



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 87 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-31
AND AMENDMENT NO. 81 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-41
FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
TURKEY POINT PLANT UNIT NOS. 3 AND 4
DOCKET NOS. 50-250 AND 50-251

Introduction

By letter dated December 30, 1980 Florida Power and Light Company (the licensee) submitted an amendment request related to the redundancy of the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) Systems for the Turkey Point Plant Unit Nos. 3 and 4. The request responds to a letter dated June 11, 1980 from D. G. Eisenhut. A related amendment request dated July 22, 1980 was discussed with the licensee staff and that request has been withdrawn.

Evaluation

The amendment request dated December 30, 1980 has been reviewed by an NRC contractor, EG&G. The Technical Evaluation Report (TER) has been reviewed by the staff and is incorporated in this Safety Evaluation Report (SER) by reference (copy attached).

The TER notes that, while the licensee has generally complied, there are departures from the model Technical Specifications (MTS) attached to the June 11, 1980 NRC letter. The Turkey Point Technical Specifications (TS) are not in the MTS format and, therefore, cannot be identical. In addition, the Turkey Point Plant predates the MTS and, therefore, some requirements are not identical. In our review we shall determine whether the differences are significant.

TS 3.4.2.a requires two RHR loops to be operable; if not they must be restored in 72 hours or be at a temperature of less than 350°F in 12 hours. This is somewhat different than the MTS but we find that there is no significant loss of safety margin and therefore acceptable.

Table 4.1.2 has no specific check for SG operability; however, the requirements for "Coolant loop operability" will cover this requirement adequately.

8208170138 820730
PDR ADDCK 05000250
P PDR



1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

Other minor departures are as follows:

1. TS 3.4 for the Turkey Point Plant maintains the core outlet temperature below 160°F rather than 140°F.
2. The Turkey Point Plant puts no time limit on removing RHR loop from service as the standard Technical Specifications do, rather it is controlled by temperature.
3. Finally, surveillance of the RHR loop in the Turkey Point Plant is done by checking core outlet temperature rather than flow rate.

We have reviewed these differences and find that they are plant specific design differences which are not significant and are, therefore, acceptable.

Summary

The proposed revisions to the TS 3.4-1 and Table 4.1.2 are necessary to comply with the NRC letter dated June 11, 1981. The changes provide for redundancy of residual heat removal systems to ensure adequate decay heat removal capability during all phases of reactor plant operation and are acceptable to the staff.

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 an accident previously evaluated, do not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, 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 the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: July 30, 1982

Principal Contributor:
M. Grotenhuis