



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 45 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-18

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-244

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 16, 1985, as supplemented on January 14, 1991, the Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (the licensee) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-18 for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. The proposed amendment would change the Ginna Technical Specifications (TS) Section 3.6.2 and its associated Bases to limit the containment internal pressure to 1 psig in lieu of the current 3 psig TS limit. The January 14, 1991, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

2.0 EVALUATION

The containment internal pressure limitations are based on a Westinghouse analysis, "Report for the BAST Concentration Reduction for R. E. Ginna," dated August 1985. BAST are the initials for the Boric Acid Storage Tank. This analysis has been approved in our License Amendment No. 33, dated March 30, 1989. We concluded that the containment design pressure limit of 60 psig would not be exceeded if the internal containment pressure prior to a major steam line break accident was limited to 1 psig. The requested decrease in initial internal containment pressure from 3 to 1 psig is in the conservative direction; therefore, it would be more unlikely that a major steam line break accident would cause the containment design pressure to exceed its limit of 60 psig. Based on the above analysis, we conclude that the change in TS Section 3.6.2 is acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the New York State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The NRC staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types,

9109060195 910828
PDR ADDCK 05000244
PDR

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 (50FR49792). Accordingly, 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 be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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.

Principal Contributor: R. Goel

Date: August 28, 1991