



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 59 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-72  
FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION, ET AL  
CRYSTAL RIVER UNIT NO. 3 NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT  
DOCKET NO. 50-302

Introduction

By letter dated October 26, 1982, which was telecopied to us, Florida Power Corporation (the licensee) proposed a change to the Crystal River Unit 3 (CR-3) Technical Specifications (TSs). This TS change would allow the plant to change modes with the intermediate pressure relief line isolation valve replaced with a pipe cap.

Evaluation

On October 26, 1982, we prepared the following evaluation prior to our approval, granted on an expedited basis, for CR-3 to restart as scheduled by the licensee: "CR-3 is currently in a cold shutdown condition and the licensee desires to enter an operational mode by October 27, 1982. Containment isolation valve WDV-60 in the intermediate pressure relief line is leaking beyond the 10 CFR 50- Appendix J limits; the valve is in series with an additional, operable isolation valve, WDV-61. WDV-60 has been removed and replaced with a pipe cap. The intermediate pressure relief line is not a safety-related component. The excessively leaky valve has placed the plant in an Action statement under TS 3.6.3.1; moreover, TS 3.0.4 will not permit entry into an operational mode while the plant is in an Action statement. The licensee requested relief from the requirements of TS 3.0.4. Based on our review of the October 26, 1982 submittal, the existing and proposed TS change, and through a conference call with our Region II office and the Senior Resident Inspector, we conclude that the pipe cap on the intermediate pressure relief line is equivalent to the removed valve WDV-60 in terms of protection of containment leak tight integrity. Therefore, the proposed change to remove WDV-60 from the requirements of TS 3.0.4 is acceptable."

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 §1.5(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 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 17, 1982

The following NRC personnel have contributed to this Safety Evaluation:  
M. Fairtile