



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 29 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

On February 8, 1988, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation proposed revisions to the Technical Specifications associated with monitoring releases through the containment mini-purge system and to clarify action statements following inoperability of the mini-purge system for 31 days.

2.0 EVALUATION

Technical Specification Amendment No. 24, dated October 27, 1987, approved the GINNA mini-purge system and requirements for operations. The existing 48 inch containment purge system was isolated and it can only be utilized at cold or refueling shutdown. This system is now called Shutdown Purge in the proposed amendment. The mini-purge system is designed to pass through charcoal and HEPA filters and to exhaust into the plant vent. Since the mini-purge system is connected to the plant vent and the flow is small compared to the shutdown purge air flow or the plant ventilation air flows, the mini-purge is operated in accordance with the plant ventilation requirements and is also designed for automatic isolation capability for radioactivity releases. This amendment proposes to clarify the operational requirements for plant ventilation, with and without mini-purge, and shutdown purge. The changes are consistent with the previously established guidance under Amendment No. 24. The clarification specifies required actions that will be taken by the operator, including the required action should the 31 day period of inoperability occur. Existing radioactive limitations will continue to be applicable and isolation of the system will occur through existing protective features.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use 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 this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has

8807120449 880623
PDR ADOCK 05000244
P PDR

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 CONCLUSION

The staff has evaluated the licensee's request to revise the Technical Specifications to correct an inconsistency associated with the monitoring of the containment mini-purge releases, and to clarify actions following inoperability for 31 days.

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 the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: June 23, 1988

Principal Contributor: Carl Stahle