

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236 Han tocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038

Hope Creek Generating Station

December 15, 1993

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Document Control Desk Washington, DC 20555

Dear Sir:

MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT HOPE CREEK GENERATION STATION UNIT 1 DOCKET NO. 50-354

In compliance with Section 6.9, Reporting Requirements for the Hope Creek Technical Specifications, the operating statistics for November are being forwarded to you with the summary of changes, tests, and experiments that were implemented during October and November 1993 pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.59(b).

Sincerely yours,

R. J. Hovey

R. J. Hovey General Manager -Hope Creek Operations

DR:WS:JC Attachments

C Distribution





INDEX

SECTION														NUMBER OF PAGES
Average Daily Unit Power	L	eve	1.			×	ŝ	÷.,	ź		×		÷	1
Operating Data Report		i - i	×	*		,	×	<u>.</u>		*	÷		×	3
Refueling Information		x x		×		×	÷	÷	÷,		×		÷.	1
Monthly Operating Summary	Ý	÷ ->	ļ,		÷	÷	к.	÷		,		×.,	÷.	1
Summary of Changes, Tests	s,	an	d	Exp	per	in	ner	its		١.,			1	3

OPERATING DATA REPORT

UNIT SHUTDOWNS AND POWER REDUCTIONS

DOCKET NO.	50-354
UNIT	Hope Creek
DATE	12/08/93 107
COMPLETED BY	V. Zabielski
TELEPHONE	(609) 339-3506

MONTH November 1993

NO.	DATE	TYPE F=FORCED S=SCHEDULED	DURATION (HOURS)	REASON (1)	METHOD OF SHUTTING DOWN THE REACTOR OR REDUCING POWER (2)	CORRECTIVE ACTION/COMMENTS
						None

AVERAGE DAILY UNIT POWER LEVEL

DOCKET NO.	50-354
UNIT	Hope Creek
DATE	12/08/93
COMPLETED BY	V. Zabielski
TELEPHONE	(609) 339-3506

MONTH	November 1993			
DAY A	VERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL (MWe-Net)	DAY AVI	ERAGE DAILY P^WER LEVE (MWe-Net)	L
1.	1064	17.	1053	
2.	1066	18.	1061	
3.	1065	19.	1056	
4.	1062	20.	1060	
5.	1053	21.	1058	
б.	1053	22.	1061	
7.	<u>1048</u>	23.	1060	
8.	1064	24.	1059	
9.	1063	25.	1066	
10.	1062	26.	1068	
11.	1060	27.	1047	
12.	1056	28.	1049	
13.	1057	29.	1065	
14.	1038	30.	1067	
15.	1036	31.	N/A	
16.	1057			

OPERATING DATA REPORT

		D U D COMPLETED TELEPH	OCKET NO. NIT <u>Hope C</u> ATE <u>12/08/</u> BY <u>V. Zab</u> ONE <u>(609)</u>	50-354 reek 93 ielski 339-3506
PE	RATING STATUS			
	Reporting Period November 1993 Gr	oss Hours	in Report P	eriod <u>720</u>
	Currently Authorized Power Level (Max. Depend. Capacity (MWe-Net) Design Electrical Rating (MWe-Net)	MWt) <u>329</u> <u>103</u> <u>106</u>	<u>3</u> <u>1</u> <u>7</u>	
	Power Level to which restricted (i	f any) (MW	e-Net) <u>No</u>	ne
•	Reasons for restriction (if any) No. of hours reactor was critical	This Month 720.0	Yr To <u>Date</u> 7935.0	<u>Cumulative</u> 52190.6
	Reactor reserve shutdown hours	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Hours generator on line	720.0	7915.9	514?0.8
	Unit reserve shutdown hours	0.0	0.0	0.0
•	Gross thermal energy generated (MWH)	2368952	25774329	63987547
ο.	Gross electrical energy generated (MWH)	788530	8550800	54298854
1.	Net electrical energy generated (MWH)	<u>756988</u>	8189325	51891709
2.	Reactor service factor	100.0	99.0	85.7
3.	Reactor availability factor	100.0	99.0	85.7
4.	Unit service factor	100.0	98.8	84.4
5.	Unit availability factor	100.0	98.8	84.4
6.	Unit capacity factor (using MDC)	102.0	<u>99.1</u>	82.6
7.	Unit capacity factor (Using Design MWe)	<u>98.5</u>	95.7	79.8
8.	Unit forced outage rate	0.0	1.2	4.3
9	Shutdowns scheduled over pavt 6 mo	nthe (tuno	ha atch	uration):

Refueling Outage 6, March 5, 1993, 49 days. 20. If shutdown at end of report period, estimated date of start-up: N/A

REFUELING INFORMATION

DOCKET NO. <u>50-354</u> UNIT <u>Hope Creek 1</u> DATE <u>December 13, 1993</u> COMPLETED BY <u>S. Hollingsworth</u> TELEPHONE (609) 339-1051

MONTH December 1993

T' VELUCITUM TUTOTWORTON HOS MUNIGED ITOW TOSC	t month:
--	----------

Yes

No X

2. Scheduled date for next refueling: 3/5/94

3. Scheduled date for restart following refueling: 4/23/94

4. A. Will Technical Specification changes or other license amendments be required?

Yes No X

B. Has the Safety Evaluation covering the COLR been reviewed by the Station Operating Review Committee?

Yes No X

If no, when is it scheduled? 2/18/94

- Scheduled date(s) for submitting proposed licensing action: Not scheduled yet.
- 6. Important licensing considerations associated with refueling:

N/A

8.

9.

7. Number of Fuel Assemblies:

A. IncoreB. In Spent Fuel Storage (prior to refueling)C. In Spent Fuel Storage (after refueling)	764 1008 1240
Present licensed spent fuel storage capacity: Future spent fuel storage capacity:	<u>4006</u> 4006
Date of last refueling that can be discharged to spent fuel pool assuming the present licensed capacity: (Does allow for full-core offload) (Assumes 244 bundle reloads every 18 months until (Does not allow for smaller reloads due to improve	5/3/2006 (EOC13) then) d fuel)

HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

MONTHLY OPERATING SUMMARY

× 1 ×

November 1993

Hope Creek entered the month of November at approximately 100% power. The unit operated at full power through the end of the month without any major power reductions or plant trips. As of November 30, the plant has been on line for 195 consecutive days.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES, TESTS, AND EXPERIMENTS FOR THE HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

October and November 1993

The following items have been evaluated to determine:

- If the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the safety analysis report may be increased; or
- If a presibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the safety analysis report may be created; or
- 3. If the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any technical specification is reduced.

The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations showed that these items did not create a new safety hazard to the plant nor did they affect the safe shutdown of the reactor. These items did not change the plant effluent releases and did not alter the existing environmental impact. The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations determined that no unreviewed safety or environmental questions are involved.

Design Changes

4EC-03254

Summary of Safety Evaluation

This DCP installs two small ventilation fans to each FRVS Ventilation System unit heater control panels. This panel is not described in the UFSAR however it does modify the procedure (OP-ST.GU-001(Q) which will verify operability of the fans during the monthly surveillance.

Therefore, this DCP does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the SAR and does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Question.

Procedure

Summary of Safety Evaluation

NC.NA-AP.ZZ-007(Q) The procedure revision describes administrative changes to the A ARA program and as such does not affect the operabilility or reliability of any safety system. Changes included were workorder processing and pre-planning, pre-job briefings, ALARA checklists, rehearsals, and mock-up training.

Therefore, this procedure revision does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the SAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Summary of Safety Evaluation

Modifications

Temporary

93-024

This Temporary Modification installs a temporary hose between Turbine Building 77' elevation to a vendor truck on turbine building 102'elevation. The purpose of this is to allow transfer of spent condensate resins from the Condensate Demineralizer system to the vendor truck for disposal. This T-Mod affects drawing M-16-1 included in UFSAR as 10.4-4 due to the removal of a 5 foot section of pipe to hook up the temporary hose.

The Condensate Demineralizer system does not impact any safety related systems. Any spill would have been directed to the Rad Waste systems via the Turbine Building floor drains.

Therefore, this Temporary Modification does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the SAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Summary of Safety Evaluation

Deficiency Reports

HTE 93-044

This Deficiency Report describes the failure of Hiller actuators on the SACs cooling lines valves to the Diesel Generator Room Coolers. The valves were failed open to allow cooling to the Diesel rooms. The normal line up position is closed. The valves are failed open 'J support both the normal and abnormal operation of the SACS Diesel Generator Room coolers.

Therefore, this Deficiency Report does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the SAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

HMD-93-045 This Deficiency Report describes the Use As Is disposition of a leaking packing gland on valve 1ABHV-F033 (Inboard Drain Valve) until such time the leak can be repaired by a temporary leak repair or the next available outage. By closing the Primary Containment Isolation Valves 1ABHV-F016 and F019 the leakage was minimized at the F033 valve. This placed the valves in the positions required for a Group 1 NSSSS PCI signal. The F016 and F019 valves remained operable.

Therefore, this Deficiency Report does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the SAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Other

Summary of Safety Evaluation

H03.5-11 This Safety Evaluation states that during Cycle-4, segments in nine control rods will exceed 34% boron-10 depletion, which is their normal design life and describes the basis that General Electric used for cycle-4 licensing analysis. The effects of this additional depletion requires deeper insertion of the blades to achieve the desired effect. The rods will be able to fulfill the reactivity control function for shutdown margin.

> Therefore, this Safety Evaluation does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the SAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

DEH-93-00158

.....

This Safety Evaluation demonstrates that a 4 minute time delay of an automatic Standby Liquid Control System (SLCS) from the beginning of an Anticipated Transient Without SCRAM (ATWS) event will satisfy the ATWS criteria even if the event commences from the Extended Load Line Limit Analysis Region.

Therefore, this Safety Evaluation does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the SAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.