



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 63 TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-16

GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION AND

JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-219

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated March 4, 1981, GPU Nuclear Corporation and Jersey Central Power & Light Company (the licensees) requested an amendment to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16 for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. This amendment would authorize the addition of the requirement for making the Control Rod Drive Scram Discharge Volume (SDV) High Level and Scram Trip Bypass Rod Block a part of the Appendix A Technical Specifications.

As a result of events involving common cause failures of SDV limit switches and SDV drain valve operability, the NRC staff sent a letter dated July 7, 1980 to all operating BWR licensees requesting that they propose Technical Specification changes to surveillance requirements on SDV limit switches. Model Technical Specifications were enclosed with this letter to provide guidance to licensees for preparation of the requested submittals.

2.0 DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

The attached Technical Evaluation Report (TER-C-5506-58) was prepared by our contractor, Franklin Research Center (FRC). The TER provides FRC's technical evaluation of the compliance of the licensees' submittal with NRC provided criteria.

FRC has concluded that the licensees' response does not meet the explicit requirements of paragraph 3.3-6 and Table 3.3.6-1 of the NRC staff's Model Technical Specifications (TS). However, the FRC report concludes that technical bases are defined on p. 50 of the staff's "Generic Safety Evaluation Report BWR Scram Discharge System," December 1, 1980 that permit consideration of this departure from the explicit requirements of the Model Technical Specifications. We conclude that these technical bases justify a deviation from the explicit requirements of the Model TS.

FRC has concluded that the licensees' proposed TS revisions (as modified by subsequent discussions) meet our criteria without the need for further revision.

Based upon our review of our contractor's report, we conclude that the licensees' proposed TS satisfy our requirements for surveillance of SDV vent and drain valves and for LCOs and surveillance requirements for SDV limit switches. Consequently the licensees' proposed TS, as modified in accordance with revisions mutually agreed upon during discussions between us and the licensees are acceptable.

3.0 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 §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.

4.0 CONCLUSION

We also conclude, 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, does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, and does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, 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 conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or the health and safety of the public.

5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

K. Eccleston, J. Lombardo and Franklin Research Center contributed to this evaluation.

Attached:
Franklin Research Center Report
dated January 27, 1982

Dated: October 15, 1982