



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 43 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-47

GULF STATES UTILITIES COMPANY

RIVER BEND STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-458

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 2, 1990, Gulf States Utilities Company (GSU) (the licensee) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-47 for the River Bend Station, Unit 1. The existing River Bend Station Technical Specification Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.f.8 requires that a simulated loss of offsite power (LOP) test per Surveillance Requirements 4.8.1.1.2.f.4.a)2) and b)2) be performed within 5 minutes of completing the diesel generator (DG) 24 hour run. The purpose of requiring the loss of offsite power test within 5 minutes following the 24 hour run test is to assure that the DG can perform this requirement when the DG operating temperature is equivalent to that after operating at full load. Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.f.8 currently allows an acceptable alternative to reperforming the 24 hour run if the LOP test is not satisfactorily completed. Under these conditions, the DG is allowed to be operated at full load for one hour or until operating temperatures have stabilized prior to performing the LOP test.

The proposed amendment would separate the loss of offsite power test from the 24 hour test and add Surveillance Requirement 4.8.1.1.2.f.4.c) for stabilization of full load operating temperatures prior to initiating the LOP test. The stabilization would be accomplished by having a separate warmup period of the DGs at full load and would last one hour. The basis for the change is that scheduling the LOP test within 5 minutes of completing the 24 hour test reduces flexibility, unnecessarily constrains outage activities, and creates the potential for critical path scheduling complications and delays.

The proposed amendment would also delete a footnote that allowed specific surveillances to be delayed coincident with the completion of the first refueling outage.

2.0 EVALUATION

GSU has proposed changes to the Technical Specifications to modify the requirement to perform a simulated LOP test of the emergency DGs within 5 minutes of performing a required 24 hour run test. GSU states that the proposal has been reviewed by the manufacturer (Cooper Industries). The manufacturer concurred that the proposed special warmup period would achieve the same operating temperature condition as the 24 hour run test. This fact is recognized by a footnote to the existing Technical Specification 4.8.1.1.2.f.8 which states that the 24 hour test need not be repeated prior to LOP test if the

initial LOP test is not satisfactorily completed. Instead, the DG may be operated at the specified full load for one hour or until the operating temperatures have stabilized prior to performing the LOP test. Thus, the present Technical Specification 4.8.1.1.2.f.8 accepts the decoupling of the LOP test from the 24 hour test, provided the DG is brought to a stabilized operating temperature prior to the LOP test. This indicates that the coupling of the LOP test to the 24 hour run test was for convenience (i.e., a special warmup test would not be required) rather than for any technical reason. This conclusion is supported by Regulatory Guide 1.108 which places the emphasis on full load temperature conditions rather than the 24 hour run test. Moreover, the staff has previously reviewed and approved similar testing changes at McGuire 1 & 2 and Grand Gulf 1. The staff review conducted for these requests are applicable to this proposed change. The Technical Specifications require that the LOP test and 24 hour run be performed at least every 18 months to demonstrate proper functioning of the DGs while simulating LOP. To obtain more flexible scheduling, it is proposed that the LOP test be separated from the 24 hour test. The DG would still be brought to a full load stabilized operating temperature before the LOP test, but at a different time than following the 24 hour test. The staff has reviewed the licensee submittal and has concluded that the separate and additional full load warmup period prior to the LOP test is equivalent to the existing Technical Specification requirements, and that the proposed changes have previously been approved at other plants, and are therefore acceptable.

The proposed editorial change deletes a footnote that allowed specific surveillances to be delayed coincident with the completion of the first refueling outage. This refueling outage has been completed; there is no longer a current or future purpose for this footnote. The GSU amendment request submittal failed to delete one notation (page 3/4 8-8) referencing the footnote. In a telephone conversation with GSU staff it was verified that the notation was to be deleted.

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, changes in surveillance requirements, and changes in recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or 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) and (10). 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. The staff therefore concludes that the proposed changes are acceptable.

Dated: May 11, 1990

Principal Contributors: N. K. Trehan
C. Abbate