



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 124 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-40

OMAHA PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT

FORT CALHOUN STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-285

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 1, 1980, Omaha Public Power District (licensee) requested some administrative changes to Table 3-4 of the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1. The proposed changes incorporate clarification to the operating modes by including the operating mode numbers. In addition, the licensee proposed that when the core is off-loaded during a Refueling Shutdown mode where there is no fuel in the core, testing required during this mode is not required.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee's proposed changes to Table 3-4 of the TS are administrative in nature. The addition of the Operating Mode numbers clarifies the modes and make them consistent with TS definition. Presently, Table 3-4 of the TS requires reactor coolant sampling and analysis during the following conditions: (a) Power Operation, (b) Hot Standby and Hot Shutdown, (c) Cold Shutdown, and (d) Refueling Operation. Refueling Operation, by TS definition, refers only to actual fuel movement. Therefore, the licensee is changing the wording of this mode to encompass the condition whereby the core has been off-loaded and renaming this mode Refueling Shutdown. By TS definition, Refueling Shutdown mode is where the reactor is at refueling boron concentration and water temperature is less than 210°F. In addition, the licensee is incorporating into Table 3-4 that when the core is off-loaded, boron and chloride sampling are not required since no fuel is present in the core. The basis for boron sampling is to ensure adequate shutdown margin for all core configuration when fuel is located in the core; and for chloride, to ensure the prevention of chloride stress corrosion cracking of the fuel in the core. Since there is no fuel in the core during the off-loaded condition, this sampling is not warranted. The staff finds that the above changes are appropriate and acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment involves a change in 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 in 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 radiation exposures. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment

involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Section 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 the amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

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 the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: January 31, 1990

Principal Contributor: Anthony Bournia