May 21, 1987

Docket No.: 50-397

Mr. G. C. Sorensen, Manager
Regulatory Programs
Washington Public Power Supply System
P. O. Box 968
3000 George Washington Way
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Sorensen:

Subject: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-21 - WPPSS NUCLEAR PROJECT NO. 2 (TAC #63052)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 42 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-21 to the Washington Public Power Supply System for WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2, located in Benton County near Richland, Washington. This amendment is in response to your letters dated June 13, and 18, 1985 and October 7, 1986.

This amendment revises the WNP-2 Technical Specifications by removing a listing of containment penetration fuses and the surveillance requirement to test fuses functionally on a rotating basis.

A copy of the related safety evaluation supporting Amendment No. 42 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-21 is enclosed.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

Robert Samworth, Project Manager
Project Directorate V
Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV/V
& Special Projects

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 42 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-21
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

DRSP/PD5	DRSP/PD5	OGC	DRSP/PD5
JLee	RSamworth:cdd		GKnighton
5/11/87	5/13/87	5/15/87	5/21/87

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Mr. G. C. Sorensen, Manager
Washington Public Power Supply System

WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2
(WNP-2)

cc:
Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq.
Bishop, Cook, Purcell
& Reynolds
1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. G. E. Doupe, Esquire
Washington Public Power Supply System
P. O. Box 968
3000 George Washington Way
Richland, Washington 99532

Mr. Curtis Eschels, Chairman
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
Mail Stop PY-11
Olympia, Washington 98504

P. L. Powell, Licensing Manager
Washington Public Power Supply System
P. O. Box 968, MD 956B
Richland, Washington 99352

Mr. W. G. Conn
Burns and Roe, Incorporated
c/o Washington Public Power Supply
System
P. O. Box 968, MD 994E
Richland, Washington 99352

R. B. Glasscock, Director
Licensing and Assurance
Washington Public Power Supply System
P. O. Box 968, MD 280
Richland, Washington 99352

Mr. C. M. Powers
WNP-2 Plant Manager
Washington Public Power Supply System
P. O. Box MD 927M
Richland, Washington 99352

Regional Administrator, Region V (4)
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1450 Maria Lane, Suite 210
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Chairman
Benton County Board of Commissioners
Prosser, Washington 99350

DISTRIBUTION
Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
PD5 Reading
D. Crutchfield
G. M. Holahan
J. Lee
R. Samworth
J. Bradfute
OGC-Bethesda
D. Hagan
E. Jordan
J. Partlow
T. Barnhart (4)
W. Jones
E. Butcher
ACRS (10)
GPA/PA
ARM/LFMB
Region V - 4 cys)

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

WASHINGTON PUBLIC POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM

DOCKET NO. 50-397

WPPSS NUCLEAR PROJECT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 42
License No. NPF-21

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

   A. The application for amendment filed by the Washington Public Power Supply System (the Supply System, also the licensee), dated June 13 and 18, 1985 and October 7, 1986 complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance: (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the enclosure to this license amendment; and paragraph 2.C.(2) of the Facility Operating License No. NPF-21 is hereby amended to read as follows:

   (2) Technical Specifications and Environmental Protection Plan

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

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

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

Enclosure:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: May 21, 1987

May 21, 1987

ENCLOSURE TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 42

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-21

DOCKET NO. 50-397

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the enclosed pages. The revised pages are identified by Amendment number and contain a vertical line indicating the area of change.

REMOVE	INSERT
3/4 8-22	3/4 8-22
3/4 8-23	3/4 8-23
3/4 8-24	3/4 8-24
B3/4 8-3	B3/4 8-3

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

2. By selecting and functionally testing a representative sample of at least 10% of each type of lower voltage circuit breakers. Circuit breakers selected for functional testing shall be selected on a rotating basis. Testing of these circuit breakers shall consist of injecting a current with a value equal to 300% of the pickup of the longtime delay trip element and 150% of the pickup of the short time delay trip element, and verifying that the circuit breaker operates within the time delay bandwidth for that current specified by the manufacturer. The instantaneous element shall be tested by injecting a current equal to ±20% of the pickup value of the element and verifying that the circuit breaker trips instantaneously with no intentional time delay. Molded case circuit breaker testing shall also follow this procedure except that generally no more than two trip elements, time delay and instantaneous, will be involved. Circuit breakers found inoperable during functional testing shall be restored to OPERABLE status prior to resuming operation. For each circuit breaker found inoperable during these functional tests, an additional representative sample of at least 10% of all the circuit breakers of the inoperable type shall also be functionally tested until no more failures are found or all circuit breakers of that type have been functionally tested.

b. At least once per 60 months by subjecting each circuit breaker to an inspection and preventive maintenance in accordance with procedures prepared in conjunction with its manufacturer's recommendations.

TABLE 3.8.4.2-1

PRIMARY CONTAINMENT PENETRATION CONDUCTOR
OVERCURRENT PROTECTIVE DEVICES

EQUIPMENT	PRIMARY PROTECTION		BACKUP PROTECTION	
a. 6900V Circuit Breakers				
RRC-P-1A	E-CB-RRA (Relay)		E-CB-S5 (Relay)	E-CB-N2/5 (Relay)
RRC-P-1B	E-CB-RRB (Relay		E-CB-S6 (Relay)	E-CB-N2/6 (Relay)
b. 480VAC Fused Disconnects				
MS-V-16	MC-8B-A	Fused	MC-8B	125ACB
RWCU-V-1	MC-8B-A	Fused	MC-8B	125ACB
RHR-V-9	MC-8B-A	Fused	MC-8B	125ACB
RCIC-V-63	MC-8B-A	Fused	MC-8B	125ACB
RCC-V-40	MC-8B-A	Fused	MC-8B	125ACB
RHR-V-123B	MC-8B-A	Fused	MC-8B	125ACB
RCIC-V-76	MC-8B-A	Fused	MC-8B	125ACB
RHR-V-123A	MC-8B-A	Fused	MC-8B	125ACB

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3/4.8.4 ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT PROTECTIVE DEVICES

Primary containment electrical penetrations and penetration conductors are protected by either deenergizing circuits not required during reactor operation or demonstrating the OPERABILITY of primary and backup overcurrent protection circuit breakers by periodic surveillance.

The surveillance requirements applicable to lower voltage circuit breakers provide assurance of breaker reliability by testing at least one representative sample of each manufacturers brand of circuit breaker. Each manufacturer's molded case and metal case circuit breakers are grouped into representative samples which are then tested on a rotating basis to ensure that all breakers are tested. If a wide variety exists within any manufacturer's brand of circuit breakers, it is necessary to divide that manufacturer's breakers into groups and treat each group as a separate type of breaker for surveillance purposes.

The bypassing of the motor-operated valve thermal overload protection continuously or during accident conditions ensures that the thermal overload protection will not prevent safety-related valves from performing their function. The surveillance requirements for demonstrating the bypassing of the thermal overload protection continuously and during accident conditions are in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.106 "Thermal Overload Protection for Electric Motors on Motor Operated Valves," Revision 1, March 1977.

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-21

WASHINGTON PUBLIC POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM

WPPSS NUCLEAR PROJECT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-397

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In letters dated June 13 and 18, 1985 and October 7, 1986, the licensee proposed changes to delete a surveillance test of fuses required by the technical specifications. Current technical specifications require functionally testing a representative sample of each type of fuse on a rotating basis. The functional test shall consist of a nondestructive resistance measurement test which demonstrates that the fuse meets its manufacturer's design criteria. Fuses found inoperable during the functional testing shall be replaced with OPERABLE fuses prior to resuming operation.

2.0 EVALUATION

The fuses used as overcurrent protective devices in the primary containment penetration conductor have a basic design, simple construction and passive operation and are, therefore, reliable overcurrent protective devices. The periodic surveillance test is intended to detect the variance in resistance of the fuses. However, a small variance in the resistance of the fuses is not reliably determined by periodic surveillance testing and would not be indicative of a truly degraded condition. Additionally, any surveillance testing could involve removing and replacing fuses as would a replacement requirement. This could decrease reliability of the fuses by increasing the inherent resistance and by increasing the risk of procedural errors and fuse damage. Therefore, the surveillance testing of the fuses does not improve the reliability of the overcurrent protective device and also does not provide any added assurance of safe plant operation. Based on the above evaluation, the proposed change to delete the surveillance testing of fuses is acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation and use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes in surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that this amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued

a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONTACT WITH STATE OFFICIAL

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (51 FR 41871) on November 19, 1986 and consulted with the State of Washington. No public comments were received, and the State of Washington did not have any comments.

5.0 CONCLUSION

We have 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.

Principal Contributor: Sang Rhow, NRR

Dated: May 21, 1987