



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 57 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-40

OMAHA PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT
FORT CALHOUN STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-285

Introduction and Background

The staff's review of Omaha Public Power District's (OPPD) request dated April 19, 1976 concerning the spent fuel storage pool concluded that additional restrictions should be placed on the Auxiliary Building Crane to preclude a spent fuel shipping cask drop accident. The staff's approval of this request by Amendment No. 13 on July 2, 1976 contained Interim Special Technical Specification 6.2 which prohibits the lifting of a spent fuel shipping cask with this crane until the staff completes its review of analyses and modifications performed on the crane. By application dated May 19, 1980, OPPD submitted supporting justification for allowing the lifting of a spent fuel shipping cask and requested that Specification 6.2 be deleted.

The staff has been aware of a number of clerical mistakes, inconsistencies and superceded or outdated requirements in the Operating License and Technical Specifications. We have, therefore, included changes in this license amendment to remove these sources of confusion.

Evaluation

I. Auxiliary Building Crane

By application dated May 19, 1980, OPPD provided a Safety Analysis Report for Handling a Spent Fuel Shipping Cask and requested that Interim Special Technical Specification 6.2 be deleted so that depleted incore detectors, stored in the fuel storage pool, can be removed for waste disposal. The report describes the crane and the modifications which had been made; it also includes an Appendix B Supplement to Generic Licensing Topical Report EDR-1. The staff's review of this report showed that the Fort Calhoun Crane had been modified in accordance with the Ederer, Incorporated Topical Report EDR-1 which was approved by letter dated January 2, 1980 from R. L. Baer, NRC to C. W. Clark, Jr., Ederer, Incorporated. The staff further found that: 1) there is assurance that a single failure in the hoisting or braking system will not result in the loss of

the crane's capability to safely retain a critical load, and 2) the crane structure, including the bridge, is designed and qualified for the Design Earthquake and the Maximum Credible Earthquake while supporting the critical load.

In addition to Specification 6.2, the Fort Calhoun Technical Specifications contain a restriction on the movement of heavy loads over irradiated fuel in the fuel storage pool. This Specification (2.11) will remain in effect and preclude damage to irradiated fuel elements in the unlikely event a spent fuel shipping cask should be accidentally dropped. The staff is also continuing its review of the control of heavy loads and, by letter dated December 22, 1980, sent all licensees revised requirements and positions; any changes to Specification 2.11 will be considered separately upon completion of our review of the information requested in that letter.

Since the crane has been modified to meet the staff's requirements and since provisions exist to preclude damage to irradiated fuel, the staff finds the proposal to remove the interim restriction on lifting a spent fuel cask to be acceptable.

II. Clerical Corrections

The staff has reviewed the Operating License and the Technical Specifications for clerical errors and problems and has made the following changes with the concurrence of the licensee.

A. Operating License

License Condition 3. contains a number of additional conditions which are numbered 3.A., B., C., D., E., F. and G. Our review has shown that Condition 3.C. should be deleted since it relates to the scheduling of fire protection modifications which have been completed and this condition has been superseded by Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50. Condition D. has, therefore, been renumbered 3.C. Conditions 3.E., F. and G. have been recently incorporated into the Operating License by Amendment Nos. 48 and 54, which were issued on May 27, 1980 and January 19, 1981. The staff has reconsidered the placement of these requirements and has concluded that these requirements are more appropriately technical specifications. Therefore, License Conditions 3.E., F. and G. have been removed and the requirements are included in their entirety in the Technical Specifications as Specifications 5.13, 5.14 and 5.15 respectively.

License Condition 4. contains a number of conditions related to the protection of the environment. The staff's review of these conditions shows that they have been superceded by subsequent changes to the Appendix "A" and "B" Technical Specifications. Since the requirements are more appropriately technical specifications and have, in fact, already been included in the Fort Calhoun Station Technical Specifications, they should be removed for consistency. Therefore, we have removed License Conditions 4.A., B., C., D., E. and F.

License Condition 5. has been renumbered 4. for consistent numbering.

B. Technical Specifications

As mentioned previously, License Conditions 3.E., F. and G. have been redesignated as Technical Specifications 5.13, 5.14 and 5.15. Since no changes were made to these requirements, the change involved in their redesignation is minimal and is acceptable.

The staff's review of the Appendix "A" Technical Specifications also disclosed a clerical error in the numbering of Tables. Two Tables are presently numbered 2-6. In order to rectify this error, the staff has moved the information from the Table 2-6 on page 2-57f to page 2-57c and incorporated it into the text of the specification. An additional change was also made on page 2-57d to remove reference to the deleted Table 2-6. Since this change involves only the rearrangement of information and was made to remove possible confusion, it is acceptable.

The staff has also removed a number of blank pages from the Technical Specifications which have been inadvertently retained. These pages are denoted in the attachment to the license amendment. Since the pages contain no requirements, the staff finds their removal to be acceptable.

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 §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.

Date: March 25, 1981