



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 85 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DRP-75

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

SALEM GENERATING STATION, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-311

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated September 25, 1989, Public Service Electric & Gas Company requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-75 for the Salem Generating Station, Unit No. 2. The proposed amendment would revise the technical specifications (TS) to extend the test interval for the last of three containment integrated leak rate tests (CILRT) for Salem 2 from 40 ±10 months to the 10-year inservice inspection outage (Cycle 6), a period of about 59 months.

2.0 EVALUATION

Paragraph III.D.1(a) of Appendix J states "After the preoperational leakage rate test, a set of three Type A tests shall be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period. The third test of each set shall be conducted when the plant is shutdown for the 10-year plant inservice inspections." In addition to the above quoted Appendix J requirement, Section 4.6.1.2.a of the Salem Unit 2 TS also specifies that "Three Type A tests shall be conducted at 40 +/- 10 month intervals during shutdown at design pressure (47 psig) during each 10 year service period. The third test of each set shall be conducted during the shutdown for the 10-year plant inservice inspection (ISI)."

In the September 25, 1989 submittal, the licensee stated that the third Type A test would be required during the next refueling outage of Salem Unit 2 (i.e., Cycle 5, from 3-31-90 to 5-14-90) in order to prevent exceeding the 50-month limit on the TS maximum interval between Type A tests. However, subsequent testing during the Cycle 6 outage would violate the TS minimum 30-month test interval requirement. The plant's 10-year ISI outage (Cycle 6) is presently scheduled for 9-21-91 to 11-24-91. Therefore, the licensee proposed to postpone the CILRT to allow the third Type A test to be completed during the plant 10-year ISI outage (i.e., Cycle 6 refueling outage). The licensee provided the following justification to support its proposed amendment:

9001260257 900117
PDR ADOCK 05000311
P PDC

1. The intent of the established testing intervals is to conduct three equally spaced Type A tests in a 10-year inservice period with the third test performed in conjunction with the 10-year inservice inspection outage.
2. The previous two Type A tests were completed successfully. There have not been any plant modifications which would impact containment integrity since the last Type A test.
3. Previous local leakage tests (Type B and C tests) have been completed satisfactorily and on schedule. Operability of the containment isolation valves and penetrations as required by current plant TS would continue to ensure containment integrity during an extended test interval.
4. This is a one-time Type A test interval extension request. A new Type A test schedule will be replanned for the next 10 years.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's submittal and finds that the first CILRT for Salem Unit 2 was conducted on a shortened interval (about 21 months from the date of commercial operation). This necessitated the licensee's request for extending the third CILRT interval in order to coincide with the plant's 10 year ISI schedule. Since the licensee has planned to conduct the third CILRT during the scheduled shutdown for the 10 year ISI and because the licensee has justified the leaktight integrity of the containment based on previous leakage test results, the staff concludes that a one-time delay of approximately 9 months beyond the maximum permitted test interval will not, for reasons stated above, have a significant safety impact. The staff, therefore, concludes that the licensee's requested test interval exemption and the associated TS changes for delay in conducting the third CILRT are acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes to the surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational dose or exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (54 FR 51261) on December 13, 1989 and consulted with the State of New Jersey. No public comments were received and the State of New Jersey did not have any comments.

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) 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 nor to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: J. S. Guo

Dated: January 17, 1990