

[Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370]

Duke Power Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-9 and NPF-17 issued to Duke Power Company (the licensee) for operation of the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina.

The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to (1) change the surveillance requirement for boron concentration in the spent fuel pool (SFP) from once per 31 days to once per 7 days in consistency with the Standard Technical Specifications, (2) remove the option to use alternate storage configurations in the SFP and replace it with footnotes to allow specific analysis on alternate fuel types, (3) add information contained in the Bases to the footnotes to Figures 3.9-1 to 3.9-3 of Specification 3/4.9.13, and (4) change the Bases to discuss the option to use specific analyses on alternate fuel.

The licensee's request of June 13, 1994, as supplemented August 15, 1994, March 23 and April 18, 1995, was previously noticed in the **Federal Register** on February 15, 1995 (60 FR 8746). The additional information provided in letters dated August 15, 1994, and April 18, 1995, did not modify the licensee's initial no significant hazards determination analysis. However, the additional information provided in the March 23, 1995, submittal was new information that did modify the licensee's initial no significant hazards determination analysis. This new information is being noticed for public comment.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the licensee request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of

a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

There is no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident in the new fuel vault since the only credible accidents for this area are criticality accidents and it has been shown that calculated, worst case K_{eff} for this area is [less than or equal to] 0.95 for fully flooded conditions and K_{eff} [less than or equal to] 0.98 under optimum moderation conditions. This is in accordance with current licensing criteria. Likewise, there is no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident in the Spent Fuel Pool since, for criticality accidents, analyses have shown that K_{eff} [less than or equal to] 0.95 under all conditions is being maintained.

There is also no increase in the probability or consequences of a fuel drop accident in the Spent Fuel Storage Pool. Since the mass of an assembly will not be affected by the increase in fuel enrichment, the probability of an accident is not increased, and since the fission product inventory of individual fuel assemblies will not change significantly as a result of increased enrichment, the consequences of a fuel rupture accident remain unchanged.

The likelihood of other accidents, previously evaluated and described in Section 9.1.2 of the FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report], is also not affected by the proposed changes. In fact, it could be postulated that since the increase in fuel enrichment will allow for extended fuel cycles, there will be a decrease in fuel movement and the probability of an accident may likewise be decreased.

2. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident since fuel handling accidents (fuel drop and misplacement) are not new or different kinds of accidents. Fuel handling accidents are already discussed in the FSAR for fuel with enrichments up to 4.0 weight %.

* * * [A]dditional analyses have been performed for fuel with enrichment up to 5.00 weight %. Worst case misloading accidents associated with the new loading patterns were evaluated. It was shown that the negative reactivity provided by soluble boron maintains k_{eff} [less than or equal to] 0.95 under all conditions.

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed [changes do] not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety since, a k_{eff} [less than or equal to] 0.95 is being maintained for fully flooded conditions and k_{eff} [less than or equal to] 0.98 under

optimum moderation conditions. The specification of k_{eff} [less than or equal to] 0.98, for optimum moderation conditions in the new fuel vault, is an addition to the existing specification requirements of k_{eff} [less than or equal to] 0.95 for fully flooded conditions. Although previous analyses have been performed to demonstrate that this requirement could be met, there was no licensing requirement to do so. Addition of this specification brings the specification more in line with current STS [standard technical specification] requirements and, in fact, may increase the margin of safety since, compliance with this requirement was not previously required.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendments until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendments before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the

Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests of hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By June 7, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating licenses and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practices for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended

petition must satisfy the specific requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendments under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendments and make them immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

If the final determination is that the request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendments.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention:

Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Herbert N. Berkow: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated June 13, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated August 15, 1994, March 23 and April 18, 1995, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 3rd day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Victor Nerses,

*Project Manager, Project Directorate II-2,
Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-11220 Filed 5-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M