



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 24 AND 10 TO
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. NPF-87 AND NPF-89
TEXAS UTILITIES ELECTRIC COMPANY
COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-445 AND 50-446

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application dated March 30, 1994, Texas Utilities Electric Company (TU Electric/the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (Appendix A to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89) for the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2 (CPSES). The proposed changes would allow the use of an alternative method for verifying that the emergency diesel generator fuel oil meets requirements.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The CPSES emergency diesel generators (EDGs) operate using high-sulfur, non-highway diesel fuel oil. The technical specifications (TS) for CPSES require that the fuel used in the EDGs meets the requirements of ASTM-D975-1981.

Recent Internal Revenue Service (IRS) regulations require that a specified concentration of blue dye be added to this fuel oil. The concentrations required by the IRS are such that the licensee is unable to determine that the fuel with this concentration of dye meets the requirements of the CPSES technical specifications.

Technical Specification 4.8.1.1 requires that the acceptability of the EDG fuel oil be verified, in part, by its having a clear and bright appearance with proper color when tested in accordance with ASTM-D4176-1982. The impact of the blue dye added to the EDG fuel oil is that it is too dark to detect water and sediment visually as required by the "clear and bright" test.

The licensee has requested that the CPSES technical specifications be revised to add an alternative method, using ASTM-D1796-1968, for determining the acceptability of EDG fuel oil regarding water and sediment. This alternative test method will allow CPSES to continue to use EDG fuel oil that meets the requirements of ASTM-D975-1981 as required by TS.

9406070234 940513
PDR ADDCK 05000445
PDR

3.0 EVALUATION

The proposed change to the TS adds an alternative test method to the EDG fuel oil surveillance requirements to determine the acceptability of EDG fuel oil regarding water and sediment. The CPSES technical specifications currently allow, in accordance with ASTM-D975-1981, fuel oil containing less than or equal to 0.05 percent volume water and sediment. To date, the licensee has made this determination in accordance with ASTM-D4176-1982, which requires the fuel oil to be "clear and bright."

The alternative test method proposed, ASTM-D1796-1968, provides a test methodology that allows confirmation that the volume percent of water and sediment is less than or equal to 0.05 percent. This alternative method is essentially equivalent to the method currently in the TS. Therefore, the staff concludes that the proposed change is acceptable.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Texas State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change a surveillance requirement. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve 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 exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (59 FR 17607). Accordingly, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 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 amendments.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: T. Bergman, NRR

Date: May 13, 1994