



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 70 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-43
DETROIT EDISON COMPANY
FERMI-2
DOCKET NO. 50-341

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 28, 1991, The Detroit Edison Company (DECo or the licensee) requested amendment to the Technical Specifications (TS) appended to Facility Operating License No. NPF-43 for Fermi-2. The proposed amendment changes TS Table 3.6.3-1, Primary Containment Isolation Valves, by modifying the numbers for two valves.

2.0 EVALUATION

TS Table 3.6.3-1, Primary Containment Isolation Valves, contains a listing of isolation valves which are required to be operational, and includes the valve function and the valve number. The proposed amendment would change Table 3.6.3-1 to be consistent with a planned change in valve numbering for two isolation valves. The two affected valves are: The Division I Emergency Equipment Cooling Water (EECW) Supply to Drywell Equipment Isolation Valve and the Division I EECW Return from Drywell Equipment Isolation Valve each of which will be renumbered.

The renumbering of these valves is planned in conjunction with the resolution of Human Engineering Discrepancy (HED) 1150, which resulted from the Fermi-2 Detailed Control Room Design Review. HED 1150 deals with improving the layout of EECW and Reactor Building Closed Cooling Water (RBCCW) controls in the Control Room. The new layout will be more logical in arrangement and consistent between the two divisions, which are on different Control Room panels.

The proposed amendment is strictly administrative in nature. The functions of each valve, including the containment isolation function, are not affected and the change has no physical effect except for plant labelling. As indicated above, the renumbering enhances the Control Room design by implementing a human engineering improvement which will improve the man/machine interface by eliminating the valve numbering inconsistency. Based on the above, the staff finds the proposed change is administrative in nature and, therefore, is acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Michigan State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official has no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The NRC 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 exposure. 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 (56 FR 11778). Accordingly, the amendment meets 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 amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

We have 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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: John Stang

Date: May 16, 1991