Public Service Electric and Gas Company

Stanley LaBruna

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038 609-339-4800

OCT 1 7 1991 NLR-N91143

Reference: LCR 91-10

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Attention: Document Control Desk Washington, DC 20555

Gentlemen:

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT FACILITY OPFRATING LICENSE NPF-57 HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION DOCKET NO. 50-354

Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G) hereby transmits an application to amend Appendix A of Facility Operating License No. NPF-57 in accordance with 10CFR50.90. This amendment request would revise the Explosive Gas Mixture and the Radioactive Gaseous and Liquid Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation sections in the Hope Creek Generating station (HCGS) Technical Specifications.

A description of the requested amendment, supporting information and analyses for the change, and the basis for a no significant hazards consideration determination are provided in Attachment 1. The Technical Specification pages affected by the proposed change are marked-up in Attachment 2.

Pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.91(b)(1), PSE&G has provided a copy of this amendment request to the State of New Jersey.

Upon NRC approval of this proposed change, PSE&C requests that the amendment be made effective on the date of issuance, but implementable within sixty days to provide sufficient time for associated administrative activities.

too1/

9110290258 911017 PDA ADDCK 05000354 Should you have any questions regarding this request, we will be pleased to discuss them with you.

ph Brune

Attachments Affidavit

C Mr. T. T. Martin, Administrator USNRC Region I

> Mr. S. Dembek USPRC Licensing Project Manager

> Mr. T. P. Johnson USNRC Senior Resident Inspector

Mr. K. Tosch, Chief, Bureau of Nuclear Engineering New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection REF: NLR-N91143

My Commission expires on

ATTACHMENT 3

PROPOSED TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS AND BASES CHANCE

PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-57
HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION
DOCTOR NO. 50-354

ref: ICR 91-10

I. DEFORTPTION OF THE CHINGE

As shown on the marked-up Technical Specifications (TS) pages in Attachment 2, PSE&G reguests that TS 3.11.2.6, ACTION b, be revised to agree with the corresponding ACTION b of TS 3.3.7.11 and ACTION 124 of Table 3.3.7.11-1.

II. FEASON FOR THE CHANGE

The current TS involved in this request are in disagreement with each other and require clarification. With Effluent monitoring instrumentation inoperable, ACTION b of specification 3.3.7.11 and ACTION 124 Of Table 3.3.7.11-1. as well as several other TS sections that contain similar grab sampling provisions, permit continued discharge via the affected pathway provided that grab samples are obtained and analyzed on a specific frequency. In those TS, if inoperable monitoring equipment that is being compensated for by grab sampling is not restored to OPERABLE status within 30 days, an explanation is required in the next Semi-annual Padiological Effluent Release Report; however, the discharges are not restricted to 30 days. Currently, with the same effluent monitors as in TS table 3.3.7.11-1 inoperable, Section 3.11.2.6, ACTION b, permits continued use of the main condenser off-gas treatment system for only 30 days and has no reporting requirement.

III. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CHANGE

ACTION 124 of Table 3.3.7.11-1 and other TS requirements that contained similar grab sampling provisions were originally written in a manner resembling the current TS 3.11.2.6, ACTION b to agree with the NRC staff's original model Radiological Environmental Technical Specifications (RETS) guidance, NURES 0473. However, in accordance with a subsequent revision to the NURES 0473 guidance, the HCGS Facility Operating License was modified, in Amerdment 2, to read as it now exists in all but TS 3.11.2.6, ACTION b. This one specification was overlooked when the change in wording was requested by PSE&G. As described in the NRC's Safety Evaluation supporting that amendment, the proposed wording is consistent with the intent of, and follows closely the staff's revised NETS guidance provided in NURCS 0473, Revision 2. Since an alternate method is available to assess the measured pyraweter when the primary method is unavailable, the intent of the TS is satisfied. This change will eliminate conflicting requirements for the same equipment and make all similar TS sampling requirements consistent.

10CFR50.92 SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION ANALYSIS

PSE&G has, pursuant to 10CFR50.92, reviewed the proposed amendment to determine whether our request involves a significant hazards consideration. We have determined that:

The operation of Hope Creek Generating Station (HCCS) in accordance with the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment does not involve a physical or procedural change to any structure, component or system that significantly affects the probability or consequences of any accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The proposed change will bring the affected TS into agreement with other similar specifications and is essentially administrative in nature.

The operation of Hope Creek Generating Station (HCCS) in accordance with the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

There are no physical changes to the plant or to the manner in which the plant is operated involved in the proposed revision. Therefore, no new or different accident is created by the proposed change.

The operation of Hope Creek Generating Station (HCCS) in accordance with the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

This change is administrative in nature. The proposed wording change was previously reviewed and approved by the NRC staff in Amendment 2 to the FOL. As described in the Safety Evaluation supporting that amendment, the proposed wording is consistent with the intent of, and follows closely the staff's revised Radiological Environmental Technical Specifications (RETS) guidance provided in NURES 0473, Revision 2. We, therefore, have determined that there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety involved in this change.

Conclusion:

Based upon the above, we have determined that this proposed change does not involve a Significant Hazards Consideration.