

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 4 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-18

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-244

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated March 30, 1984, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E or licensee) requested an amendment to the Appendix A Technical Specifications appended to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-18 for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. The proposed changes would revise notification and reporting requirements, as requested by NRC Generic Letter 83-43 dated December 19, 1983, to be consistent with the new requirements in 10 CFR Parts 50.72 and 50.73. In addition, the changes would delete certain environmental qualification schedule and documentation requirements, which have been superseded by new requirements in 10 CFR Part 50.49.

A Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing related to the requested action was published in the Federal Register on May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21837). No requests for hearing and no public comments were received.

Subsequently, on December 10, 1984, the Appendix A Technical Specifications was reissued in its entirety and appended to (full-term) Facility Operating License No. DPR-18 for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. Therefore, the proposed changes, as originally requested, have been revised in format to be consistent with the reissued R. E. Ginna Technical Specifications. Also, two typographical corrections were made to the original changes requested by RG&E, as discussed with and agreed to by Dr. R. Mecredy of the licensee's staff.

EVALUATION

Currently, Administrative Controls Specification 6.9.2 "Reportable Occurrences" requires the licensee to report certain types of events either by prompt notification with written follow-up or in thirty day written reports. The proposed revisions which bring the Ginna Technical Specifications in conformance with new requirements in 10 CFR Parts 50.72 and 50.73 include adding Definition 1.19 "Reportable Event", deleting unnecessary and conflicting references to reporting requirements in the Limiting Conditions for Operations and Surveillance Requirements sections (or otherwise revising previous reporting requirements in these sections), and revising the Administrative Controls sections to reference 10 CFR Part 50.73 and to delete the previous reporting requirements, now unnecessary or conflicting.

8506120321 850607
PDR ADDCK 05000244
P PDR

Administrative Controls Specification 6.14 "Environmental Qualification" describes the implementation schedule and records requirements for environmental qualification of all safety-related electrical equipment in the facility. Specification 6.10.2.m requires records for environmental qualification to be retained for the duration of the facility operating license. The proposed revisions delete these requirements from the Technical Specifications, since schedule and documentation requirements for environmental qualification of electrical equipment are superseded by 10 CFR Part 50.49, which was effective June 30, 1982. The deletion of these requirements from the R. E. Ginna Technical Specifications is consistent with final rulemaking by the Commission, as published in the Federal Register on November 15, 1984 (49 FR 45114).

The staff has evaluated the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications and concludes that these changes are administrative and do not involve any physical change to the plant's safety-related structures, systems or components. Further, these changes do not increase the likelihood of a malfunction of safety-related equipment, or increase the consequences of an accident previously analyzed or create the possibility of a malfunction different from those previously evaluated. Therefore, based on the above, the staff finds the licensee requested changes to revise event reporting requirements and environmental qualification schedule and documentation requirements to be acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves changes in recordkeeping, reporting or administrative procedures or requirements. This amendment also involves changes in schedule requirements with respect to installation or use of facility electrical components located within the restricted area, as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant change in the types, and no significant increase in the amounts, of any effluents that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational 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) and (10). 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.

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; 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.

DATED: June 7, 1985

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Donald R. Haverkamp, NRC Region I, and C. Miller prepared this Safety Evaluation.

LICENSE AUTHORITY FILE COPY
UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

T. Barnhart
DO NOT REMOVE
Posted
Basis Change
to DPR-18

May 30, 1985

Packet No. 50-244
LS05-85-05-036

Mr. Roger W. Kober, Vice President
Electric and Steam Production
Rochester Gas & Electric Corporation
89 East Avenue
Rochester, New York 14649

Dear Mr. Kober:

SUBJECT: DELETION OF INFORMATION PERTAINING TO DEFINITION OF HOT
CHANNEL FACTORS

Re: R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant

By letter dated July 17, 1984, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E), submitted a request for an amendment to the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant Technical Specifications (TS) contained in Appendix A of Facility Operating License No. DPR-18. This request was submitted to provide consistency in the basis for TS 2.1. Changes to basis sections of TS do not require license amendments.

The staff has reviewed the proposed changes to the basis of TS 2.1 and as discussed in the enclosed Safety Evaluation finds them acceptable.

Enclosed are the revised pages which modifies the basis for TS 2.1 in accordance with your request.

Sincerely,

John A. Paulson
John A. Zwolinski, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #5
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

1. Revised Basis Pages
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures:
See next page

010540411

Mr. Roger W. Kober
Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation

R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant

cc
Harry H. Voigt, Esquire
LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby and MacRae
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ezra Bialik
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Protection Bureau
New York State Department of Law
2 World Trade Center
New York, New York 10047

Resident Inspector
R.E. Ginna Plant
c/o U.S. NRC
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, New York 14519

Stanley B. Klimberg, Esquire
General Counsel
New York State Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Regional Administrator
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region I Office
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Supervisor of the Town of Ontario
1850 Ridge Road
Ontario, New York 14519

Jay Dunkleberger
Division of Policy Analysis & Planning
New York State Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region II Office
ATTN: Regional Radiation Representative
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007

parameter during reactor operation. Therefore, the observable parameters, thermal power, reactor coolant temperature and pressure have been related to DNB through the W-3 and/or WRB-1 DNB correlation. These DNB correlations have been developed to predict the DNB flux and the location of DNB for axially uniform and non-uniform heat flux distributions. The local DNB heat flux ratio, defined as the ratio of the heat flux that would cause DNB at a particular core location to the local heat flux, is indicative of the margin to DNB. A minimum value of the DNB ratio, MDNBR, is specified so that during steady state operation, normal operational transients and anticipated transients, there is a 95% probability at a 95% confidence level that DNB will not occur.⁽¹⁾ The curves of Figure 2.1-1 represent the loci of points of thermal power, coolant system pressure and average temperature for which this minimum DNB value is satisfied. The area of safe operation is below these lines.

Since it is possible to have somewhat greater enthalpy rise hot channel factors at part power than at full power due to the deeper control bank insertion which is permitted at part power, a conservative allowance has been made in obtaining the curves in Figure 2.1-1 for an increase in $F_{\Delta H}^N$ with decreasing power levels. Rod withdrawal block and load runback occurs before reactor trip set points are reached.

The Reactor Control and Protective System is designed to prevent any anticipated combination of transient conditions for reactor coolant system temperature, pressure and thermal power level that

would result in there being less than a 95% probability at a 95% confidence level that DNB would not occur. (2)

(1) FSAR, Section 3.2.2

(2) Safety Evaluation for R.E. Ginna Transition to 14 x 14 Optimized Fuel Assemblies, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, November 1983.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING BASES CHANGE

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-244

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated July 17, 1984, the Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E), licensee for the R. E. Ginna Plant, submitted a request (Ref. 1) for an amendment to the Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A of Facility Operating License No. DPR-18 to provide consistency in the basis for Technical Specification 2.1. In the amendment request for the Cycle 14 reload (Ref. 2), the licensee had intended to delete the appropriate portions of pages 2.1-2 and 2.1-3. The information on pages 2.1-2 and 2.1-3 identifies the nuclear hot channel factors which formed the basis for the previous safety limit curves, which are no longer applicable. The correct basis is identified on the pages changed. The purpose of the change, in which pages 2.1-2 and 2.1-3 are to be removed and replaced by new pages 2.1-2 and 2.1-3, is to remedy the inconsistency by deleting the incorrect information on pages 2.1-2 and 2.1-3. In addition, a revised reference to recognize the use of the Westinghouse optimized fuel assemblies is provided in the new page 2.1-3.

It should be noted that changes to basis sections of Technical Specifications do not require license amendments.

2.0 EVALUATION

The information on pages 2.1-2 and 2.1-3 of the current Technical Specifications Basis has nuclear hot channel factors which the licensee has requested to be deleted. The correct values for the nuclear hot channel factors exist in the current Technical Specifications in Section 3.10.2.2 on page 3.10-3 which were approved in Amendment 61 of the Provisional Operating License (POL). The change is administrative in nature as the licensee did not explicitly identify this portion in its previous submittal and therefore the NRC did not approve this change in the issuance of Amendment 61 of the POL dated May 1, 1984. The licensee has also deleted obsolete references and substituted a reference for the current use of the Westinghouse optimized fuel assemblies. The staff has found these changes acceptable.



3.0 CONCLUSION

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that the requested changes to the basis section of 2.1 are acceptable.

4.0 REFERENCES

1. Letter from R. W. Kober, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, to H. R. Denton, MPC, July 17, 1984.
2. Letter from J. E. Maier, Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation to H. R. Denton, NRC, December 20, 1983.

5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

H. Balukjian and C. Miller prepared this Safety Evaluation.

Dated: May 30, 1985.

