PSE&G

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038

Nuclear Department

Ref: LCR-84-18

October 15, 1984

Director of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operations Reactors Branch 1
Division of Licensing

Gentlemen:

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES
UNIT NO. 2
SALEM GENERATING STATION
DOCKET NO. 50-311

In accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended and the regulations thereunder, we hereby transmit copies of our request for amendment and our analyses of the changes to Facility Operating License DPR-75 for Salem Generating Station, Unit No. 2.

This amendment request consists of a revision to Technical Specifications, Appendix A, Section 4.6.2.2d, regarding modification NaOH flow test criteria.

In accordance with the fee requirements of 10CRF170.21, a check in the amount of $150.00 is enclosed.

Pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.91, a copy of this request for amendment has been sent to the State of New Jersey as indicated below.

The Energy People

A001 w/check #150.00
#013105713

This submittal includes three (3) signed originals and forty (40) copies.

Sincerely,

E. A. Liden
Manager - Nuclear
Licensing and Regulation

Enclosure

C Mr. Donald C. Fischer
Licensing Project Manager

Mr. James Linville
Senior Resident Inspector

Mr. Frank Cosolito, Acting Chief
Bureau of Radiation Protection
Department of Environmental Protection
380 Scotch Road
Trenton, New Jersey 08628

Honorable Charles M. Oberly, III
Attorney General of the State of Delaware
Department of Justice
820 North French Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Ref: LCR-84-18

STATE OF NEW JERSEY)
) ss: COUNTY OF SALEM
COUNTY OF SALEM)

RICHARD A. UDERITZ, being duly sworn according to law deposes and says:

I am a Vice President of Public Service Electric and Gas Company, and as such, I find the matters set forth in our Request for Amendment dated October 15, 1984, are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

RICHARD A. UDERITZ

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 1st day of November, 1984

Donna G. Hitchner
Notary Public of New Jersey

DONNA G. HITCHNER
NOTARY PUBLIC OF NEW JERSEY
My Commission Expires March 24, 1987

My Commission expires on

ATTACHMENT TO LCR 84-18

Description of Change

sodium hydroxide

Revise Unit 2 Technical Specification requirement 4.6.2.2.d read "at least once per 5 years by verifying a NaOH solution flow rate of 12 ± 3 gpm from the spray additive tank through sample valve 2CS61 with the spray additive tank at 2.5 ± 0.5 psig."

Presently, a flow of 7.3 ± 0.7 gpm is specified.

Reason for Change

During testing in late 1980, a flow value of 11.9 gpm was recorded for Unit 1 and 12.5 gpm for Unit 2. These values exceeded the values of 7.3 ± 0.7 gpm specified in the Technical Specification for each Unit. Since the intent of the test is to verify that there is no flow obstruction between the tank and the sample valve, the "as found" results were evaluated by PSE&G and found to be satisfactory. The PSE&G review is documented in Safety Evaluation SGS/M-SE-074 Rev. 1.

The Unit 1 Technical Specification was changed to 12 ± 3 gpm through Amendment #29. The Unit 2 Technical Specifications were at that time in draft form. This item, along with many others, was discussed at meetings with the NRC to finalize the Unit 2 Technical Specifications, but apparently, it was not implemented with the original issue of the Unit 2 Technical Specifications. A recent review by station personnel detected this inconsistancy.

Significant Hazards Consideration Analysis

The purpose of the test, a gravity flow of NaOH solution from the spray additive tank through a sample line (valve 2CS61), is to demonstrate unobstructed flow of liquid NaOH solution out of the tank to the containment spray system eductors (The NaOH would then be added to the containment by the containment spray pumps). This specification change, thus, provides higher assurance that NaOH addition to the containment will occur if required. Since the change does not alter any system design, function or method of operation, there is no increase in the probability or consequences of any previously analyzed accident, no new accidents or malfunctions are created, and no margins of safety are decreased.

Since this change constitutes a more stringent surveillance requirement, it conforms to example (ii) of Examples of Amendments that are not Likely to Involve Significant Hazards Consideration as provided by the Commission in 48FR14870.