

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE  
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 2  
TO LICENSE NPF-12  
SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY  
SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY

INTRODUCTION

By letter, dated August 13, 1982, the South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (SCE&G) requested changes to correct inconsistencies in three Technical Specifications regarding isolation of the containment purge and exhaust lines on high radiation. In addition, changes were requested to correct typographical errors in two other Technical Specifications.

EVALUATION

Table 3.3-3 specifies the total number of channels, channels to trip, and minimum channels operable for isolating the containment purge and exhaust lines on containment high radiation for Modes 1, 2, 3, and 4. The current Technical Specifications indicate that four channels are available to isolate the purge and exhaust lines for Modes 1, 2, 3, and 4. However, the design includes only two channels, i.e. radiation monitors RM-A2 and RM-A4. Therefore the minimum channels to trip is one since a trip will occur if the setpoint is exceeded on either RM-A2 or RM-A4 and both channels must be operable.

Table 3.3-4 in the current Technical Specifications specifies the trip setpoint and allowable values for containment high radioactivity at twice the background levels. The licensee requested that these values be changed to be consistent with Specification 3.11.2.1.

The licensee requested that a clarification be made to the surveillance requirements of 4.9.8 to require verification that for a high radiation test signal from the reactor building manipulator crane area channels, isolation of the 36-inch purge supply and exhaust valves occurs. This is consistent with the design. The current specification implies that isolation of the 6-inch line would also be required.

The licensee also requested that two typographical errors be corrected. These occur in Table 3.3-12 and Table 3.8-1.

We have reviewed each of the above changes that the licensee has proposed and find them acceptable. These changes are administrative in nature and are consistent with the design that was reviewed and approved by the staff during the operating license stage.

B209230313 B20827  
PDR ADOCK 05000395  
P PDR

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 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: **AUG 27 1982**

\*See previous yellow.

OFFICE ▶	DL:LB#1*	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1			
SURNAME ▶	MRushbrook/yt	Wkane	JYoungblood			
DATE ▶	8/ /82	8/27/82	8/27/82			

We have reviewed each of the changes that the licensee has proposed and find them acceptable. These changes are administrative in nature and are consistent with the design that was reviewed and approved by the staff during the operating license stage.

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 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:

OFFICE	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1	DL:LB#1				
SURNAME	Rushbrook/yt	Wkane	BJYoungblood				
DATE	8/1/82	8/1/82	8/1/82				

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE  
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 2  
TO LICENSE NPF-12  
SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY  
SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY

INTRODUCTION

By letter, dated August 13, 1982, the South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (SCE&G) requested changes to correct inconsistencies in three Technical Specifications regarding isolation of the containment purge and exhaust lines on high radiation. In addition, changes were requested to correct typographical errors in two other Technical Specifications.

EVALUATION

Table 3.3-3 specifies the total number of channels, channels to trip, and minimum channels operable for isolating the containment purge and exhaust lines on containment high radiation for Modes 1, 2, 3, and 4. The current Technical Specifications indicate that four channels are available to isolate the purge and exhaust lines for Modes 1, 2, 3, and 4. However, the design includes only two channels, i.e. radiation monitors RM-A2 and RM-A4. Therefore the minimum channels to trip is one since a trip will occur if the setpoint is exceeded on either RM-A2 or RM-A4 and both channels must be operable. The licensee also requested that the Technical Specifications be changed to permit entry into another operational mode with less than the minimum number of channels operable, provided the purge and exhaust lines are isolated. The licensee stated that this is consistent with the intent of Action 17 which allows operation to continue provided that the containment purge and exhaust valves are maintained closed. Table 3.3-4 in the current Technical Specifications specifies the trip setpoint and allowable values for containment high radioactivity at twice the background levels. The licensee requested that these values be changed to be consistent with Specification 3.11.2.1.

The licensee requested that a clarification be made to the surveillance requirements of 4.9.8 to require verification that for a high radiation test signal from the reactor building manipulator crane area channels, isolation of the 36-inch purge supply and exhaust valves occurs. This is consistent with the design. The current specification implies that isolation of the 6-inch line would also be required.

The licensee also requested that two typographical errors be corrected. These occur in Table 3.3-12 and Table 3.8-1.

OFFICE ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SURNAME ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
DATE ▶	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....