



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENTS 43 AND 35 TO LICENSE NOS. DPR-31 AND DPR-41
FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
TURKEY POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 3 AND 4
DOCKET NOS. 50-250 AND 50-251

By applications dated October 21, 1976, and July 5, 11 and 26, and November 1, 1977 Florida Power and Light Company (FPL) requested amendments to Operating Licenses DPR-31 and DPR-41 for Turkey Point Unit Nos. 3 and 4. The applications are in support of requests that (1) specify the qualification requirements for Health Physics Supervisors, (2) delete the existing requirements for an Annual Operating Report, (3) reflect additional batteries and battery chargers, (4) update the use of respiratory protective equipment, (5) extend the time period for approval of temporary changes to procedures. In addition, we have added a footnote that was inadvertently dropped from page B3.2-6, we have added p. 6-22 which was inadvertently omitted from Amendments 42 and 34, and we have corrected a typographical error on p. 1-1 and 4-3 in Amendments 41 and 33. During our review of the FPL proposals for these amendments, we found that certain changes were necessary to meet our requirements. The FPL staff agreed to these changes and they have been incorporated in these amendments.

Discussion and Evaluation

(1) Qualification requirements for Health Physics Supervisors.

On March 2, 1977 we sent a letter to FPL regarding the requirements for an individual qualified in radiation protection. This letter included the staff position regarding the criteria for "Individuals Qualified in Radiation Protection Procedures". We also noted that the Turkey Point Facility Technical Specifications do not require that the incumbent performing the function of Health Physics Supervisor meet the minimum qualification requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.8, September 1975.

By letter dated July 11, 1977 FPL responded to our request to revise the Turkey Point, Unit Nos. 3 and 4 Technical Specifications to require the presence on site of an individual qualified in radiation procedures anytime fuel is in either reactor and to establish the minimum qualifications of the Health Physics Supervisor to the requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.8, September 1975. The response proposed a new Section 6.3.2 to the Technical Specifications to specify Health Physics Supervisor qualification requirements as requested by the staff. The changes are additional administrative controls and, with a change to include NRC concurrence on any exceptions, which the FPL staff agreed to, conform to our current guidance, thus are acceptable.

(2) Deletion of the requirement for an Annual Operating Report. -

After two years of experience with the reporting requirements for nuclear power reactors, we reviewed the scope of information licensees have been required to submit in the Licensee Event Report (LER), Annual Operating Report, Monthly Operating Report and the Startup Report. Based on our review of LER's we developed a modified format for the LER to make this document more useful for evaluation purposes. By letters sent in July and August 1977, we informed licensees of the new LER format and requested that they use it.

From our review of all licensee reports we determined that much of the information found in the Annual Operating Reports either is addressed in the LER's or Monthly Operating Reports; both of which are submitted in a more timely manner, or could be included in these reports with only a slight augmentation of the information already supplied. Therefore we concluded that the Annual Operating Report could be deleted as a Technical Specification requirement if certain additional information were to be provided in the Monthly Operating Reports. As a result, in September 1977, we sent letters to licensees informing them that a revised and improved format for Monthly Operating Reports was available and requested that they use it. Licensees were informed that if they agreed to use the revised format they should request deletion of the requirement for an Annual Operating Report except that occupation exposure data must still be submitted. On November 1, 1977 FPL submitted an amendment request which proposed to delete the requirement for an Annual Operating Report in accordance with our request.

The FPL's proposed amendment would delete all but one of the four specified items in the Annual Operating Report, the report which tabulates occupation exposure on an annual basis is needed and therefore, the requirement to submit this information has been retained. We have determined that the failed fuel examination information does not need to be supplied routinely by licensees because this historical data can be obtained in a compiled form from fuel vendors when needed. The information concerning forced reductions in power and outages will be supplied in the revised Monthly Operating Report rather than annually. The licensee has committed to use the revised Monthly Operating Report format beginning with its report for January 1978 as requested. We requested, and the licensee agreed to, use of words consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications in Specification 6.9.1.c. We conclude that all needed information will be provided. Therefore, the proposed deletion of the Annual Operating Report except for occupational exposure data which will continue to be reported annually is acceptable.

(3) Additional batteries and battery chargers.

On July 26, 1977, FPL submitted an amendment request which would provide Technical Specifications for existing batteries and battery chargers, not covered in the existing Technical Specifications, for operation of engineered safety features. The number of batteries and battery chargers delineated in the Technical Specifications would be increased to four batteries per unit and six battery chargers per unit, of which four must be operable. This amendment request would update Specification 3.7 to fully reflect the "as-built" 125 volt DC system.

During a site visit, an NRC inspector noted that the DC power supply as indicated in the Technical Specification (Section 3.7) was not consistent with the DC power supply in the FSAR (Section 8.2) Revision Nos. 32 and 33 dated January 18, 1973 and March 30, 1973 respectively. The Safety Evaluation for Turkey Point Unit Nos. 3 and 4 dated March 15, 1972 (Section 7.4) concluded that the onsite power system (including the DC system) conforms to the General Design Criteria and is acceptable. Our evaluation indicates that the review of the DC power in March 1972 included batteries which were, by oversight, not included in the Technical Specifications. We conclude that the amendment request corrects an inadvertent omission and is acceptable.

(4) Respiratory Protection Equipment

On July 29, 1977 FPL was notified that on November 27, 1976 the Commission had published in the Federal Register an amended Section 20.103 of 10 CFR Part 20 which became effective on December 29, 1976. The letter advised FPL that, pursuant to 10 CFR 20.103(c) and (f), if they desired credit for use of respiratory protective equipment at the Turkey Point Facilities after December 28, 1977, such use must be as stipulated in Regulatory Guide 8.15 rather than in the current Technical Specifications. Based on the revocation provision (Section 6.12.3) of the Technical Specifications for Turkey Point Unit Nos. 3 and 4 and in the absence of prior written objection, per our letter of July 29, 1977, deletion of Section 6.12 of the Technical Specifications for Turkey Point Unit Nos. 3 and 4 is in order. This change is consistent with our amended regulation and we therefore find it acceptable.

(5) Time limit for approval of temporary changes to procedures.

On October 21, 1976, FPL submitted a request for amendment which would increase the time limit for the Plant Nuclear Safety Committee to review and for the Plant Superintendent - Nuclear to approve temporary changes to procedures from 7 days to 14 days. The proposed amendment is based on the Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Pressurized Reactors which includes those of the Turkey Point type. This change will have no deleterious effect on the safe operation of the facilities. We, therefore, find the change acceptable.

(6) Administratives Changes

In addition, we have added a footnote that was inadvertently dropped from page B3.2-6, we have added p.6-22 which was inadvertently omitted from Amendments 42 and 34, and we have corrected a typrographical error on p.1-1 and 4-3 in Amendments 41 and 43.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendments do not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendments involve 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 these amendments.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendments do 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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: February 15, 1979