



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 48 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-47

GULF STATES UTILITIES COMPANY

RIVER BEND STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-458

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated March 19, 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 proposed amendment would add new surveillance requirements to Technical Specification (TS) 4.9.6.2 for a new frame mounted auxiliary hoist on the fuel building fuel handling platform. The new hoist will be used to move control rods and Inclined Fuel Transfer System (IFTS) fuel and control rod inserts from the IFTS area to storage racks. An overload cutoff and normal uptravel stop interlock for lifting control rods are the proposed additions to the TS as a result of installation of the new hoist.

EVALUATION

The licensee indicated that the new frame mounted auxiliary hoist on the fuel handling platform will be of the same design as currently used on the refueling platform and that both platforms are structurally similar in design. The fuel handling platform will continue to meet all seismic and other previously established design requirements as described in updated safety analysis report (USAR) Section 9.1.4 ensuring no increased probability of platform failure, which could result in an accident.

The licensee stated that its request to add surveillance requirement 4.9.6.2c to demonstrate operation of  $500 \pm 50$  pounds overload cutoff when handling control rods by the new auxiliary hoist is consistent with other auxiliary hoists in the plant that are used for lifting of control rods. The above cutoff limit is to ensure that fuel assemblies will not be inadvertently lifted during control rod handling operation.

The licensee also stated that its request to revise surveillance requirement 4.9.6.2d to include the new frame mounted auxiliary hoist's uptravel stop interlock with the monorail mounted auxiliary hoist to maintain at least 6 feet, 9 inches of water coverage above the top of the irradiated control rods is consistent with other auxiliary hoists that are currently used to handle control rods. This uptravel limit was previously approved by the staff.

The licensee's request to change surveillance requirements 4.9.6.2c, d, e and f to 4.9.6.2d, e, f and g is administrative in nature and therefore acceptable.

The licensee indicated that the new auxiliary hoist will be equipped with a keylock switch on the platform control panel to allow bypassing the 500-pound limit to a higher 1000-pound limit needed for lifting of IFTS inserts. The operation of the load bypass switch will be controlled through administrative procedures to preclude inadvertent fuel lifts by proposed separation between the point of lift and the location of spent fuel and will be used only for specific designated tasks, such as handling of the IFTS inserts. Handling of fuel assemblies and installation of a fuel handling grappler will be prohibited at all times. The bypass capability coupled with appropriate administrative restrictions is consistent with that utilized on the monorail mounted auxiliary hoist and will not result in a reduction of any margins of safety.

The licensee stated that the most severe fuel handling accident is the drop of a channeled fuel bundle onto unchanneled spent fuel located in the spent fuel racks in the fuel handling building as discussed in USAR Section 15.7.4. The proposed modification does not affect the result of that analysis, as none of the assumptions used to estimate the consequences of such an accident are affected. Therefore, all conditions potentially generated by the addition of the new hoist remain bounded by the original analysis.

These proposed changes continue to support all design and operational requirements described in USAR and SER Sections 9.1.4, 15.7.4 and Technical Specification 3/4.9.6. The staff has reviewed the licensee's submittal as discussed above and considers that the proposed changes are acceptable.

#### SUMMARY

Based on the above evaluation, the staff concludes that the proposed installation of a new frame mounted auxiliary hoist on the fuel handling platform and the proposed changes to TS 4.9.6.2 to add surveillance requirements for the new hoist for overload cutoff and uptravel stop interlock for handling of control rods, and the installation of a keylock bypass switch to allow lifting of IFTS inserts for control and fuel rods under administrative controls are acceptable.

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 and changes in surveillance 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). 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.

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: September 27, 1990

Principal Contributor: R. Goel, SPLB