

July 17, 1996

Mr. Leon R. Eliason  
Chief Nuclear Officer & President-  
Nuclear Business Unit  
Public Service Electric & Gas  
Company  
Post Office Box 236  
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO FACILITY  
OPERATING LICENSES, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION  
DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING, SALEM NUCLEAR  
GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M96069 AND M96070)

Dear Mr. Eliason:

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice for your information. This notice  
relates to your application dated July 12, 1996, for Salem Nuclear Generating  
Station, Units 1 and 2. Your application proposes changes to Technical  
Specification 3.3.2.1, "Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System  
Instrumentation," to reflect a revised setpoint for the interlock designated  
P-12.

This notice will be forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for  
publication.

Sincerely,

/S/

Leonard N. Olshan, Project Manager  
Project Directorate I-2  
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-272/311

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File MO'Brien  
PUBLIC LOlshan  
PDI-1 Reading OGC  
SVarga/JZwolinski ACRS  
JStolz LNicholson, RGN-I

DF01/11

OFFICE	PDI-2/BA <i>MB</i>	PDI-2/PM <i>MB</i>	PDI-2/D <i>MB</i>		
NAME	MO'Brien	LOlshan:smm <i>LO</i>	JStolz <i>JS</i>		
DATE	7/17/96	7/17/96	7/17/96		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY  
DOCUMENT NAME: A:\SALEM\SA96069.IND

9607300374 960717  
PDR ADOCK 05000272  
P PDR

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

July 17, 1996

Mr. Leon R. Eliason  
Chief Nuclear Officer & President-  
Nuclear Business Unit  
Public Service Electric & Gas  
Company  
Post Office Box 236  
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO FACILITY  
OPERATING LICENSES, PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION  
DETERMINATION, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR A HEARING, SALEM NUCLEAR  
GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. M96069 AND M96070)

Dear Mr. Eliason:

Enclosed is a copy of the subject notice for your information. This notice relates to your application dated July 12, 1996, for Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2. Your application proposes changes to Technical Specification 3.3.2.1, "Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation," to reflect a revised setpoint for the interlock designated P-12.

This notice will be forwarded to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

*Ronald A. Brien*  
for Leonard N. Olshan, Project Manager  
Project Directorate I-2  
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-272/311

Enclosure: Notice

cc w/encl: See next page

Mr. Leon R. Eliason  
Public Service Electric & Gas  
Company

Salem Nuclear Generating Station,  
Units 1 and 2

cc:

Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire  
Winston & Strawn  
1400 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Richard Hartung  
Electric Service Evaluation  
Board of Regulatory Commissioners  
2 Gateway Center, Tenth Floor  
Newark, NJ 07102

Richard Fryling, Jr., Esquire  
Law Department - Tower 5E  
80 Park Place  
Newark, NJ 07101

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

Mr. Clay Warren  
General Manager - Salem Operations  
Salem Generating Station  
P.O. Box 236  
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Lower Alloways Creek Township  
c/o Mary O. Henderson, Clerk  
Municipal Building, P.O. Box 157  
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Louis Storz  
Sr. Vice President - Nuclear Operations  
Nuclear Department  
P.O. Box 236  
Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038

Mr. Frank X. Thomson, Jr., Manager  
Licensing and Regulation  
Nuclear Department  
P.O. Box 236  
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Charles S. Marschall, Senior  
Resident Inspector  
Salem Generating Station  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Drawer 0509  
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. David Wersan  
Assistant Consumer Advocate  
Office of Consumer Advocate  
1425 Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Dr. Jill Lipoti, Asst. Director  
Radiation Protection Programs  
NJ Department of Environmental  
Protection and Energy  
CN 415  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0415

P. M. Goetz  
MGR. Joint Generation  
Atlantic Energy  
6801 Black Horse Pike  
Egg Harbor Twp., NJ 08234-4130

Maryland Office of People's Counsel  
6 St. Paul Street, 21st Floor  
Suite 2102  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Carl D. Schaefer  
External Operations - Nuclear  
Delmarva Power & Light Company  
P.O. Box 231  
Wilmington, DE 19899

Maryland  
Ms. R. A. Kankus  
Joint Owner Affairs  
PECO Energy Company  
965 Chesterbrook Blvd., 63C-5  
Wayne, PA 19087

Public Service Commission of  
Engineering Division  
Chief Engineer  
6 St. Paul Centre  
Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Mr. Elbert Simpson  
Senior Vice President - Nuclear Engineering  
Nuclear Department  
P.O. Box 236  
Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY  
SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2  
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311  
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. DPR-70 and DPR-75 issued to Public Service Electric and Gas Company (the licensee) for operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Salem County, New Jersey.

The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.3.2.1, "Engineered Safety Feature Actuation System Instrumentation" to reflect a revised setpoint for the interlock designated P-12.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, 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 amendment 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 amendment 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 change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

This change to the Technical Specifications does not involve any physical changes to the plant or any procedures changes.

There is no safety consequence to the [safety injection] SI function being enabled at 543 °F. The  $T_{avg}$  no-load temperature is at 547 °F with increasing  $T_{avg}$  for higher power operation. The allowable value of 545 °F as the upper limit assures the availability of the SI function, therefore, the protective function will perform within its analyzed range. On increasing temperature, P-12 automatically enables SI in both High Steamline Flow coincident with Low-Low  $T_{avg}$  and High Steamline Flow coincident with Low Steamline Pressure. It also provides an arming signal to the Steam Dump System.

On decreasing temperature, P-12 permits manual block of SI in both High Steamline Flow coincident with Low-Low  $T_{avg}$  and High Steamline Flow coincident with Low Steamline Pressure. This permits blocking of the SI below the minimum temperature for criticality during a controlled shutdown. With a 2 °F allowable deviation from the nominal setpoint, the setpoint of 543 °F is adequate to enable the operator to block SI.

Hardware design of the [engineered safety feature actuation system] ESFAS provides that actuation of the SI block, enable, and ESFAS protection system operations are all provided by the same bistables. The analyses were performed supporting the design of the ESFAS system.

Revision of the P-12 setpoint to enable manual block of SI from 541 °F to 543 °F does not impact the safety analyses. SI is available at or above the  $T_{avg}$  no-load value of 547 °F, which is consistent with the setpoint for Low-Low  $T_{avg}$  in TS Table 3.3-4. Retaining the allowable value of 541 °F is also consistent with Table 3.3-4. The proposed revisions do not affect the integrity of the fuel assembly or reactor internals such that their function in the control of radiological consequences is affected. In addition, the proposed revisions do not affect any fission product barrier. The proposed revision does not change, degrade, or prevent the response of safety related mitigation systems to accident scenarios, as described in the [Final Safety Analysis Report] FSAR.

Therefore the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

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

The proposed changes to the TS setpoints for P-12 do not create failure modes that could adversely impact safety-related equipment or cause the initiation of any accident. The P-12 interlock circuit pertains to accident mitigation systems and not accident initiation. Functions of safety related systems and components, which are related to accident mitigation, have not been altered.

The proposed TS setpoint change does not cause the initiation of any accident or create any new credible failure in the system. The proposed revisions do not result in any malfunction of equipment previously evaluated. The proposed revisions do not result in increased probability of equipment failure scenarios previously deemed improbable.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, the revisions will not create the possibility of a malfunction of equipment important to safety different than previously evaluated in the FSAR.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Several different steamline break analyses are performed to support operation of the Salem units. Analyses are performed to determine the core response to postulated steamline breaks and to calculate mass and energy releases both inside and outside containment.

In the current licensing basis core response steamline break analysis, the High Steamline Flow coincident with Low-Low  $T_{avg}$  or Low Steamline Pressure protective functions are not modeled. As such, a change to the SI permissive has no impact on the analysis. Other SI signals generated from a postulated steamline break are credited in the analysis. Interlock P-12 is independent of these credited SI signals. Therefore, this change has no impact on the safety analysis.

The licensing basis steamline break mass and energy release safety analyses, inside and outside containment, for Salem Units 1 and 2 assumes the availability of the High Steamline Flow coincident with Low-Low  $T_{avg}$  or Low Steamline Pressure for actuation of SI and steamline isolation. However, no credit is taken for these trip

functions. The noted Technical Specification change is resolving a discrepancy between the permissive P-12 setpoint and the Low-Low  $T_{avg}$  setpoint. Even though this Low-Low  $T_{avg}$  function is available in the steamline break mass and energy release analyses, operation is not credited in the analyses.

There are no new safety analyses or revision[s] to any existing safety analyses as a result of these changes. In addition, the proposed change does not impact any input assumptions or results of any current licensing basis analyses for the design basis events. Therefore, there is no significant reduction in the margin of safety.

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 amendment 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 amendment 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 amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves 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 Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, 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 for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By August 22, 1996 , the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license 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 Practice 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 Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey. 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 specificity 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 amendment 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 amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

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

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 20555-0001, 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 John F. Stolz: 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 20555-0001, and to Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502, 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 amendment dated July 12, 1996, which is 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 Salem Free Public Library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of July 1996.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Donald S. Brinkman*

Donald S. Brinkman, Senior Project Manager  
Project Directorate I-2  
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation