

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 4
TO LICENSE NPF-9
DUKE POWER COMPANY

INTRODUCTION

By telecopied letter dated August 28, 1981, the Duke Power Company (the licensee) requested an emergency change to the Technical Specifications appended to Facility Operating License No. NPF-9 for the McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1. The change would add the following item to Section 7.0, Special Test Program, page 7-1 of the McGuire Technical Specifications:

	Test					
Technical Specification	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.5.1.2 Upper Head Injection Accumulator	X	X		X	X	X

Background

The reason for the requested change is to prevent inadvertent actuation of the Upper Head Injection system during the performance of the Special Test Program. The UHI system provides borated water to the reactor in the event of significant depressurization indicating a LOCA.

EVALUATION

The licensee's proposed change was evaluated to assure that adequate core cooling was available based upon the operating history to date of the McGuire Unit No. 1 core with the UHI system temporarily isolated. Based on our evaluation we agree with the licensee's conclusion that plant loss of coolant behavior during the low power testing sequence with UHI temporarily isolated will still have sufficient cooling water available to prevent fuel damage from over heating on a short term basis. The low power level and short operating history support this conclusion.

8110020214 810917
PDR ADOCK 05000369
P PDR

OFFICE							
SURNAME							
DATE							

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.

DATE: September 17, 1981

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶