

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8610220165 DDC DATE: 86/10/14 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-397 WPPSS Nuclear Project, Unit 2, Washington Public Power 05000397
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
 SORESEN, G. C. Washington Public Power Supply System
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 ADENSAN, E. G. BWR Project Directorate 3

SUBJECT: Informs that steps being taken by util to improve scheduling of Tech Spec revs. Discusses plans for Nov 1986 meeting to resolve 17 util amend requests currently pending.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001D COPIES RECEIVED: LTTR 1 ENCL 0 SIZE: 2
 TITLE: OR Submittal: General Distribution

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
	BWR EB	1	BWR EICSB	2
	BWR FOB	1	BWR PD3 LA	1
	BWR PD3 PD 01	5	BRADFUTE, J	1
	BWR PSB	1	BWR RSB	1
INTERNAL:	ACRS 09	6	ADM/LFMB	1
	ELD/HDS2	1	NRR/DHFT/TSCB	1
	NRR/ORAS	1	<u>REG FILE</u> 04	1
	RGN5	1		
EXTERNAL:	EG&G BRUSKE, S	1	LPDR 03	1
	NRC PDR 02	1	NSIC 05	1

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 29 ENCL 0

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

Washington Public Power Supply System

3000 George Washington Way P.O. Box 968 Richland, Washington 99352-0968 (509)372-5000

Docket No. 50-397

October 14, 1986

Ms. Elinor G. Adensam, Director
BWR Project Directorate No. 3
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Ms. Adensam:

Subject: NUCLEAR PLANT NO. 2
WNP-2 LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUESTS

I appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and Mr. Bradfute on September 9, 1986 to discuss steps that are being taken by the Supply System to improve the scheduling of WNP-2 technical specification revisions. I was particularly pleased that the change in meeting date was accommodated to permit the Plant Manager, Mr. Powers, to attend.

The steps which we discussed are currently being implemented by our Plant, Engineering and Licensing organizations, and I expect to soon begin providing you with technical specification changes that will be required for the Spring 1987 outage (R-2).

As we discussed on September 9, there are 17 Supply System amendment requests currently pending with NRR. It is my understanding that Mr. Powell (WNP-2 Licensing Manager) and Mr. Bradfute are making progress in reducing this backlog. During our meeting you stated that, due to priorities in the technical staff, the possibility exists that some of these amendment requests could remain open for several years. This of course is frustrating to us, since every amendment request is based on either safety, ALARA concerns, or operational efficiencies and therefore has value to the Supply System. I appreciate the fact that you also feel this frustration, and are as interested as we are in eliminating this backlog.

Subsequent to our meeting, I have discussed this subject with licensing personnel from several other utilities and find that the problem is by no means unique to the Supply System. Some stated that their goal is to clean up all amendment requests greater than 2 years old. The issue appears to be quite generic, and may benefit from discussion between NRC senior management and an industry organization such as NUMARC. However, before making such a recommendation to our NUMARC representative, I would prefer to see what we can work out to resolve the issue for WNP-2.

8610220165 861014
PDR ADDCK 05000397
P PDR

A001
1/0

E. G. Adensam
WNP-2 Tech. Spec. Amendments
Page 2

At the September meeting, we discussed the benefits of meeting again in November. At that time, I recommend that we review the status of any requests which may be outstanding, and consider approaches which may be taken to bring them to closure. Since the technical resources needed to complete the reviews report to Mr. Bernero, it might be desirable to include him in the November meeting.

My concerns with the technical specification amendment process should not be taken as a reflection on Mr. Bradfute's abilities to perform his responsibilities as the Project Manager. I am frankly amazed at the amount he is able to accomplish, given the competing demands for technical resources.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "G. C. Sorensen".

G. C. Sorensen, Manager
Regulatory Programs

cc: JO Bradfute/NRC
NS Reynolds/BLCP&R

1944

1. The first part of the report is a general statement of the purpose and scope of the study. It is followed by a brief review of the literature on the subject.

2. The second part of the report is a description of the methods used in the study. This includes a description of the subjects, the instruments used, and the procedures followed.

3. The third part of the report is a presentation of the results of the study. This includes a description of the data collected and a discussion of the findings.

4. The fourth part of the report is a discussion of the implications of the findings. This includes a discussion of the theoretical implications and the practical implications of the study.