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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 44 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 May 26, 1981 (submitted by letter dated May 29, 1981), Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (RG&E) (the licensee) requested changes to the technical specifications for the R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. These proposed changes included modification of the table of safety-related hydraulic shock suppressors (snubbers) and modification of the existing requirement that the NRC staff be notified prior to removal of any snubber (installation did not require notification).

2.0 DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

The proposed physical changes to systems at Ginna, as covered by this Safety Evaluation and as reflected in the proposed changes to the technical specifications are: (a) One hydraulic snubber was added to the steam supply piping for the turbine driven auxiliary feedwater pump; (b) eight hydraulic snubbers were added to the pressurizer safety and relief piping; and (c) four existing hydraulic snubbers were replaced with mechanical snubbers.

Related to these physical changes and of equal importance was the requested change to the specifications to allow removal of existing snubbers without prior NRC approval. Such approval had been specifically required in the original technical specifications, although licensees were free to add snubbers when necessary. Their addition is to be reported in a subsequent technical specification change request. This action was considered necessary by the NRC during the initial issuance of the hydraulic snubber technical specifications in 1976 and 1977, simply because of the large number of hydraulic snubber failures then being reported and because of NRC concern that removal of snubbers without requisite analysis could degrade existing margins. The NRC staff has also become concerned about failures of

mechanical snubbers. Applicable technical specification inspection requirements have been addressed in a March 23, 1981 NRC letter to all Systematic Evaluation Program licensees. Mechanical snubber specifications will be the subject of separate correspondence.

RG&E has undertaken a significant program designed to upgrade the seismic capability of the Ginna plant. The proposed physical changes are the result of the extensive reanalysis and more changes are anticipated as analysis continues. Portions of this program will be reviewed by the Systematic Evaluation Program Branch as part of its audit of the plant's seismic design. However, in order to facilitate necessary changes to the plant resulting from the reanalysis, a change to the specifications is considered necessary to allow timely removal of snubbers determined by analysis to be unnecessary. We concur and conclude that, since their removal will be based on analysis which will be reported to the NRC as part of the Ginna annual report pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59, the administrative change to the technical specifications is acceptable for the duration of the seismic upgrade program. We also conclude that the physical actions taken to date as part of the seismic upgrade meet the intent of the existing technical specifications and thus are acceptable.

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: June 30, 1981