Suite 720
1850 Parkway Place
Marietta, Georgia 30067-8237

Jack R. Newman, Esq.
Newman & Holtzinger
1615 L Street, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, D. C. 20036

Chief, Texas Bureau of Radiation Control
Texas Department of Health
1100 West 49th Street
Austin, Texas 78756

Honorable Dale McPherson
County Judge
P. O. Box 851
Glen Rose, Texas 76043

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

CHAPTERS 4 AND 15 OF FINAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

TU ELECTRIC COMPANY

COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION UNIT 2

DOCKET NO. 50-446

1. Section 4.2.2.3 of Chapter 4 of the FSAR, page 4.2-21, mentions the desirability of a negative moderator temperature coefficient when greater than 75 percent of full power. However, Figure 15.0.6 shows a positive value up to 100 percent of full power. Explain this discrepancy.

2. Use of hafnium as the absorber material in the control rods is mentioned throughout Chapter 4. NRC Information Notice No. 89-31, "Swelling and Cracking of Hafnium Control Rods," alerted PWR licensees of swelling and cracking of hafnium control rods at several PWRs. Did you consider this information in your application of hafnium as a control rod material for Unit 2?

3. Section 4.3.2.2.8 of Chapter 4 of the FSAR, specifies that tests performed at the beginning of each reload cycle are limited to verification of steady state power distributions. Explain why control rod worth measurements and moderator temperature coefficient surveillance are not also performed at this time.

4. Section 4.3.2.6 of Chapter 4 of the FSAR, refers to the use of the LEOPARD and PDQ computer codes for fuel storage criticality calculations. NRC Information Notice 92-21, "Spent Fuel Pool Reactivity Calculations," indicates inaccuracies discovered in the use of these codes to predict the criticality in fuel storage racks. Did you consider this information on potential computer code inaccuracies in relation to your Unit 2 fuel storage analyses?

5. The first footnote to Table 4.3-B of Chapter 4 of the FSAR for Unit 2 refers to a value which includes a 0.1 percent delta-rho uncertainty. What value is being referred to?

6. Table 4.3-4 of Chapter 4 of the FSAR which is supposed to summarize the comparisons of criticality calculations with 101 critical experiments is missing.

7. Explain why the control rod drop time has decreased to 2.4 seconds for Unit 2 compared to 3.3 seconds for Unit 1.

8. The analysis for the uncontrolled rod cluster control assembly bank withdrawal from a subcritical or low power startup condition

Specifications allow fewer than two pumps to be in operation during shutdown. The analysis should be performed from flow conditions corresponding to the minimum number of allowable operating pumps.

9. Recent nonconservatisms were identified at Comanche Peak related to the input assumptions and boundary conditions (inverse count rate ratio data and flux-multiplication setpoint) in the analyses of the licensing basis boron dilution event. Based on this, justify the automatic actions to terminate the dilution and start boration which were assumed in the boron dilution analyses for Unit 2.