



June 13, 1997

LD-97-020

Docket No. 52-002

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: System 80+™ Design Certification Rule Errata

Attachment: Memorandum from J. Egan & J. Lawrence to C. Brinkman, dated 5/21/97

Dear Sirs:

On May 21, 1997, the NRC published the Final Rule for the Standard Design Certification for the System 80+ Standard Plant design in the Federal Register (62 FR 27840). The applicant for the certification of the System 80+ Standard Plant design was Combustion Engineering, Inc.

We have reviewed the rule and have identified errata. Attached is a memorandum from Egan and Associates to C. Brinkman which lists the errata, the basis for correction and the suggested corrections.

We hereby request that these errata be corrected in an errata amendment to the System 80+ design certification rule.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 301-881-7040.

Sincerely yours,

COMBUSTION ENGINEERING, INC.

Charles B. Brinkman
Director, Nuclear Licensing

DO32 1/1



xc: J. N. Wilson (NRC)
G. S. Mizuno (NRC)
J. Egan (E&A)

ABB Combustion Engineering Nuclear Systems

000017

Combustion Engineering, Inc.


2000 Day Hill Road
P.O. Box 503
Windsor, CT 06095-0500

Telephone (860) 685-1911
Fax (860) 285-5203

9706230002 970613
PDR ADOCK 05200002
A PDR

MEMORANDUM

TO: Charlie Brinkman

FROM: Joseph R. Egan
John W. Lawrence 

DATE: May 21, 1997

RE: Errata for the ABB-CE System 80+ Design Certification Rule

Upon review of NRC's design certification rule for the ABB-CE System 80+, published today at 62 Fed. Reg. 27840-70 (attached), we have identified the following errata for your consideration. Where appropriate we have reprinted the entire sentence in need of correction with any additions noted by use of red-lined text and any deletions noted by use of ~~strike-out text~~.

<u>FR Pg</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Errata and Basis</u>
27840	col. 3	"In accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act of 1947 <u>1946</u> (APA), as amended," Basis: To correct a typographical error.
27845-6	col. 3	"The Commission agrees that departures from Tier 2 information that describe the resolution of severe accident issues should use criteria that is <u>are</u> different from the criteria in 10 CFR for determining if a departure constitutes an unreviewed safety question (USQ)." Basis: To correct a grammatical error.
27854	col. 3	"Thus, the plant-specific DCD would function akin to an updated Final Safety Analysis Report, in the since <u>sinec</u> sense that it would provide the most complete and accurate information on a plant's licensing basis for that part of the plant within the scope of this appendix." Basis: To correct a grammatical error.

Charlie Brinkman
May 21, 1997
Page 2

<u>FR Pg</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Errata and Basis</u>
27867	V.B.6	<p>Include an exemption from 10 C.F.R. Part 100 for the operating basis earthquake (OBE).</p> <p>Basis: To account for the fact that the new siting rule (10 C.F.R. § 50.34(a)(1), <u>see</u> 61 Fed. Reg. 65157) is not applicable to the System 80+ since the design certification application was filed before the rule's effective date.</p>
27868	VI.B.4	<p>"All exemptions from the DCD pursuant to and in compliance with the change processes in Sections VIII.A.4 and VII.B.5 of this appendix, but only for that <u>proceeding plant</u>."</p> <p>Basis: For clarity.</p>
27868	VI.B.5	<p>"All departures from the DCD that are approved by license amendment, but only for that <u>proceeding plant</u>."</p> <p>Basis: For clarity.</p>
27869	VIII.B.5.f	<p>"The Commission may admit such a contention if it determines the petition raises a genuine issue of <u>material fact</u> regarding compliance with VIII.B.5 of this appendix."</p> <p>Basis: To maintain consistency with the provision in 10 C.F.R. § 2.749(d).</p>
27869	VIII.B.6.a	<p>"Except as provided by Section VI.B.5 of this appendix, the departure will not be considered a resolved issue, within the meaning of Section VI of this appendix and 10 CFR 52.63(a)(4)."</p> <p>Basis: To maintain consistency between Sections VIII.B.6.a and VI.B.5, and to properly reflect when Tier 2* changes may be accorded finality.</p>

Charlie Brinkman
May 21, 1997
Page 3

<u>FR Pg</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Errata and Basis</u>
27869	VIII.C.3	<p>"The Commission may require plant-specific departures on generic technical specifications and other operational requirements that were completely reviewed and approved, provided a change to a design feature in the generic DCD is not required and special circumstances as defined in 10 CFR 2.758(b) are present or the requirements of 10 CFR 50.109 are met."</p> <p>Basis: To maintain consistency between Sections VIII.C.1, VIII.C.3, and VIII.C.5, and because 10 C.F.R. § 2.758 is only applicable to hearings and not to NRC staff reviews.</p>
27869	VIII.C.4	<p>"An applicant who references this appendix may request an exemption from the generic technical specifications or other operational requirements. A departure from an operational requirement that does not involve an unreviewed safety question does not require an exemption from this appendix. The Commission may grant such a request"</p> <p>Basis: To maintain consistency between Sections VIII.C.4 and VII.B.5.e.</p>
27869	VIII.C.5	<p>"Such petition must comply with the general requirements of 10 CFR 2.714(b)(2) and must demonstrate why special circumstances as defined in 10 CFR 2.758(b) are present, or for compliance with the Commission's regulations in effect at the time this appendix was approved, as set forth in Section V of this appendix, including the requirements of 10 CFR 50.109."</p> <p>Basis: To maintain consistency between Sections VIII.C.1, VIII.C.3, and VIII.C.5, and because 10 C.F.R. § 2.758 is only applicable to hearings and not to NRC staff reviews.</p>

Attachment