



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 41 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-54

SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT

RANCHO SECO NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-312

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND DISCUSSION

By letter dated January 6, 1982, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (the licensee) requested amendment of Facility Operating License No. DPR-54. In this request, the licensee proposed to amend Appendix A Technical Specifications Table 4.1-1 "Instrument Surveillance Requirements" to delete, for Item 39 "Control rod relative position", the requirement to calibrate the control rod misalignment channel each refueling interval. The licensee stated that this request was made because it is impossible to calibrate control rod misalignment for the control rod relative position channel, and inclusion of this requirement in the Technical Specifications is an editorial error.

2.0 EVALUATION

The effect of granting the licensee's request would be to delete, for Item 39 in Table 4.1-1, the requirement to calibrate the control rod misalignment channel each refueling interval.

Based on our review of the Rancho Seco Final Safety Analysis Report, each control rod drive unit is equipped with an absolute position sensor and a relative position sensor. Only the absolute position sensors, however, provide input to the asymmetric rod alarm circuit (a measure of control rod misalignment). Accordingly, only the absolute rod position sensors can provide a measurement of control rod misalignment. Calibration of this function each refueling interval is required by Table 4.1-1 (Item 38). Conversely, the control rod relative position sensors do not supply signals to the rod misalignment channel. Hence, calibration of these signals, as required by the present technical specifications cannot be performed.

Based on the above, we conclude that this is an apparent editorial error and that the change as requested by the licensee, is 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 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 an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, 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 to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: November 15, 1982

The following NRC personnel have contributed to this Safety Evaluation:
G. Perez, G. Zwetzig.