REGULATORY DOCKET FILE COPY

DISTRIBUTION:
~~Docket~~
NRC PDR
Local PDR
TERA
NSIC
NRR Reading
ORB #5 Reading
DEisenhut
JOlshinski
GLainas
TNovak
RDiggs
OPA (Clare Miles)
RTedesco
RPurple
JHeltemes
DCrutchfield
HSmith
SNowicki
OELD
OI&E (5)
BJones (4)
BScharf (10)
ACRS (16)
Gray File
Xtra cy (6)

Docket No. 50-244

JULY 14 1980

Mr. Leon D. White, Jr.
Vice President
Electric and Steam Generation
Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation
89 East Avenue
Rochester, New York 14649

Dear Mr. White:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 34 to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-18 for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. This amendment is in response to your application dated January 24, 1977 (transmitted by letter dated February 1, 1977), as superseded by submittals dated July 28, 1978 (transmitted by letter dated August 10, 1978), and May 8, 1979.

This amendment revised Sections 3.3, 3.11, 4.5 and 4.11 and incorporates Section 3.3.5 to: (1) add limiting conditions for operation, (2) revise surveillance requirements for the engineered safety feature ventilation filter systems and (3) add limiting conditions for fuel handling operations, and surveillance requirements for the spent fuel pool ventilation charcoal filter system.

During our review we found it necessary to change your proposed technical specifications. These changes were discussed with and agreed to by your representative.

Copies of our related Safety Evaluation and the Notice of Issuance are also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Dennis M. Crutchfield

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #5
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 34 to License No. DPR-18
2. Safety Evaluation
3. Notice

8008060214

| OFFICE | Enclosures: See next page | DL:ORB #5/LA | DL:ORB #5/PM | OELD | DL:ORB #5/C | DL/AD/SA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SURNAME | | HSmith | SNowicki | Ketchen | DCrutchfield | GLainas |
| DATE | | 6/20/80 | 6/30/80 | 6/30/80 | 7/11/80 | 7/14/80 |

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

July 14, 1980

Docket No. 50-244

Mr. Leon D. White, Jr.
Vice President
Electric and Steam Generation
Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation
89 East Avenue
Rochester, New York 14649

Dear Mr. White:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 34 to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-18 for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. This amendment is in response to your application dated January 24, 1977 (transmitted by letter dated February 1, 1977), as superseded by submittals dated July 28, 1978 (transmitted by letter dated August 10, 1978), and May 8, 1979.

This amendment revises Sections 3.3, 3.11, 4.5 and 4.11 and incorporates Section 3.3.5 to: (1) add limiting conditions for operation, (2) revise surveillance requirements for the engineered safety feature ventilation filter systems and (3) add limiting conditions for fuel handling operations, and surveillance requirements for the spent fuel pool ventilation charcoal filter system.

During our review we found it necessary to change your proposed technical specifications. These changes were discussed with and agreed to by your representative.

Copies of our related Safety Evaluation and the Notice of Issuance are also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Dennis M. Crutchfield

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #5
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 34 to License No. DPR-18
2. Safety Evaluation
3. Notice

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

8008060214

cc w/enclosures:
Harry H. Voigt, Esquire
LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae
1757 N Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. Michael Slade
12 Trailwood Circle
Rochester, New York 14618

Rochester Committee for
Scientific Information
Robert E. Lee, Ph.D.
P. O. Box 5236 River Campus
Station
Rochester, New York 14627

Jeffrey Cohen
New York State Energy Office
Swan Street Building
Core 1, Second Floor
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

* Director, Technical Development Programs
State of New York Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Rochester Public Library
115 South Avenue
Rochester, New York 14604

Supervisor of the Town
of Ontario
107 Ridge Road West
Ontario, New York 14519

Director, Technical Assessment
Division
Office of Radiation Programs
(AW-459)
U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Crystal Mall #2
Arlington, Virginia 20460

U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Region II Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007

Herbert Grossman, Esq., Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. Richard F. Cole
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. Emmeth A. Luebke
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. Thomas B. Cochran
Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.
1725 I Street, N. W.
Suite 600
Washington, D. C. 20006

*With incoming

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

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION

DOCKET NO. 50-244

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

AMENDMENT TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 34
License No. DPR-18

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Rochester Gas and Electric Company (the licensee) dated January 24, 1977 (transmitted by letter dated February 1, 1977), as superseded by submittals dated July 28, 1978 (transmitted by letter dated August 10, 1978), and May 8, 1979, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and 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 rules and 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;

   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.

8008060817

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 Provisional Operating License No. DPR-18 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   "(2) Technical Specifications

   The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 34, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications."

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

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Dennis M. Crutchfield

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #5
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: July 14, 1980

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 34

PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-18

DOCKET NO. 50-244

Remove the following pages of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications and insert the enclosed pages. The revised pages contain the captioned amendment number and vertical lines indicating the areas of change.

| REMOVE | INSERT |
|---|---|
| 3.3-4 | 3.3-4 |
| 3.3-5 | 3.3-5 |
| 3.3-6 | 3.3-6 |
| 3.3-7 | 3.3-7 |
| - - - | 3.3-7a |
| 3.3-11 | 3.3-11 |
| 3.3-12 | 3.3-12 |
| 3.11-2 | 3.11-2 |
| 3.11-4 | 3.11-4 |
| 4.5-4 | 4.5-4 |
| 4.5-5 | 4.5-5 |
| - - - | 4.5-5a |
| - - - | 4.5-5b |
| 4.5-7 | 4.5-7 |
| - - - | 4.5-7a |
| 4.11-1 | 4.11-1 |
| 4.11-2 | 4.11-2 |

(ii) The two reactor coolant drain tank pumps shall be tested and their operability demonstrated prior to initiating repairs of the inoperable residual heat removal pump.

d. One residual heat exchanger may be out of service for a period of no more than 24 hours.

e. Any valve required for the functioning of the safety injection or residual heat removal systems may be inoperable provided repairs are completed within 12 hours. Prior to initiating repairs, all valves in the systems that provide the duplicate function shall be tested to demonstrate operability.

f. Power may be restored to any valve referenced in 3.3.1.1 g for the purposes of valve testing providing no more than one such valve has power restored and provided testing is completed and power removed within 12 hours.

3.3.1.3 Except during diesel generator load and safeguard sequence testing or when the vessel head is removed or the steam generator manway is open no more than one safety injection pump shall be operable whenever the temperature of one or more of the RCS cold legs is $\leq$ 330°F.

3.3.1.3.1 Whenever only one safety injection pump may be operable by 3.3.1.3 at least two of the three safety injection pumps shall be demonstrated inoperable a minimum of once per twelve hours by verifying that the control switches are in the pull-stop position.

3.3.2 <u>Containment Cooling and Iodine Removal</u>

3.3.2.1 The reactor shall not be made critical except for low temperature physics tests, unless the following conditions are met:

a. The spray additive tank contains not less than 4500 gallons of solution with a sodium hydroxide concentration of not less than 30% by weight.

b. At least two containment spray pumps are operable.

c. Four fan cooler units are operable.

d. At least two charcoal filter units are operable.

e. All valves and piping associated with the above components which are required to function during accident conditions are operable.

f. At least two HEPA filter units with demisters are operable.

3.3.2.2 During power operation, the requirements of 3.3.2.1 may be modified to allow one of the following components to be inoperable at any one time. If the system is not restored to meet the requirements of 3.3.2.1 within the time period specified, the reactor shall be placed in the hot shutdown condition. If the requirements of 3.3.2.1 are not satisfied within an additional 48 hours, the reactor shall be placed in the cold shutdown condition.

a. One fan cooler may be out of service for a period of no more than 7 days.

b. One containment spray pump may be out of service provided the pump is restored to operable status within 3 days. The remaining containment spray pump shall be tested to demonstrate operability before initiating maintenance on the inoperable pump.

c. Any valve in the system, required to function during accident conditions, may be inoperable provided repairs are completed within 24 hours. Prior to initiating repairs, all valves in the system that provide the duplicate function shall be tested to demonstrate operability.

d. One post accident charcoal filter unit may be out of service provided the unit is restored to operable status within 7 days and provided the two containment spray pumps are demonstrated to be operable within 24 hours and daily thereafter. The two containment spray pumps shall be tested to demonstrate operability before initiating maintenance on the inoperable charcoal unit.

e. The spray additive system may be out of service for a period of no more than 3 days.

3.3.3 Component Cooling System

3.3.3.1 The reactor shall not be made critical unless the following conditions are met:

a. At least two component cooling pumps are operable.

b. At least two component cooling heat exchangers are operable.

c. All valves, interlocks and piping associated with the above components which are required to function during accident conditions are operable.

3.3.3.2 During power operation, the requirements of 3.3.3.1 may be modified to allow one of the following components to be inoperable at any one time. If the system is not restored to meet the conditions of 3.3.3.1 within the time period specified, the reactor shall be placed

in the hot shutdown condition. If the requirements of 3.3.3.1 are not satisfied within an additional 48 hours, the reactor shall be placed in the cold shutdown condition.

a. One component cooling pump may be out of service provided the pump is restored to operable status within 24 hours.

b. One heat exchanger or other passive component may be out of service provided the system may still operate at 100% capacity and repairs are completed within 24 hours.

3.3.4 Service Water System

3.3.4.1 The reactor shall not be made critical unless the following conditions are met:

a. At least two service water pumps and one loop header are operable.

b. All valves, interlocks, and piping associated with the operation of two pumps are operable.

3.3.4.2 Any time that the conditions of 3.3.4.1 above cannot be met, the reactor shall be placed in the cold shutdown condition.

3.3.5 Control Room Emergency Air Treatment System

3.3.5.1 The reactor shall not be made critical unless the control room emergency air treatment system is operable.

3.3.5.2 During power operation, the requirements of 3.3.5.1 may be modified to allow the control room emergency air treatment system to be inoperable for a period of 48 hours. If the system is not made operable within those 48 hours, the reactor shall be placed in hot shutdown condition utilizing normal operating procedures.

Basis:

The normal procedure for starting the reactor is, first to heat the

dundancy for certain ranges of break sizes.[2]

The containment cooling and iodine removal functions are provided by two independent systems: (a) fan-coolers plus post accident charcoal filters and (b) containment spray with sodium hydroxide addition. During normal power operation, only two of the four fan-coolers are required to remove heat lost from equipment and piping within containment.[3] In the event of a Design Basis Accident, any one of the following will serve to reduce airborne iodine activity and maintain doses within the values calculated in the FSAR: (1) two containment spray pumps and sodium hydroxide addition, (2) two fan-coolers and two post accident charcoal filters, or (3) one containment spray pump and sodium hydroxide addition plus one fan-cooler and one post accident charcoal filter.[4] In addition, the containment integrity analysis assumes that one containment spray pump and two fan-coolers operate to reduce containment pressure following a Design Basis Accident.[9] Because of the difficulty of access to make repairs to a fan-cooler and because of the low probability of a Design Basis Accident during that time, an additional seven days operation with an inoperable fan-cooler is permitted. The containment spray pumps and spray additive system are located outside containment and are, therefore, less difficult to repair. Therefore, three days with an inoperable containment spray pump or spray additive system is deemed acceptable.

The Component Cooling System is different from the other systems discussed above in that the components are so located in the Auxiliary Building as to be accessible for repair after a loss-of-coolant accident.[5] In addition, if during the post-accident phase the component cooling water supply is lost, core and containment cooling could be maintained

until repairs were effected.[6][7]

The facility has four service water pumps. Only one is needed during the injection phase, and two are required during the recirculation phase of a postulated loss-of-coolant accident.[8]

The control room emergency air treatment system is designed to filter the control room atmosphere during periods when the control room is isolated and to maintain radiation levels in the control room at acceptable levels following the Design Basis Accident.[9] Reactor operation may continue for a limited time while repairs are being made to the air treatment system since it is unlikely that the system would be needed.

The limits for the accumulator pressure and volume assure the required amount of water injection during an accident, and are based on values used for the accident analyses. The indicated level of 50% corresponds to 1108 cubic feet of water in the accumulator and the indicated level of 82% corrresponds to 1134 cubic feet.

The limitation of no more than one safety injection pump to be operable and the surveillance requirement to verify that two safety injection pumps are inoperable below 330°F provides assurance that a mass addition pressure transient can be relieved by the operation of a single PORV.

<u>References</u>


(1) FSAR Section 9.3

(2) FSAR Section 6.2

(3) FSAR Section 6.3

(4) FSAR Section 14.3.5

(5) FSAR Section 1.2

(6) FSAR Section 9.3

(7) FSAR Section 14.3

(8) FSAR Section 9.4

(9) FSAR Section 14.3.5

e. Charcoal adsorbers shall be installed in the ventilation system exhaust from the spent fuel storage pit area and shall be operable.

3.11.2 Radiation levels in the spent fuel storage area shall be monitored continuously.

3.11.3 The trolley of the auxiliary building crane shall never be stationed or permitted to pass over storage racks containing spent fuel.

3.11.4 Fuel assemblies with less than 60 days since irradiation shall not be placed in storage positions with less spacing between them than that indicated in Figure 3.11-1 by the designation RDF.

Change No. 4,
Amendment No. 11, 34

facility. The roughing filter protects the adsorber from becoming fouled with dirt; the adsorber removes iodine, the isotope of highest radiological significance, resulting from a fuel handling accident. The effectiveness of charcoal for removing iodine is assured by having a high throughput and a high removal efficiency. The throughput is attained by operation of the exhaust fans. The high removal efficiency is attained by minimizing the amount of iodine that bypasses the charcoal and having charcoal with a high potential for removing the iodine that does pass through the charcoal.

The minimum spacing specified for fuel assemblies with less than 60 days decay is based on maintaining the potential release of fission products that could occur should an object fall on and damage stored fuel to less than that which could have occurred with fuel stored in the original fuel storage racks.

Amendment No. 77, 34

of the spray additive valves closed, each valve will be opened and closed by operator action. This test shall be performed prior to startup if the time since the last test exceeds one month.

c. The accumulator check valves shall be checked for operability during each refueling shutdown.

4.5.2.3 Air Filtration System

4.5.2.3.1 At least once every 18 months or after every 720 hours of charcoal filtration system operation since the last test, or following painting, fire or chemical release in any ventilation zone communicating with the system, the post accident charcoal system shall have the following conditions demonstrated.

a. The pressure drop across the charcoal adsorber bank is less than 3 inches of water at design flow rate (± 10%).

b. In place Freon testing, under ambient conditions, shall show at least 99% removal.

c. The iodine removal efficiency of at least one charcoal filter cell shall be measured. The filter cell to be tested shall be selected randomly from those cells with the longest in-bank residence time. The minimum acceptable value for filter efficiency is 90% for removal of methyl iodide when tested at at least 286°F and 95% RH and at 1.5 to 2.0 mg/m$^3$ loading with tagged $CH_3I$.

4.5.2.3.2 After each replacement of a charcoal drawer or after any structural maintenance on the housing for the post accident charcoal system, the condition of Specification 4.5.2.3.1.b shall be demonstrated for the affected portion of the system.

4.5.2.3.3 At least every 18 months or following painting, fire, or chemical release in any ventilation zone communicating with the system, the containment recirculation system shall have the following conditions demonstrated.

a. The pressure drop across the HEPA filter bank is less than 3 inches of water at design flow rate (± 10%).

b. In place thermally generated DOP testing of the HEPA filters shall show at least 99% removal.

4.5.2.3.4 After each complete or partial replacement of the HEPA filter bank or after any structural maintenance on a housing for the containment recirculation system, the condition of Specification 4.5.2.3.3.b shall be demonstrated for the affected portion of the system.

4.5.2.3.5 Except during cold or refueling shutdowns the post accident charcoal filter isolation valves shall be tested at intervals not greater than one month to verify operability and proper orientation and flow shall be maintained through the system for at least 15 minutes. The test shall be performed prior to startup if the time since the last test exceeds 1 month.

4.5.2.3.6 At least once every 18 months or after every 720 hours of charcoal filtration system operation since the last test, or following painting, fire or chemical release in any ventilation zone communicating with the system, the control room emergency air treatment system shall have the following conditions demonstrated.

a. The pressure drop across the combined HEPA filters and charcoal adsorber banks is less than 6" of water at design flow rate (± 10%).

b. In place Freon testing, under ambient conditions, shall show at least 99% removal.

c. In place thermally generated DOP testing of the HEPA filters shall show at least 99% removal.

d. The results of laboratory analysis on a carbon sample shall show 90% or greater radioactive methyl iodide removal when tested at at least 125°F and 95% RH and at 1.5 to 2.0 $mg/m^3$ loading with tagged $CH_3I$.

4.5.2.3.7 After each complete or partial replacement of the HEPA filter bank or after any structural maintenance on the HEPA housing for the control room emergency air treatment system, the condition of Specification 4.5.2.3.6.c shall be demonstrated for the affected portion of the system.

4.5.2.3.8 After each replacement of a charcoal drawer or after any structural maintenance on the charcoal housing for the control room emergency air treatment system, the condition of Specification 4.5.2.3.6.b shall be demonstrated for the affected portion of the system.

4.5.2.3.9 Except during cold or refueling shutdowns the automatic initiation of the control room emergency air treatment system shall be tested at intervals not to exceed one month to verify operability and proper orientation and flow shall be maintained through the system for at least 15 minutes. The test shall be performed prior to startup if the time since the last test exceeds one month.

Basis:

The Safety Injection System and the Containment Spray System are principal plant safeguards that are normally inoperative during reactor operation.

Complete systems tests cannot be performed when the reactor is operating because a Safety Injection signal causes containment isolation and a Containment Spray System test requires the system to be temporarily disabled. The method of assuring operability of these systems is therefore to combine systems tests to be performed during annual plant shutdowns, with more frequent component tests, which can be performed during reactor operation.

The annual systems tests demonstrate proper automatic operation of the Safety Injection and Containment Spray Systems. With the pumps blocked from starting, a test signal is applied to initiate automatic action

The air filtration portion of the containment air recirculation system is a passive safeguard which is isolated from the cooling air flow during normal reactor operation. Hence the charcoal should have a long useful lifetime. The filter frames that house the charcoal are stainless steel and should also last indefinitely. The pressure drop, filter efficiency, and valve operation test frequencies will assure that the system can operate to meet its design function under accident conditions. As the adsorbing charcoal is normally isolated, the test schedule, related to hours of operation as well as elapsed time, will assure that it does not degrade below the required adsorbtion efficiency. The test conditions for charcoal sample adsorbing efficiency are those which might be encountered under an accident situation.[2]

The control room air treatment system is designed to filter the control room atmosphere (recirculation and intake air) during control room isolation conditions. HEPA filters are installed before the charcoal filters to remove particulate matter and prevent clogging of the iodine adsorbers. The charcoal filters reduce the airborne radioiodine in the control room. Bypass leakage must be at a minimum in order for these filters to perform their designed function. If the performances are as specified the calculated doses will be less than those analyzed.[3]

Retesting of the post accident charcoal system or the control room emergency air treatment system in the event of painting, fire, or chemical release is required only if the system is operating and is providing filtration for the area in which the painting, fire, or

chemical release occurs.

Testing of the air filtration systems will be, to the extent it can, given the configuration of the systems, in accordance with ANSI N510-1975, "Testing of Nuclear Air-Cleaning Systems."

References:

(1) FSAR Section 6.2

(2) FSAR Section 6.3

(3) FSAR Section 14.3.5

4.11 Spent Fuel Pit Charcoal Adsorber Testing

Applicability

Applies to testing the performance of the spent fuel pit charcoal adsorbers.

Specification

4.11.1 Within 60 days prior to each major fuel handling*, the spent fuel pit charcoal adsorber system shall have the following conditions demonstrated. After the conditions have been demonstrated, the occurrence of painting, fire or chemical release in any ventilation zone communicating with the spent fuel pit charcoal adsorber system shall require that the following conditions be redemonstrated before major fuel handling* may continue.

a. The total air flow rate from the charcoal adsorbers shall be at least 75% of that measured with a complete set of new adsorbers.

b. In-place Freon testing, under ambient conditions, shall show at least 99% removal.

c. The results of laboratory analysis on a carbon sample shall show 90% or greater radioactive methyl iodide removal when tested at at least 150$^{0}$F and 95% RH and at 1.5 to 2.0 mg/m$^{3}$ loading with tagged $CH_3I$.

d. Flow shall be maintained through the system using either the filter or bypass flow path for at least 15 minutes each month.

4.11.2 After each replacement of a charcoal filter drawer or after any structural maintenance on the charcoal housing for the spent fuel pit charcoal adsorber system, the condition of Specification 4.11.1.b shall be demonstrated for the affected portion of the system.

---

* Major fuel handling is considered as removal of 20% or more of the fuel assemblies from the reactor vessel.

Basis

The measurement of the air flow assures that air is being withdrawn from the spent fuel pit area and passed through the adsorbers. The flow is measured prior to employing the adsorbers to establish that there has been no gross change in performance since the system was last used. The Freon test provides a measure of the amount of leakage from around the charcoal adsorbent.

The ability of charcoal to adsorb iodine can deteriorate as the charcoal ages and weathers. Testing the capacity of the charcoal to adsorb iodine assures that an acceptable removal efficiency under operating conditions would be obtained. The difference between the test requirement of a removal efficiency of 90% for methyl iodine and the percentage assumed in the evaluation of the fuel handling accident provides adequate safety margin for degradation of the filter after the tests.

Retesting of the spent fuel pit charcoal adsorber system in the event of painting, fire, or chemical release is required only if the system is operating and is providing filtration for the area in which the painting, fire, or chemical release occurs.

Testing of the air filtration systems will be tested, to the extent it can given the configuration of the systems, in accordance with ANSI N510-1975, "Testing of Nuclear Air-Cleaning Systems".

Reference:

(1) Letter from E.J. Nelson, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation to Dr. Peter A. Morris, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, dated February 3, 1971

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 34 TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-18

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-244

## INTRODUCTION

By application dated January 24, 1977 (transmitted by letter dated February 1, 1977), as superseded by submittals dated July 28, 1978 (transmitted by letter dated August 10, 1978), and May 8, 1979, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (the licensee) requested an amendment to the Technical Specifications of Appendix A to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-18 for R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. The proposed amendment would approve changes to Sections 3.3, 3.11, 4.5 and 4.11 and the addition of 3.3.5 to Section 3.3 of the Technical Specifications. The proposed Technical Specifications would add limiting conditions for operation (Section 3.3) and change the surveillance requirements (Section 4.5) for the engineered safety feature (ESF) ventilation filter systems, and add limiting conditions for fuel handling operations (Section 3.11) along with surveillance requirements (Section 4.11) for the spent fuel pool ventilation charcoal filter system.

We have reviewed and evaluated these proposed changes and additions. The results of our evaluation is based on the model Technical Specification for engineered safety feature ventilation filter systems for operating nuclear reactors and with Positions C.5 (in-place testing criteria) and C.6 (laboratory testing criteria for activated charcoal) of Regulatory Guide 1.52 (Revision 2), "Design, Testing and Maintenance Criteria for Atmospheric Cleanup System Air Filtration and Adsorption Units of Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Plants".

## EVALUATION

The licensee proposed to revise Subsection 3.3.2, "Containment Cooling and Iodine Removal", to the existing Technical Specifications. This specification applies to the operability of the fan cooler units and the associated post accident charcoal filter units. The proposed specification and its bases are consistent with the model Technical Specifications and based for ESF air filter systems. We conclude that the proposed specification and bases are acceptable.

8008060220

The licensee proposed to add Subsection 3.3.5, "Control Room Emergency Air Treatment System", to the existing Technical Specifications. This specification applies criteria to the operability of the Control Room Emergency Air Treatment System. The proposed specification and its bases are consistent with the model Technical Specifications and bases for ESF air filter systems. We conclude that the proposed specification and the bases are acceptable.

The licensee removed the air flow and charcoal adsorber test specifications from Section 3.11 and revised Section 4.11 titled, "Spent Fuel Pit Charcoal Adsorber Testing", to include the modified specifications from Section 3.11. The proposed Technical Specification is consistent with the model Technical Specifications for ESF ventilation filter systems and Positions C.5 and C.6 of Regulatory Guide 1.52, except that the specifications for testing air heaters were deleted. Heaters for humidity control on the filter systems are not installed at R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant since design parameters do not require them at this facility. The laboratory testing condition for the installed charcoal filter is established to be representative of the accident conditions. Our evaluation of this filter system was based on the assumption that the relative humidity would not be controlled. We agree with the licensee that there is no need for air heaters in this filter system. Accordingly, we conclude that the deletion of the Technical Specifications for testing air heaters is acceptable. However, we require that the circuit in the spent fuel pit be operated 15 minutes every month. With the inclusion of this specification in Section 4.11, we conclude that the proposed Technical Specification for the system is acceptable.

The licensee proposed to revise Subsection 4.5.2.3, "Air Filtration System", to the existing Technical Specifications. This specification applies to the testing of the containment fan cooler units and associated post accident charcoal filter units and to the Control Room Emergency Air Treatment System. The proposed Technical Specifications are consistent with the model Technical Specifications for ESF ventilation filter systems and Positions C.5 and C.6 of Regulatory Guide 1.52, except that the specifications for testing air heaters were deleted. Heaters for humidity control on the filter systems are not installed at R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant since design parameters do not require them at this facility. The laboratory testing conditions for the installed charcoal filter conditions are established to be representative of the accident conditions. Our evaluation of these filter systems is based upon the assumption that the relative humidity would not be controlled. We agree with the licensee that there is no need for air heaters in these filter systems. Accordingly, we conclude that inclusion of Technical Specifications

for testing air heaters is not required and that the proposed Technical Specifications for the containment fan cooler units and associated post accident charcoal filter units and Control Room Emergency Air Treatment System is acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner and (3) 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 or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: July 14, 1980

7590-01

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 50-244

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 34 to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-18, issued to Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (the licensee) which revised the Technical Specifications for operation of the R. E. Ginna Plant located in Wayne County, New York. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

The amendment revises Sections 3.3, 3.11, 4.5 and 4.11 and incorporates Section 3.3.5 to: (1) add limiting conditions for operation, (2) revise surveillance requirements for the engineered safety feature ventilation filter systems and (3) add limiting conditions for fuel handling operations, and surveillance requirements for the spent fuel pool ventilation charcoal filter system.

The application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment was not required since the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of this amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to

8008060222

10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with issuance of this amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated January 24, 1977 (transmitted by letter dated February 1, 1977), and submittals dated July 28, 1978 (transmitted by letter August 10, 1978), and May 8, 1979 , (2) Amendment No. 34 to License No. DPR-18 and (3) the Commission's related Safety Evaluation. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20555 and at the Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14627. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 14th day of July, 1980.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Dennis M. Crutchfield

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #5
Division of Operating Reactors

re: testing of char. al filters and operability of containment iodine removal equipment.

William O. Miller, Chief
License Fee Management Branch, ADM

Date: 8/24/78
Amended Form Date:

FACILITY AMENDMENT CLASSIFICATION - DOCKET NO(S). 50-244 "final"

Licensee: Rochester Gas & Elec. (LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae)

Plant Name and Unit(s): Ginna

License No(s): DPR-18 Mail Control No: 78219006

Request Dated: * 8/10/78 (Ltr) 7/28/78 (app) Fee Remitted: Yes ____ No ✓

Assigned TAC No: 6774 + 10138

Licensee's Fee Classification: Class I ____, II ____, III ____, IV ____, V ____, VI ____, None ✓.

Amendment No. 34 Date of Issuance 7/14/80

[X] 1. This request has been reviewed by DOR/DPM in accordance with Section 170.22 of Part 170 and is properly categorized.

[ ] 2. This request is incorrectly classified and should be properly categorized as Class ____. Justification for classification or reclassification: ____

This submittal provides revisions to the

[ ] 3. Additional information is required to properly categorize the request: 1/24/77 application (attached to ltr. dated 7/1/77)

[X] Our original fee position is hereby affirmed.

[ ] 4. This request is a Class ____ type of action and is exempt from fees because it:

(a) ____ was filed by a nonprofit educational institution

(b) ____ was filed by a Government agency and is not for a power reactor,

(c) ____ is for a Class ____ (can only be a I, II, or III) amendment which results from a written Commission request dated ____ for the application and the amendment is to simplify or clarify license or technical specifications, has only minor safety significance, and is being issued for the convenience of the Commission, or

(d) ____ other (state reason therefor): ____

Division of Operating Reactors/Project Management

[ ] The above request has been reviewed and is exempt from fees.

Attached: incoming

William O. Miller, Chief
License Fee Management Branch

Date

LFMB 6/78

* further revised by submittal dated 5/8/79 (cy. attached)