



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 78 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-29  
AMENDMENT NO. 72 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-30

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

AND

IOWA-ILLINOIS GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

QUAD CITIES STATION UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-254 AND 50-265

Author: R. B. Bevan

Introduction

By letter dated May 20, 1982, Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo, the licensee) proposed an amendment to the Technical Specifications (TS) for Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2. The amendment would extend from June 1, 1982 to July 1, 1982 the expiration date of a limited TS change that had previously been authorized by Amendments 75 and 68 dated December 18, 1981. The need for the limited TS change arose after a leak developed in a buried portion of the 16-inch residual heat removal (RHR) service water (SW) line for loop "A" of Unit 1. The amendments transmitted by our December 18, 1981 letter allowed the loop "A" RHR heat exchangers (HX) for each unit to be fed from the RHR-SW pumps for Unit 2 by way of a cross-tie already in place.

The CECo proposal dated May 20, 1982 would allow operation in this configuration to continue beyond June 1, 1982, the date currently given in the TS, to July 1, 1982, at which time the licensee expects to have completed the modification necessary to restore the original configuration.

Discussion and Evaluation

Modifications were performed as a result of the RHR-SW line leak to enable continued operation of Units 1 and 2 until the leaking RHR-SW line could be repaired or replaced. It was necessary also to change the TS in order to assure that operation in the modified configuration could be continued without increased safety risk. Our evaluation of the previously approved changes are contained in our Safety Evaluation dated December 18, 1981. At that time, approval was given to continue operation (with conditions described in the Safety Evaluation and modified TS) until June 1, 1982, after which the repairs would be complete, the system restored to its original configuration, and the original TS requirements would be restored. The period of time estimated as necessary to complete the work took account of the possible adverse effects of severe winter weather, the problems of procurement of properly qualified materials, and related matters.

Since that time the licensee has determined that a preferred action is a modification consisting of a complete above ground rerouting of the 16-inch service water line. The new line will be a safety-related and seismically qualified pipe, running from the turbine building condensate pit to the reactor building basement high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) room. Because of the complexity of this modification, and the tight work schedule, the licensee has determined that additional time beyond the previously estimated June 1, 1982, date, will be needed to complete the modification. The licensee estimates that the modification will be completed, except for final installation of seismic restraints, by June 6, 1982.

Continued operation of both units beyond June 1, 1982, until such time as the modification can be completed and qualified, will require a change to the TS. The change requested is to revise the June 1, 1982 date, authorized by the previously cited amendments, to July 1, 1982. From personal observations by the NRR project manager, and discussions with the licensee while on site visits, and from discussions with the Resident Inspectors at the site who have followed the work on a day-to-day basis, we have determined that a best effort has been made to complete the work by the June 1, 1982 date. The licensee will maintain all interim procedure changes previously adopted during the extended time period. All safety justifications discussed in the licensee's earlier proposal, and evaluated in our Safety Evaluation, dated December 18, 1981, still apply.

On the basis of the foregoing considerations, we conclude that extension of the completion date of the modifications to July 1, 1982 is acceptable.

#### Environmental Considerations

We have determined that these amendments do 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 these amendments involve 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 these amendments.

#### Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendments do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendments do 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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: May 27, 1982