

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-75

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY,
PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY,
DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, AND
ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-311

On May 20, 1981, a license was issued to Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G), et.al. authorizing operation of the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 2 at 100 percent power (3411 megawatts thermal). Pursuant to the findings from a review of PSE&G's cable interaction study the Facility Operating License was conditioned to require the completion by specified dates of certain activities related to Fire Protection. On July 10, 1981, PSE&G submitted a letter requesting an extension for portions of this schedule.

An on-site review of PSE&G's fire interaction study was conducted from April 30, 1981 to May 7, 1981 by a team of NRC personnel. The team's report, documented in Supplement No. 6 to Salem Safety Evaluation Report, concluded that "the fire protection measures are adequate for continued operation of Unit 1 and for issuance of a (full power) license with appropriate license conditions for Unit 2..." This report was the genesis of the license conditions contained in paragraph 2.C(10) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-75.

Since the issuance of the license for full power operation, PSE&G has completed action on the fire protection measures which were required to be in place prior to operating above five percent rated thermal power. The remaining modifications identified in the review team's report were recommended for completion in accordance with PSE&G's cable wrap schedule. By separate correspondence dated May 14, 1981, PSE&G established July 31, 1981 as its scheduled date for completion of cable wrapping. This schedule provided reasonable assurance that the added modifications would be completed in a timely fashion and was incorporated into the associated license conditions in the Facility Operating License No. DPR-75.

Based upon current PSE&G estimates, the cable wrap schedule may be impacted by the addition of any further corrective actions identified during the final stages of PSE&G's internal fire protection review. Because of the extensive nature of this review and the benefits derived from the identification of any deficiencies over and above those noted in the NRC team report, the staff concludes that a two week extension of its original schedule is warranted.

8108100121 810720
PDR ADCK 05000311
PDR

In addition to the specified modifications, PSE&G was required to complete a final engineering verification of the fire protection analysis and corrective actions by July 15, 1981. PSE&G has stated that its report of this review has involved the preparation of extensive documentation including 190 new drawings, and that this effort has been somewhat hampered by limited plant access during operations. Therefore, PSE&G has requested an extension in the schedule for completion of this review. Because of the extensiveness of this review, its confirmatory nature, and the substantial benefits it provides, the staff concludes that a two week extension in the original schedule is warranted and will cause no undue risk to the health and safety of the public.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does 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 amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR Section 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.

Conclusion

We have concluded, 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 to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: July 20, 1981

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶