



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

October 29, 1984

Docket No. 50-219  
LS05-84-10-034

Mr. P. B. Fiedler  
Vice President and Director  
Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station  
Post Office Box 388  
Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Dear Mr. Fiedler:

SUBJECT: WEIGHT LIMITATION OF THE SPENT FUEL SHIPPING CASK

Re: Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 77 to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16 for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. This amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated August 28, 1984 and supplemented September 7, 1984.

The amendment authorizes changes to the Appendix A Technical Specifications, Section 5.3.1.E, which removes the weight limitation of the spent fuel shipping cask.

A Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing related to the requested action was published in the Federal Register on September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38400). No request for hearing and no comments were received.

SEO/  
11 EK(SI)

8410310217 841029  
PDR ADOCK 05000219  
PDR

Mr. P. B. Fiedler

- 2 -

October 29, 1984

A copy of our related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. A notice of issuance pertaining to this action will appear in the Commission's next Monthly Notice publication in the Federal Register.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

John A. Zwolinski, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #5  
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No. 77 to License No. DPR-16
- 2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:  
See next page

DISTRIBUTION

Docket	PM
NRC PDR	OELD
Local PDR	ELJordan
ORB Reading	JNGrace
NSIC	ACRS (10)
WPaulson	SEPB
CJamerson	ASingh
TBarnhart (4)	LHarmon
WJones	DBrinkman
RDigg (w/TACS)	CMiles, OPA

DL:ORB#5  
CJamerson:fb  
10/26/84

DL:ORB#5  
JLombardo  
10/26/84

DL:ORB#5  
JZwolinski  
10/29/84

OELD  
10/26/84

DL:AOYSA  
DCrutchfield  
10/26/84

Mr. P. B. Fiedler

- 3 -

October 29, 1984

cc

G.F. Trowbridge, Esquire  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge  
1800 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Resident Inspector  
c/o U.S. NRC  
Post Office Box 445  
Forked River, New Jersey 08731

J.B. Lieberman, Esquire  
Berlack, Isreals & Lieberman  
26 Broadway  
New York, New York 10004

Commissioner  
New Jersey Department of Energy  
101 Commerce Street  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Dr. Thomas E. Murley  
Regional Administrator  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region I Office  
631 Park Avenue  
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Frank Cosolito, Acting Chief  
Bureau of Radiation Protection  
Department of Environmental  
Protection  
380 Scotch Road  
Trenton, New Jersey 08628

BWR Licensing Manager  
GPU Nuclear  
100 Interplace Parkway  
Parsippany, New Jersey 08625

Deputy Attorney General  
State of New Jersey  
Department of Law and Public Safety  
36 West State Street - CN 112  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Mayor  
Lacey Township  
818 Lacey Road  
Forked River, New Jersey 08731

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region II Office  
ATTN: Regional Radiation Representative  
26 Federal Plaza  
New York, New York 10007

Licensing Supervisor  
Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station  
Post Office Box 388  
Forked River, New Jersey 08731



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

GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION

AND

JERSEY CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

AMENDMENT TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 77  
License No. DPR-16

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
  - A. The application for amendment by GPU Nuclear Corporation and Jersey Central Power and Light Company (the licensees) dated August 28, 1984 and supplemented September 7, 1984 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.

8410310225 841029  
PDR ADOCK 05000219  
P PDR


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-16 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 77, are hereby incorporated in the license. GPU Nuclear Corporation 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



John A. Zwolinski, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #5  
Division of Licensing

Attachment:  
Changes to the Technical  
Specifications

Date of Issuance: October 29, 1984

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 77

PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-16

DOCKET NO. 50-219

Replace the following page of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the enclosed page. The revised page is identified by the captioned amendment number and contains vertical lines indicating the area of change.

Remove Page

5.3-1

Replace Page

5.3-1

5.3 AUXILIARY ELEMENT

## 5.3.1 Fuel Storage

- A. Normal storage for unirradiated fuel assemblies is in critically-safe new fuel storage racks in the reactor building storage vault; otherwise, fuel shall be stored in arrays which have a  $K_{eff}$  less than 0.95 under optimum conditions of moderation or in NRC-approved shipping containers.
- B. The spent fuel shall be stored in the spent fuel storage facility which shall be designed to maintain fuel in a geometry providing a  $K_{00}$  less than or equal to 0.95.
- C. The maximum U-235 loading in grams of U-235 per axial centimeter of fuel shall not exceed 15.6 gms U-235/cm.
- D. Loads greater than the weight of one fuel assembly shall not be moved over stored irradiated fuel in the spent fuel storage facility.
- E. The spent fuel shipping cask shall not be lifted more than six inches above the top plate of the cask drop protection system. Vertical limit switches shall be operable to assure the six inch vertical limit is met when the cask is above the top plate of the cask drop protection system.
- F. The temperature of the water in the spent fuel storage pool, measured at or near the surface, shall not exceed 125°F.

BASIS

The specification of  $K_{00} \leq 0.95$  and the maximum U-235 loading of  $\leq 15.6$  gm U-235/cm per axial centimeter for fuel in the spent fuel storage facility assures an ample margin from criticality. Conservative assumptions and allowance for tolerances, void effects, calculational uncertainties, pool temperature effects, etc. have been considered in the derivation of these limits (1,2). Note that the 15.6 gm U-235/cm is equivalent to a 3 w/o enrichment. (7)

The 15.6 gm U-235/cm is the limit of U-235 at any plane through the assembly perpendicular to the length of the assembly. It is to assure that possible non-uniform enrichments along the length of fuel rods cannot lead to a critical condition.

The effects of a dropped fuel bundle onto stored fuel in the spent fuel storage facility has been analyzed. This analysis shows that the fuel bundle drop would not cause doses resulting from ruptured fuel pins that exceed 10 CFR 100 limits (3, 4, 5) and that dropped waste cans will not damage the pool liner.

The elevation limitation of the spent fuel shipping cask to no more than 6 inches above the top plate of the cask drop protection system prevents loss of the pool integrity resulting from postulated drop accidents. An analysis of the effects of a 100 ton cask drop from 6 inches has been done (6) which showed that the pool structure is capable of sustaining the loads imposed during such a drop. Limit switches on the crane restrict the elevation of the cask to  $\leq 6$  inches when it is above the top plate.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 77 TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-16  
GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION AND  
JERSEY CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY  
OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION  
DOCKET NO. 50-219

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 28, 1984, and supplemented September 7, 1984, GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPU) (the licensee) requested an amendment to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16 for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. This amendment would authorize removal of the weight limitation of the spent fuel shipping cask in Section 5.3.1.E of the Technical Specifications (TS).

A Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing related to the requested action was published in the Federal Register on September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38400). No request for hearing or public comments were received.

On October 14, 1983, a U.S. District Court, Western District of New York, issued a Partial Settlement Agreement and Order which requires GPU to return 224 spent fuel assemblies from the Nuclear Service Center in West Valley, New York to Oyster Creek. Accordingly, in preparation for receiving these fuel assemblies GPU is contracting for the use of two TN-9 spent fuel shipping casks each having a full load weight of 40.5 tons. The use of these casks would reduce the number of shipments from West Valley to 32 instead of the 114 required if the NLI 1/2 cask were utilized.

2.0 DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

The staff has reviewed the existing Oyster Creek TS, Section 5.3.1.E, as well as the proposed change. The staff has also examined the applicability of the staff's previous findings regarding handling of the spent fuel cask as stated in the Safety Evaluation (SE) dated March 30, 1977 for Amendment 22 to the Oyster Creek License.

8410310232 841029  
PDR ADOCK 05000219  
P PDR



In the March 30, 1977 SE the staff imposed a 30-ton limitation on cask handling and stated that "movement of the 100-ton fuel cask assumed in the cask drop analyses will not be permitted until the details of the means used to limit the height to which the cask can be raised over the operating deck have been submitted by the licensee and approved by the NRC staff." Although the original analysis for the cask drop protection system had been performed by GPU using a 100-ton cask, this analysis was found acceptable by the staff only with the above condition satisfied as discussed in the March 30, 1977 SE. The licensee has proposed to use a TN-9 spent fuel shipping cask having a full load weight of 40.5 tons. The licensee has provided details of the means for limiting the height to which the cask can be raised. The design consists of redundant limit switches which will be provided to ensure that the cask will not be raised more than 6 inches above the operating deck. In addition, a "GO, NO-GO" gauge will be used to ensure the cask is at the correct height prior to movement. Specific procedures will be developed prior to use of the TN-9 cask.

The proposed change is in accordance with the criteria of SRP Section 9.1.5 and therefore, the staff concludes that the proposed change to Section 5.3.1.E of the TS is acceptable.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. 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 Section 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

### 4.0 CONCLUSION

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 or to the health and safety of the public.

5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This evaluation was prepared by A. Singh.

Dated: October 29, 1984