

January 13, 1989

Docket No.: STN 50-528

Mr. Donald B. Karner
Executive Vice President
Arizona Nuclear Power Project
Post Office Box 52034
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-2034

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
NRC & LPDRs
PD5 Reading
MVirgilio
JLee
MDavis
OGC (F/info only)
GPA/PA

DHagan
EJordan
BGrimes
TBarnhart (4)
Wanda Jones
EButcher
ACRS (10)
ARM/LFMB

Dear Mr. Karner:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE
NO. NPF-41, FOR THE PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION,
UNIT 1 (TAC NO. 71573)

The Commission has issued the subject Amendment, which is enclosed, to the Facility Operating License for Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1. The Amendment consists of a change to the Technical Specifications (Appendix A to the license) in response to your application transmitted by letter dated December 23, 1988.

The amendment revises Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 to allow continued operation of PVNGS Unit 1, until the end of the current cycle (approximately 3 months), without conducting any further exercise tests of control element assembly (CEA) No. 64.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. The Safety Evaluation makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next regular biweekly Federal Register notice. The period for members of the public to request a hearing on this issue expires on January 18, 1989.

Sincerely,

original signed by

Michael J. Davis, Project Manager
Project Directorate V
Division of Reactor Projects - III,
IV, V and Special Projects

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 42 to NPF-41
2. Safety Evaluation

cc: See next page

SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCES.

DRSP/PD5
JLee
1/12/89

DRSP/PD5 *rw*
MDavis:rw
1/12/89

OGC
CBarth
1/ 5/89

DRSP/PD5
Wrighton
1/12/89

DRSP/PD5
TChan
1/4/89

8901260096 890113
PDR ADOCK 05000528
P PDC

*DF01
1/1*



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

January 13, 1989

Docket No.: STN 50-528

Mr. Donald B. Karner
Executive Vice President
Arizona Nuclear Power Project
Post Office Box 52034
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-2034

Dear Mr. Karner:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE
NO. NPF-41, FOR THE PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION,
UNIT 1 (TAC NO. 71573)

The Commission has issued the subject Amendment, which is enclosed, to the Facility Operating License for Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1. The Amendment consists of a change to the Technical Specifications (Appendix A to the license) in response to your application transmitted by letter dated December 23, 1988.

The amendment revises Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 to allow continued operation of PVNGS Unit 1, until the end of the current cycle (approximately 3 months), without conducting any further exercise tests of control element assembly (CEA) No. 64.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. The Safety Evaluation makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next regular biweekly Federal Register notice. The period for members of the public to request a hearing on this issue expires on January 18, 1989.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Michael J. Davis", is positioned above the typed name.

Michael J. Davis, Project Manager
Project Directorate V
Division of Reactor Projects - III,
IV, V and Special Projects

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 42 to NPF-41
2. Safety Evaluation

cc: See next page

Mr. Donald B. Karner
Arizona Nuclear Power Project
Executive Vice President
Post Office Box 52034
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-2034

Palo Verde

cc:

Arthur C. Gehr, Esq.
Snell & Wilmer
3100 Valley Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85073

Mr. James M. Flenner, Chief Counsel
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Charles R. Kocher, Esq. Assistant
Council
James A. Boeletto, Esq.
Southern California Edison Company
P. O. Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770

Mr. Mark Ginsberg
Energy Director
Office of Economic Planning
and Development
1700 West Washington - 5th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Mr. Wayne Shirley
Assistant Attorney General
Bataan Memorial Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Mr. Tim Polich
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
HC-03 Box 293-NR
Buckeye, Arizona 85326

Regional Administrator, Region V
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1450 Maria Lane
Suite 210
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Ms. Lynn Bernabei
Government Accountability Project
of the Institute for Policy Studies
1901 Que Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Mr. Charles B. Brinkman, Manager
Washington Nuclear Operations
Combustion Engineering, Inc.
7910 Woodmont Avenue Suite 1310
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Arizona Nuclear Power Project

- 2 -

Palo Verde

cc:

Chairman
Arizona Corporation Commission
Post Office Box 6019
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency
ATTN: Ms. Clara Palovic, Librarian
4814 South 40 Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85040

Mr. Charles Tedford, Director
Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency
4814 South 40 Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85040

Chairman
Maricopa County Board of Supervisors
111 South Third Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85003



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

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, ET AL.

DOCKET NO. STN 50-528

PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 42
License No. NPF-41

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment, dated December 23, 1988, by the Arizona Public Service Company (APS) on behalf of itself and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, El Paso Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and Southern California Public Authority (licensees), 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;
 - 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;
 - 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 enclosure to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C(2) of Facility Operating License No. NPF-41 is hereby amended to read as follows:


8901260099 890113
PDR ADOCK 05000528
P PDC

(2) Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 42, and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, are hereby incorporated into this license. APS shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

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

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION


George W. Knighton, Director
Project Director V
Division of Reactor Projects - III,
IV, V and Special Projects

Enclosure:
Change to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: January 13, 1989

January 13, 1989

ENCLOSURE TO LICENSE AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-41

DOCKET NO. STN 50-528

Replace the following page of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the enclosed page. The revised page is identified by Amendment number and contains vertical lines indicating the area of change. Also to be replaced is the following overleaf page to the amended page.

Amendment-Page

3/4 1-22

Overleaf-Page

3/4 1-21

REACTIVITY CONTROL SYSTEMS

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION (Continued)

ACTION: (Continued)

- b) The SHUTDOWN MARGIN requirement of Specification 3.1.1.2 is determined at least once per 12 hours.

Otherwise, be in at least HOT STANDBY within 6 hours.

- d. With one full-length CEA inoperable due to causes other than addressed by ACTION a., above, but within its above specified alignment requirements, operation in MODES 1 and 2 may continue pursuant to the requirements of Specification 3.1.3.6.
- e. With one part-length CEA inoperable and inserted in the core, operation may continue provided the alignment of the inoperable part length CEA is maintained within 6.6 inches (indicated position) of all other part-length CEAs in its group and the CEA is maintained pursuant to the requirements of Specification 3.1.3.7.

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.1.3.1.1 The position of each full-length and part-length CEA shall be determined to be within 6.6 inches (indicated position) of all other CEAs in its group at least once per 12 hours except during time intervals when one CEAC is inoperable or when both CEACs are inoperable, then verify the individual CEA positions at least once per 4 hours.

4.1.3.1.2 Each full-length CEA not fully inserted and each part-length CEA which is inserted in the core shall be determined to be OPERABLE by movement of at least 5 inches in any one direction at least once per 31 days.*

*With the exception that CEA #64 is exempt from this surveillance requirement for the remainder of Cycle 2 operations (i.e., until restart from the second refueling outage).



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-41
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, ET. AL.
PALO VERDE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT 1
DOCKET NO. STN 50-528

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 23, 1988, the Arizona Public Service Company (APS) on behalf of itself, the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, Southern California Edison Company, El Paso Electric Company, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and Southern California Public Power Authority (licensees), requested a change to the Technical Specifications for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (Appendix A to Facility Operating License No. NPF-41). The proposed change would revise Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 to exempt control element assembly (CEA) #64 from further exercise tests for the remainder of Cycle 2 operations (approximately 3 months).

The licensees requested that this proposed change be processed expeditiously because unnecessary challenges to plant safety would be avoided if the requested change is granted prior to the next required performance of the CEA exercise test. In accordance with the existing Technical Specifications, the next test would be required on or before January 14, 1989.

2.0 DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

The NRC staff has evaluated the proposed changes and concludes that they are acceptable. The staff's evaluation is given below.

During the last three performances of the monthly CEA Exercise Test (41ST-1SF01) CEA #64 has experienced slippage. This results in perturbations in the core power distribution which could cause a reactor trip.

Licensee investigations have determined that the cause of the CEA slippage is an intermittent ground on the coil of the lower gripper assembly of CEA #64. The ground occurs immediately following the voltage increase associated with energizing the lower lift coil, thereby placing a load on the lower gripper assembly. The magnitude of the ground varies, so slippage does not occur on every movement of CEA #64. When slippage does occur it is because the ground is large enough to degrade coil voltage sufficiently to allow the lower gripper assembly to disengage from the CEA drive shaft. Slippage will then occur until the upper or lower gripper assembly sufficiently engages the drive shaft.

8901260102 890113
PDR ADCK 05000528
P FDC

Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 requires that each full-length CEA not fully inserted and each part-length CEA which is inserted in the core shall have its operability determined by movement of at least 5 inches every 31 days. This CEA exercise test helps to ensure that CEAs are not untrippable due to excessive friction or mechanical interference. Adequate shutdown margin is assured if all CEAs are properly positioned and capable of dropping into the core when required.

The licensees stated in their submittal that all performances of the CEA motion test to date show that CEA #64 can be inserted into the core. Also, CEA #64 has fallen into the core as required during each of the six reactor trip events Unit 1 has experienced during the current operating cycle.

The licensees' analysis also stated the following:

"It is unlikely that an obstruction would develop between now and the end of the current cycle that would render CEA #64 untrippable. However, even if CEA #64 would not drop into the core when required, this condition is within the bounds of the safety analyses. All analyses in which shutdown CEA reactivity is critical require that the most reactive CEA be assumed to remain stuck outside the core (refer to Section 15.0.3.3.3 of the CESSAR FSAR). In addition, SHUTDOWN MARGIN (as defined in Technical Specification Bases Section 3/4.1.1) would not be adversely affected by this change because it is determined by considering a single malfunction resulting in the highest worth CEA failing to insert."

The staff concurs with the licensees' analysis. CEA #64 is part of shutdown group 'B' and is located on the periphery of the core. CEA #64 should remain trippable since the degraded lower gripper coil will remain de-energized during steady state operation and reactor trip events. The coil is only energized when CEA insertion or withdrawal is attempted. Therefore, shutdown margin would not be adversely affected by this change. However, should CEA #64 become stuck prior to the end of the current operating cycle, the question of adequate shutdown margin for continued operation would constitute an unreviewed safety question and would require a separate analysis.

Exempting CEA #64 from further rod motion testing for approximately three months until the end of the current operating cycle would eliminate the possibility of an unnecessary challenge to plant safety systems by precluding the possibility of a dropped CEA. The licensees plan to replace the lower gripper coil during the upcoming refueling outage.

On the basis of the above evaluation, the staff concludes that the proposed change to Technical Specifications Surveillance Requirement 4.1.3.1.2 is acceptable. Further, the staff agrees that exigent circumstances are present in that performance of the CEA exercise test would be an unnecessary challenge to plant safety.

3.0 FINAL NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION

The Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92 state that the Commission may make a final determination that a license amendment involves no significant hazards considerations if operation of the facility in accordance with the amendment would not:

- (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any 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 or safety.

This amendment has been evaluated against the standards in 10 CFR 50.92. A discussion of these standards as they relate to the amendment request follows:

Standard 1 - Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change authorizes no design or operational changes. CEA #64 should remain capable of being inserted into the core when required. CEA #64 has been shown to be capable of insertion during all previous performances of the rod motion test and has fallen into the core during each of the six reactor trip events during the current operating cycle. Even if CEA #64 would not drop into the core as required, this condition is within the bounds of the safety analyses, which assume that the most reactive CEA remains stuck outside the core. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Standard 2 - Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment does not vary, affect or provide any physical changes to the facility. Therefore, it would not introduce new systems, modes of operation, failure modes or other plant perturbations. The lower gripper coil for CEA-64 would only be energized during CEA inward or outward motion. The coil is not energized when the reactor is tripped nor during steady state operation. Therefore, the requested Technical Specification change will not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than those already evaluated in the FSAR.

Standard 3 - Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The requested amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the proposed change does not affect the design basis of the plant. CEA #64 is expected to remain trippable for the remainder of the current operating cycle. In the event that it does not trip on demand, the safety analyses already address the condition where the single most reactive CEA fails to drop into the core during design basis events.

The staff, therefore, has determined that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that this amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

4.0 CONTACT WITH STATE OFFICIAL

The Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency has been advised of the proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration with regard to this change. No comments were received.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

This amendment involves changes to surveillance requirements of a 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. According, the 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 or environmental assessment need to be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

6.0 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public. We, therefore, conclude that the proposed change is acceptable.

Principal Contributor: M. Davis

Dated: January 13, 1989