



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 41 TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-18

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION

R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-244

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application notarized November 16, 1977, (submitted by letter dated November 21, 1977), Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E) (the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. The proposed changes would remedy an existing inconsistency in the specifications regarding diesel generator testing.

2.0 EVALUATION

Existing Technical Specification 4.6.1 would require that, during testing, the Ginna diesel generators be loaded to their nameplate rating and that electrical loads not be increased beyond the long term rating of 1950 kW. However, the nameplate rating is 2500 KVA at 80% power factor, the equivalent of 2000 kW, which is in excess of the long-term limit. To remedy this inconsistency, RG&E has proposed that the limits be modified such that each generator is loaded to at least 1950 kW but less than the two-hour rating of 2250 kW.

The NRC staff's present guidance is contained in Regulatory Guide 1.108, "Periodic Testing of Diesel Generator Units Used as Onsite Electric Power Systems at Nuclear Power Plants". The applicable portion of this Guide calls for demonstration of full-load-carrying capability (continuous rating) at an interval of no more than 31 days. Because the proposed change conforms to this guidance and because it will remedy the inconsistency noted above, we have found it to be acceptable.

In addition to the above specification, RG&E proposed the addition of several other specifications related to diesel generator operability. We have reviewed these specifications and have concluded that they add to the assurance that the diesel generators will operate as required. Because they enhance diesel generator operability and because they improve upon the existing specifications, we have found them to be acceptable.

8105120484

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the proposed amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types, increase in total amounts of effluents, or an increase in power level, and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact, and, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

We also conclude, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration; (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner; and (3) 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 the health and safety of the public.

Date: April 23, 1981