

August 28, 1989

Docket No. 50-388

Mr. Harold W. Keiser
Senior Vice President-Nuclear
Pennsylvania Power and Light Company
2 North Ninth Street
Allentown, Pennsylvania 18101

Dear Mr. Keiser:

SUBJECT: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES TO PERMIT ONE-TIME EXTENSION OF
SURVEILLANCE INTERVAL (TAC NO. 73585)

RE: SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 2

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 57 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-22 for the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2. This amendment is in response to your letter dated June 19, 1989.

This amendment changes the Technical Specifications to permit a one-time extension of combined three consecutive surveillance interval limit of 3.25 times the specified time interval for each interval.

A copy of our Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's Biweekly Federal Register Notice.

Sincerely,

/s/

Walter R. Butler, Director
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No. 57 to License No. NPF-22
- 2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

[KEISER]

PDI-2/LA
MO'Brien
/ /89

MJ
PDI-2/PM
MThadani:mj
8/11/89

PDI-2/D
WButler
8/12/89

DFOI
/1/
NLD
OGC
8/14/89

OP



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

August 28, 1989

Docket No. 50-388

Mr. Harold W. Keiser
Senior Vice President-Nuclear
Pennsylvania Power and Light Company
2 North Ninth Street
Allentown, Pennsylvania 18101

Dear Mr. Keiser:

SUBJECT: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES TO PERMIT ONE-TIME EXTENSION OF
SURVEILLANCE INTERVAL (TAC NO. 73585)

RE: SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 2

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 57 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-22 for the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2. This amendment is in response to your letter dated June 19, 1989.

This amendment changes the Technical Specifications to permit a one-time extension of combined three consecutive surveillance interval limit of 3.25 times the specified time interval for each interval.

A copy of our Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's Biweekly Federal Register Notice.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Walter R. Butler".

Walter R. Butler, Director
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 57 to
License No. NPF-22
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

Mr. Harold W. Keiser
Pennsylvania Power & Light Company

Susquehanna Steam Electric Station
Units 1 & 2

cc:

Jay Silberg, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Mr. S. B. Ungerer
Joint Generation
Projects Department
Atlantic Electric
P.O. Box 1500
1199 Black Horse Pike
Pleasantville, New Jersey 08232

Bryan A. Snapp, Esq.
Assistant Corporate Counsel
Pennsylvania Power & Light Company
2 North Ninth Street
Allentown, Pennsylvania 18101

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Mr. E. A. Heckman
Licensing Group Supervisor
Pennsylvania Power & Light Company
2 North Ninth Street
Allentown, Pennsylvania 18101

Mr. R. E. Byram
Superintendent of Plant
Susquehanna Steam Electric Station
Pennsylvania Power and Light Company
2 North Ninth Street
Allentown, Pennsylvania 18101

Mr. Scott Barber
Senior Resident Inspector
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 35
Berwick, Pennsylvania 18603-0035

Mr. Herbert D. Woodeshick
Special Office of the President
Pennsylvania Power and Light Company
1009 Fowles Avenue
Berwick, Pennsylvania 18603

Mr. Thomas M. Gerusky, Director
Bureau of Radiation Protection
Resources
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
P. O. Box 2063
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Mr. Jesse C. Tilton, III
Allegheny Elec. Cooperative, Inc.
212 Locust Street
P.O. Box 1266
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108-1266



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

PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ALLEGHENY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

DOCKET NO. 50-388

SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 57
License No. NPF-22

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or the NRC) having found that:
 - A. The application for the amendment filed by the Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, dated June 19, 1989 complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance: (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment and paragraph 2.C.(2) of the Facility Operating License No. NPF-22 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 57 and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, are hereby incorporated in the license. PP&L shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Walter R. Butler, Director
Project Directorate I-2
Division of Reactor Projects I/II

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: August 28, 1989

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO.57

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-22

DOCKET NO. 50-388

Replace the following page of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with enclosed page. The revised page is identified by Amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the area of change. The overleaf page is provided to maintain document completeness.*

REMOVE

3/4 0-1
3/4 0-2

INSERT

3/4 0-1*
3/4 0-2

3/4.0 APPLICABILITY

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

3.0.1 Compliance with the Limiting Conditions for Operation contained in the succeeding Specifications is required during the OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS or other conditions specified therein; except that upon failure to meet the Limiting Conditions for Operation, the associated ACTION requirements shall be met.

3.0.2 Noncompliance with a Specification shall exist when the requirements of the Limiting Condition for Operation and associated ACTION requirements are not met within the specified time intervals. If the Limiting Condition for Operation is restored prior to expiration of the specified time intervals, completion of the ACTION requirements is not required.

3.0.3 When a Limiting Condition for Operation is not met, except as provided in the associated ACTION requirements, within one hour action shall be initiated to place the unit in an OPERATIONAL CONDITION in which the Specification does not apply by placing it, as applicable, in:

1. At least STARTUP within the next 6 hours,
2. At least HOT SHUTDOWN within the following 6 hours, and
3. At least COLD SHUTDOWN within the subsequent 24 hours.

Where corrective measures are completed that permit operation under the ACTION requirements, the ACTION may be taken in accordance with the specified time limits as measured from the time of failure to meet the Limiting Condition for Operation. Exceptions to these requirements are stated in the individual Specifications. This specification is not applicable in OPERATIONAL CONDITION 4 or 5.

3.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL CONDITION or other specified condition shall not be made when the conditions for the Limiting Conditions for Operation are not met and the associated ACTION requires a shutdown if they are not met within a specified time interval. Entry into an OPERATIONAL CONDITION or other specified condition may be made in accordance with the ACTION requirements when conformance to them permits continued operation of the facility for an unlimited period of time. This provision shall not prevent passage through or to OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS as required to comply with ACTION requirements. Exceptions to these requirements are stated in the individual Specifications.

APPLICABILITY

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.0.1 Surveillance Requirements shall be met during the OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS or other conditions specified for individual Limiting Conditions for Operation unless otherwise stated in an individual Surveillance Requirement.

4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified time interval with:

- a. A maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25% of the surveillance interval, but
- b. The combined time interval for any 3 consecutive surveillance intervals shall not exceed 3.25 times the specified surveillance interval.*

4.0.3 Failure to perform a Surveillance Requirement within the allowed surveillance interval, defined by Specification 4.0.2, shall constitute noncompliance with the OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation. The time limits of the ACTION requirements are applicable at the time it is identified that a Surveillance Requirement has not been performed. The ACTION requirements may be delayed for up to 24 hours to permit the completion of the surveillance when the allowable outage time limits of the ACTION requirements are less than 24 hours. Surveillance Requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment.

4.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL CONDITION or other specified applicable condition shall not be made unless the Surveillance Requirement(s) associated with the Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the applicable surveillance interval or as otherwise specified. This provision shall not prevent passage through or to OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS as required to comply with ACTION requirements.

4.0.5 Surveillance Requirements for inservice inspection and testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, & 3 components shall be applicable as follows:

- a. Inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2, and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda as required by 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g)(6)(i).
- b. Surveillance intervals specified in Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda for the inservice inspection and testing activities required by the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable Addenda shall be applicable as follows in these Technical Specifications:

*Not applicable to 18 month surveillances required to be performed prior to the startup following the end of the Unit 2 Third Refueling and Inspection Outage.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 57 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-22
PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
ALLEGHENY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.
DOCKET NO. 50-388
SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 2

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 19, 1989, Pennsylvania Power & Light Company requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-22 for the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2. The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications surveillance requirements of section 4.0.2.b for those surveillances for which performance is required prior to the beginning of the Unit 2 third refueling and inspection outage. The change is requested to permit a one-time relief from the specification 4.0.2.b requirement that the combined time for three consecutive intervals does not exceed 3.25 times the specified surveillance interval. The licensee has stated that the delay in completing the surveillances would not exceed sixty-six days duration projected for the third refueling and inspection outage.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee states that it is faced with a surveillance scheduling problem for Unit 2 as a result of an extraordinarily long first operating cycle run. Longer than usual first refueling cycle resulted in significantly longer surveillance intervals than the nominal 18 months allowed by the Technical Specifications. Subsequent refueling cycles have not offset the impact of long first cycle. The cumulative effect of longer than 18 month cycles has caused some of the third refueling outage surveillances to become due on September 5, 1989, approximately 4 days prior to the projected shutdown of Unit 2 for third refueling and inspection outage scheduled for September 9, 1989. The licensee has confirmed that it will not exceed the provisions of specification 4.0.2.a which requires that each Surveillance cycle should not exceed 1.25 times the 18 months specified for an operating cycle.

The NRC Generic Letter 83-27 dated July 6, 1983 entitled "Surveillance Intervals in Standard Technical Specifications" indicates that the 18-month surveillance interval is based on reactor operating experience and the recognition of reactors utilizing 18-month fuel cycles. The basis for the provision which allows any surveillance interval to be extended by 25% is to provide necessary operating flexibility which may be required due to

8909050348 890828
PDR ADOCK 05000388
P PDC

operational considerations. The Generic Letter also indicates that one-time changes may be granted for plant specific conditions when adequate justification is provided.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's justification for extending the requirements of Technical Specification section 4.0.2.b for a combined surveillance interval for three consecutive surveillances limit of 58.5 months by about two months. This represents less than 4% extension beyond the specification limit. The licensee has provided an acceptable justification that its problem was caused by unusually longer than usual first cycle operation. Additionally, since the licensee will continue to meet the provisions of specification 4.0.2.a, the reliability of the equipment surveyed is not expected to degrade as a result of one-time extension of combined three cycle surveillance interval limit by less than 4%. The staff concludes that the licensee's request meets the criteria in the Generic Letter 83-27 for a one-time change. The staff finds the proposed Technical Specification changes acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to the surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement nor environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (54 FR 31112) on July 26, 1989 and consulted with the State of Pennsylvania. No public comments were received, and the State of Pennsylvania did not have any comments.

The staff 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security nor to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Mohan C. Thadani

Dated: August 28, 1989