



Commonwealth Edison
Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station
22710 206 Avenue North
Cordova, Illinois 61242
Telephone 309/654-2241

GCT-92-15

April 2, 1992

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555

SUBJECT: Quad Cities Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2
Changes, Tests, and Experiments Completed
NRC Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265

Enclosed please find a listing of those facility and procedure changes, tests, and experiments requiring safety evaluations completed from January 1, 1991 thru December 31, 1991, for Quad-Cities Station Units 1 and 2, DPR-29 and DPR-30. A summary of the safety evaluations are being reported in compliance with 10CFR50.59 and 10CFR50.71(e).

Respectfully,

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY
QUAD-CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATION

Gerry Tietz
Technical Superintendent

GCT/dak

Enclosure

cc: A. B. Davis, Regional Administrator
T. Taylor, Senior Resident Inspector

160078
9204160320 910401
PDR ADDCK 05000254
R PDR

LEA7
111

Minor Design Change P04-0-90-180

DESCRIPTION:

Installation of a discharge header to tie in 12 relief valves in the 3rd floor HVAC Room for the purpose of venting freon in the case that the freon tanks over-pressurized and released through the relief valves.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to a fire accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change does not affect any safety-related equipment, systems, or functions. The change does not alter the function or operation of the relief valves or the 5700 system. If the change were to malfunction or fail, the surrounding systems and/or components would not be adversely affected. The reason being that if it failed or malfunctioned, the freon gases would vent into the 3rd floor HVAC room, which they already would do in the case of over-pressurization. This was not considered adverse for the surrounding equipment before so it shall not be considered adverse after the change. The change is being implemented for human factors reasons so as to reduce the change of human contact with the gases. Furthermore, the remote possibility that a safety-related intake fan may interact with the freon gases was considered and it was found that no such intakes are near the proposed exhaust piping. Therefore, there is not a possibility of an accident or malfunction different from those evaluated in the UFSAR created by this change.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change MC4-1(2)-90-152

DESCRIPTION:

The purpose of this minor design change is to replace the existing check valves between the drains in the reactor building corner core spray and RHR rooms and the reactor building sump with new sliding stem valves with ball float actuators. The existing check valves are swing, flapper, and mission types of valves. The existing check valves have allowed water from the sump to seep back thru the floor drains and enter the corner rooms. The new valves should prevent any backflow of water into the corner rooms.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Flooding	UFSAR SECTION	6.2.2
----------	---------------	-------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the new valves are designed to provide better flood protection than the present valves. The intent of the valves remain the same.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Temporary Procedure

DESCRIPTION:

This temporary procedure change provides a method for utilizing the 1B Instrument Air System as a backup air source to the Unit Two system. Unit Two Reactor requires instrument air for operation. Unit One is in refuel.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because Instrument Air is required for Unit Two reactor operation. This change will make Unit Two Instrument Air failure less likely.

Instrument Air failure does not jeopardize safe shutdown of the reactor.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for a Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Replace the 1-1201-81 Check Valve (Crane #973) with a Rockwell Edward Model 970Y.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the failure of this check valve has no safety consideration.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the margin of safety must remain the same as the function does not change and there are no safety considerations.

Procedure Revision to QOS 6600-1&S1

DESCRIPTION:

Changes to the monthly surveillance to add checks for new equipment added via M-4-1-88-019.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Total loss of Off-Site AC Power (LOOP)	UFSAR SECTION 8.2.2
Loop with DBA	UFSAR SECTION 8.2.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change of checking the prelube equipment during the monthly surveillance testing of the Diesel Generators will improve the reliability of the auto-start function of the Diesels'.

Therefore, this change does not adversely impact operation of the Diesel Generators nor change any safety related function of the Diesel Generators.

No new accident or malfunction is created.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the margin of safety is increased since the change will increase the reliability of the Diesel Generators.

Minor Design Change P04-1-91-003

DESCRIPTION:

Relocate variable spring can pipe hanger (MK #GE-14) to a existing hydro hanger location. Hangers are attached to the turbine cross around piping.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no new failure modes are created by this minor design change. The relocated support will perform the same function as before in its existing location. No other systems will be impacted by this minor design change. Based upon the above reasons, the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR is not created by installation of this minor design change.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-1-91-004

DESCRIPTION:

1. Install a 300K resistor in the bypass valve positioning Unit.
2. Replace EHC circuit board A48 Group 5 with circuit board A48 Group 12 for Control Valve amplifiers.
3. Replace EHC Circuit boards B83 & B84 with board B83 Group 9.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Load Rejection without Bypass	UFSAR SECTION	3.2.5.4.1
Loss of Electrical Load	UFSAR	11.2.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the failure modes of the Control and bypass valves are not being changed with this minor design change. The bypass and control valves will still function as designed. The possibility of a failure of the #1, #2, and #3 bypass valves is actually being decreased by this minor design change because the current oscillation problems with these valves at low power levels are being reduced by the addition of these resistors. The wear on the valves and associated hydraulic actuators will be reduced with the reduction in oscillations. The possibility of a failure of the control valves is also being reduced by this MDC because the number of circuit boards for the total control valve position signed is being reduced from two boards to one board. The single new board will perform the same function as the current two board arrangement. No other systems will be impacted by this minor design change. Based upon the above reasons, the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR is not created by installation of this minor design change.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change MC4-2-90-057, Q86508

DESCRIPTION:

Perform minor design change test of HPCI Linear heat detector. With deluge system out of service, actuate detection system by heating protection wire, and use of manual pull/push button stations.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change is only a routine test that will prove the newly installed linear detector to be functional. The steps needed to be performed during this test do not differ from the current surveillance for the HPCI detection system except that this test will be performed on out of service equipment.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SF-91-10

TEMP ALT 91-1-7

DESCRIPTION:

Install a pipe nipple fabricated from stock SI#551A33 and pipe cap SI #504862 as a drain plug assembly in place of GE drain plug SI #792B43.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.4
------	---------------	--------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because Core Spray System will operate as designed since no change to the oil drain plug function has occurred.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because no margin of safety occurred since no change of core spray operation occurred.

DESCRIPTION:

Lift leads "FU" and "FV" from terminals 5 & 6, respectively of KW Limiter at excitation panel 2251-12 of Standby Diesel Generator 1. Lift leads "FGC" and "FGD" from terminals 1 & 2, respectively, of the same KW Limiter. Lift the last 2 leads also from terminals 8 & 9 of Terminal Block 35L of Panel 2251-12. NOTE: Leads "FU" and "FV" have been lifted from terminals 26 & 27, respectively, of the voltage regulator in the Panel 2251-12 since the plant began operation in 1971.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the KW Limiter has never been used. Therefore, disconnecting leads to terminals 1, 2, 5 & 6 will not adversely affect any systems different from UFSAR Systems. Leads to terminals 3 & 4 of the KW Limiter are needed. Disconnecting them would break the daisy chain.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This change has two parts. Part one is to install a grounded and shielded box with removable flex conduit to the area around the U1 and U2 drywell radiation monitors. Part two wraps the incoming signal cable from the detector with braided conduit from the cable spreading room to the 90X-56 panels.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the addition of the braided jacket to the detector cable from the cable spreading room to the 90X-56 panels does not in any way create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

The addition of the shielded box and flexible conduit to the areas adjacent to the drywell penetrations will not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction different from those evaluated in the UFSAR. It is merely to provide a clearer, spike free signal to increase the reliability of the system.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because when initially placing the detector cable inside the flex conduit, the cables must be unplugged from the monitor. This can easily be accomplished within the 7 day period. The same goes for the addition of the braided jacket to the cable running from the cable spreading room to the 90X-56 panels.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform electrical work required for installation of the 1/2 Instrument air system.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling Accident	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.2
Loss of Coolant Accident	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change has no affect on secondary containment. Drilling six 3" deep .265" diameter holes in "H" wall does not affect the structural integrity of secondary containment since "H" wall is constructed of four foot thick reinforced concrete. The possibility of a loss of coolant accident or a refueling accident with failure of secondary containment is not increased by this change.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change MC4-1(2)-91-008

DESCRIPTION:

Install splined adapter retainers on the 1-3905 and 2-3905 Limitorque HBC gear adapters.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION	10.8
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is a reliability related Minor Design Change and this should improve the 3905 valves ability to function.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-1-91-009 Q89443

DESCRIPTION:

Change spring packs on 1301-22 and 1301-26 valves.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Condenser with Loss of Feedwater System	UFSAR SECTION	4.5.1
--	---------------	-------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change is to allow us to make the valves more reliable by keeping them within a range of thrust, determined by NED, which will help prevent overthrusting, but still keep the valves functional during accident conditions. As long as the valves thrust remains within these windows, there will be no problem repositioning them at any time.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because spring pack changes do not alter RCIC operability. RCIC pump will still produce 400 gpm @ 150 psig - 1150 psig regardless of a spring pack change on the 1301-26 and 1301-22 valves. Surveillances on RCIC will not change due to spring pack changes.

DESCRIPTION:

The as-built change was made in the past. Various leads to rod control relays and switches are wired differently than on the wiring diagram 4E1755C. However, the schematic drawing 4E-1414 remains unchanged. There is no schematic or electric change that would affect operability of rod control.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the as-built change was made in the past. Various leads to rod control relays and switches are wired differently than on the wiring diagram 4E1755C. However, the schematic drawing 4E-1414 remains unchanged. There is no schematic or electric change that would affect operability of rod control.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The plant changes were made prior to the current Work Request (Q88754) that is associated with this DCR. No current or previous drawing revisions reflect the plant changes. Cables 16794, 16780, 16781, 16795, 16769, 16770, 16782 and 16783 were routed through terminals 9 through 12 of terminal blocks ITB-28, ITB-30, ITB-29 and ITB-31 of the reactor protection system instead of travelling directly from the plant to the control room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change will not affect any system or possible accident outcome.
3. The margin of safety, as not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA Dose Reduction Sheet #297

DESCRIPTION:

Place lead shielding on 2-1202-6" from the 2-1201-2 valve to the penetration at X-14.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the lead shielding load is well within the engineering design limits of this pipe. Additionally the unit is in cold shutdown/refuel and primary containment is not required.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA Dose Reduction Sheet #298

DESCRIPTION:

Place lead shielding on the Recirc Jet pump risers from the grating at 614 to the nozzle connection at the Reactor Vessel.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the lead shielding will not exceed the maximum allowed stress of the pipe. Additionally this unit will be Cold Shutdown/Refuel and the Recirc system will be shutdown.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Unused wires to various intercept and stop valve switches were lifted and taped. The valve switches are:

1. Intercept valve #2 open and closed switches.
2. Stop valve #3 closed switches (SVCS).
3. Stop valve #2 open and closed switches (SVOS & SVCS)
4. Stop Valve #1 open switch (SVOS).

Also 17212 cable wires routed through terminals 3 & 4 instead of terminals 2 & 3 of stop valve #1.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there will be no effect on plant operation by lifting unused wires and having terminal wires routed through different terminals.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-1(2)-91-014

DESCRIPTION:

Replace existing crane #1 seals on the fuel pool cooling pumps with Chesterton 155 seals.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the Chesterton 155 seals will have the same function as Crane #1 seals, therefore this will not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA Dose Reduction Sheet #292

DESCRIPTION:

Place 10 - 40 lb lead blankets on 1-1009A-18" from heat exchanger out to about 6 feet.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the unit is in Refuel/Shutdown mode and the "A" RHR loop is out of service, due to work on the RHR heat exchanger. Also, the stress calculations done by Nutech show that this amount of lead is acceptable without violating any of the design stresses of the pipe.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA Dose Reduction Sheet #293

DESCRIPTION:

Place 10 - 40 lb. lead blankets on 1-1008A-18" from heat exchanger to 4' past the 1-1001-15A valves.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the unit is in Refuel/Shutdown mode and the "A" RHR loop is out of service due to work on the RHR heat exchanger. The stress calculations done by Nutech show that this amount of lead is acceptable without violating any of the design stresses of the pipe.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA Dose Reduction Sheet #294

DESCRIPTION:

Place 15 lead blankets (40lbs each) on 1-1009A-18" adjacent to the "A" RHR heat exchanger.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the unit is in the shutdown/refuel mode and the "A" RHR loop B out of service due to work on the RHR heat exchanger. These stress calculations, performed by Nutech, indicate that the amount of lead is acceptable without violating any of the design stresses of the pipe.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION FOR APRM 1 CHART RECORDER ON UNIT 2

DESCRIPTION:

Addition of a "Special APRM Power Supply Current Monitoring Box" in the line from the APRM 1 power supply to the APRM.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Turbine Trip w/o Bypass	UFSAR SECTION: 4.4.3 7.8.1
Load Reject w/o Bypass	UFSAR SECTION: 7.8.1

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this temporary alteration does not effect the operation of the APRM. The Temp. Alt. places a "special" APRM Power Supply Current Monitor Box" in line between the APRM power supply and electronics. The IM department verified the circuit current before and after installation and found them to be identical. Also, in the past Surveillance Test (ST) were successfully performed with the test recorder in place. If this were to fail the circuit would open or short which would provide a decreased voltage to the APRM, tripping the APRM on an inop trip. Therefore, this does not adversely impact or increase the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than those analyzed in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

WORK REQUEST #43101

DESCRIPTION:

Perform required electrical work for the 1B pump back compressor modification.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the structural properties of the floor at 595 elevation are not adversely affected by drilling six inch deep by .265 inch diameter holes in three locations, because the floor is made of two foot thick reinforced concrete. In addition, wiring affected by this change only affects the 1B pumpback system, and is not interconnected with other equipment. Required work at 901-3 panel will be performed during the QIRII refueling outage to minimize possible disruption to that panel.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 1-156

DESCRIPTION:

Special test to check local starting logic of U-1 Diesel Generator. No permanent changes to equipment.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the equipment used during the test will be removed after the test, and all permanent equipment manipulated for the test will be restored to its original condition, no new accidents or malfunctions are created. The special test will be performed on the U-1 Diesel Generator which is not considered operable. The 1/2 Diesel Generator is operable, and meets all FSAR and Tech Spec requirements while in Shutdown and Refueling modes.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

LOADING EVALUATION 91-001

DESCRIPTION

Place a total of 21 lead blankets in the Reactor Building Floor Drain sump of Unit 1.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the plant is in the refuel/shutdown mode and the Reactor Building Drain Sumps are used to detect leakage during the other modes of the reactor.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure will allow rejecting water from the primary coolant system. RHR Shutdown cooling will be on and water will be rejected to radwaste via the normal path.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Large/Small Break LOCA

UFSAR SECTION: 10.4.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the RHR failure would not adversely affect operation of the core spray system and the core spray system capacity is beyond the blowdown through the RHR discharge relief. The malfunction of the RHR system isolations is most limited (most adverse) if the 1001-50 fails to close to isolate the system. In this case the core spray system would function to restore reactor inventory.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the primary containment isolation requirements are only applicable to reactor operating conditions.

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test to balance the flow through the RHR Service Water Pump cubicle coolers.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test will not affect the function of the system. The Modification installed pressure indicators at the inlet and outlet of the coolers to regulate differential pressure across the coolers. This Modification test will balance the flow through the cubicle coolers.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA DOSE REDUCTION SHEET 313

DESCRIPTION:

Place 10, 40 pound lead blankets on scaffolding in the Unit 1 Regen Room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the loading evaluation was done in accordance to guidelines set forth by Sargent & Lundy, and therefore no new failure modes will be created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION 4-1-89-165 MOD TEST

DESCRIPTION:

This evaluation is for a modification test to M4-1-89-165, addition of protective relays to MCC 18/19-5.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this evaluation is for a mod test and equipment affected in this test will not be required during testing, so all operating configurations and methods will be met. Unit is shutdown for a refuel outage.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION

DESCRIPTION:

Inhibit HPCI turbine trip on pump low suction pressure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Slow Depressurizing Loss of Coolant Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 1.3.5	6.2.2
Inadvertent Injection of HPCI		6.2.5 6.2.7
		4.3.3.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the proposed change will not reduce the ability of the HPCI system to operate in a slow depressurizing LOCA. An actual low pump suction pressure condition will render the system inoperable just as it would without the change. The change will increase the possibility of damage to the pump resulting from a low pressure condition, since the trip function is no longer automatic but relies on operator action. The change should increase the overall reliability of the system by eliminating sporadic trips of the HPCI turbine due to normal pressure transients in the pump suction piping during startup. The proposed change has no effect on the probability of an inadvertent HPCI actuation.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because there are no Technical Specification requirements involved with the low pressure pump suction trip.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE 6533

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary procedure to verify removal of HPCI pump low suction pressure turbine trip.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because if the temporary procedure is successful, turbine operation will be unaffected. If it fails, the turbine will trip as designed with no chance of damage to any equipment. The temporary procedure simulates a pump low suction pressure to verify proper annunciation with no turbine trip.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

PO4-1 J1-013 MINOR DESIGN CHANGE

DESCRIPTION:

Remove temporary data logger, supports, thermocouples and all associated wiring that was originally installed under ECN QC-89E-37 and Work Request Q79403 & Q79404.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because removal of the temporary test equipment will not adversely affect any systems as described in the UFSAR. Because this was a temporary it is independent of all other systems and in no-way affects other systems.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Insert lead from 125 VDC control bus to contact 2 of Unit 1 Diesel Generator lockout relay. The lead will come off the 125 VDC control bus at a point that is different from the one shown in the 4E-1656H drawing. However, operability is not affected, and the circuit remains the same schematically and electrically. A different point off the bus was chosen in order to avoid pieing several leads at one terminal.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change can only reduce the likelihood of accidents or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Place 6 lead blankets on the Unit 1 Fuel Pool Heat Exchanger 1A pump discharge (1-1902A-6").

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because an evaluation was performed for cold shutdown/refueling. These results were then checked against results from an evaluation performed on the Operational Mode. Both evaluations permit placing more than the required amount of lead on the pipes involved.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Place 6 lead blankets on the Unit 1 Fuel Pool Heat Exchanger 1B pump suction line (1-1901B-6").

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because evaluations were performed for both Operational and Cold Shutdown/Refuel. Both evaluations approve more than the required amount of lead to be placed on the pipe involved.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 1-157

DESCRIPTION:

To pressurize the 101 heater in order to perform a leak test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test will only pressurize the heater to 15 psig at ambient temperature. Under normal operation the heater sees much higher pressures and temperatures, therefore, the pressure test will not exceed the design limits of the heater.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This test is to ensure proper placement of lighting and that the relocated lighting provides minimum lighting to all areas per Station Security Plan.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test involves visually checking lighting positions and making light intensity readings via a portable photometer. Therefore, this test can not impact systems or functions of systems so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification; therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Vendor recommended upgrades of electrical components of control room HVAC chlorine Analyzer. Also replacement of flowmeter for IM dept. use.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA

UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the function will not change in the least. The reliability of the alarming will increase. The change is an upgrade of existing components. The operation of the analyzer will not change. The replacement of the flowmeter will also not change the operation or function. It will only be used for reference purposes and a similar flow indicator existed here before.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST - M4-1-84-033B (Completion of Mod)

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification test on new RCIC time delay relays and associated disturbed wiring in panel 901-48. These relays control annunciator alarm functions. Various temporary jumpers will be installed to verify correct operation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the unit will be in refuel or shutdown. RCIC is not required to be operable. RCIC is a high pressure system. No isolation valve functions will be bypassed during the test.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA DOSE REDUCTION SHEET 316

DESCRIPTION:

Place lead shielding on the Clean-up Decant Pump (1-2029). This involves a total of 4 - 40 lb. blankets to be placed on the pump housing.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this particular pump is not required to be operational in shutdown/refuel and therefore no new failure modes will be created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Cut, thread and cap line 1-1240-3/4" below the 592' - 0" Grating Elevation. Remove the pipe and supports running up to the 1-1201-2 valve.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is a non-safety portion of the system and failure of the line has no safety considerations.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This mod test covers the balancing of the ECCS Room Coolers using U1 Diesel Generator cooling water pump and the U 1/2 Diesel Generator cooling water pump.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this mod test will not affect the HPCI, RHR, or Core Spray systems by balancing the flow through their room coolers. This mod test involves the balancing of the ECCS Room Coolers using the U1 and U 1/2 Diesel Generator cooling water pumps.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE P04-2-91-020

DESCRIPTION:

Replace pressure transducer and power supply in the Unit 2 reactor building ventilation system.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this design change is a component upgrade and therefore does not change the function of the circuit, or the function of the reactor building ventilation system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST FOR MC4-1-89-002

DESCRIPTION:

To perform a modification test on the Unit 1 EHC Oil Skid.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is a visual verification with no physical interaction what-so-ever and therefore no possibility of accidents or malfunctions exist.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This Minor Design change provides improved pipe support for the U-2 HPCI steam drain lines.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Large/Small Break LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 6.2.2, 6.2.5, 6.2.7, 1.3.5
------------------------	--

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the proposed change will not effect the operability of the steam drain line or the ability of the HPCI system to operate in a slow depressurizing LOCA. The three supports which are being removed can be taken out without affecting operability of the steam drain line. The structural integrity of the supports during installation will be maintained from the use of temporary vibration supports that can be utilized as needed.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure QOP 250-3, T1

DESCRIPTION:

Revise procedure QOP 250-3-T1 to include instructions on adjusting the fast closure time, slow closure time, and normal opening time of the new R.A. Hiller Actuators installed on the Unit One Main Steam Isolation Valves.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Main Steam Line Break Outside the Drywell	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.3
--	---------------	--------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure revision will allow for adjustments in the closing and opening times of the Unit One MSIVs. Technical specification Table 3.7-1 requires the MSIVs to close in $3 \leq T < 5$ seconds. This procedure revision does not affect or change the closing times of the MSIVs. There are no new failure modes added by this procedure revision. Also, no other systems or components are affected by this revision. Based upon the above reasons, the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type from those evaluated in the UFSAR is not created by implementation of this procedure revision.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure QOS 300-12

DESCRIPTION:

The CRD monthly surveillance was restricted so as not to be able to perform it below 20% of rated thermal power.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Control Rod Drop	UFSAR SECTION	14.2
------------------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the procedure change does not affect any systems or functions. It only adds a new limitation to the procedure so that BPWS constraints are met. Therefore it does not create the possibility of a new accident or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the margin of safety is not reduced since the surveillance on moving the control rods is still in effect. The procedure just restricts doing the surveillance below 20% power so that the initial conditions for the CRD accident is met. If it ever occurs that the unit is below 20% power and the surveillance comes due the unit will have to go over 20% power to do the surveillance or, the unit will have to enter 3.3.G and start shutting down. In both cases the margin of safety as described in Tech Specs is kept the same.

DESCRIPTION:

The CRD weekly exercise and CRD Daily Exercise - Inoperable Control Rods were changed so that the procedures are not performed below 20% of rated thermal power.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:

- The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
- The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
- Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Control Rod Drop	UFSAR SECTION	14.2
------------------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the procedure change does not affect any systems or functions. It only adds a new limitation to the procedure so that BPWS constraints are met. Therefore, it does not create the possibility of a new accident or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the surveillances on moving the control rods are still in effect. The procedure changes just restricts doing the surveillance below 20% power. The restriction is to make sure the initial conditions for the CRD accident is met. If it ever occurs that the unit is below 20% power and the surveillance comes due the following would have to be done. Either increase power above 20% for the surveillance or enter 3.3.G and start shutting down. In both cases the margin of safety in Tech Specs stays the same.

Modification Test M04-1-82-036

DESCRIPTION:

Verify partial modification test performed for M04-1-82-036.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no components are affected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure QMMS 4160-23

DESCRIPTION:

Change procedure to reflect new testing requirements for the HPCI protection fire detection system as it can not be tested by applying heat.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change does not increase the potential for an accident or a malfunction not addressed in the UFSAR. The new testing criteria is a more accurate method of testing that does not introduce any unreviewed question previously evaluated in the UFSAR or Technical Specifications.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because there is no reduction in safety introduced by this change. The test method being introduced is vendor approved and performs the same function as the test method being replaced. The new test method also verifies several points of activation of the detection system up and downstream of the heat detector.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE 89-1-001

DESCRIPTION:

Mod test does not have any physical actions, therefore no change is involved.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there is no impact to systems or functions because mod test does not perform any physical actions.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure QEMP 600-7, QEMP 600-7-S1, S2

DESCRIPTION:

Revise QEMP 600-7, S1 & S2 to include instructions on providing an alternate electrical supply to the Unit One MSIV actuators for stroking the valves when setting the 10% scram limit switches.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system, or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Main Steam Line Break Outside of Drywell	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.3
---	---------------	--------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure revision only affects the method of supplying an alternate source of electrical power to the solenoids of the MSIVs. This will allow the Electrical Maintenance Department to locally stroke the Unit One MSIVs when setting the 10% scram limit switches. The method of setting 10% limit is remaining unchanged. No other systems or components are affected by this revision. Also, no new failure modes are added by this revision. Based upon the above reasons, the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type from those evaluated in the UFSAR is not created by implementation of this procedure revision.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Special Test #1-158, 2-99

DESCRIPTION:

This special test is a variation of QOS 1100-6, SBLC Demineralized water recycle test with flow indicator (Rev. 6). The test will run a SBLC pump recycling water to the SBLC tank, and monitor pump parameters while raising the water temperature to 150 degrees fahrenheit.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Anticipated Transient Without SCRAM (Including Loss of CRD System without other transient)	UFSAR SECTION	6.7, 6.7.1 (and 10 CFR50.62)
--	---------------	---------------------------------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test only temporarily disables the SBLC system to perform operations very similar to the monthly surveillance Tech Specs allow a 24 hour LCO for a unit not in cold shutdown when SBLC is inoperable. Personnel capable of restoring the system to an operable status will be at the SBLC system throughout the test. As SBLC is not an automatic initiation system, takes 90 to 120 minutes to shut down the reactor (per FSAR 6.7.3), and is usually not an immediate operator action, the amount of time in which SBLC is inoperable will not increase the probability of an accident requiring SBLC such that SBLC cannot be restored promptly.

The purpose of this test is to assist in verifying that SBLC will function properly during an event in which it is needed. Therefore, this test helps to assure that the proper margin of safety is present.

If, as a result of this test, it is determined that the SBLC system is inoperable, the Technical Specification LCO requirement will be applied as necessary.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because Tech Specs allow SBLC to be inoperable for a short period of time. This test will be completed within the time limitations. Further, personnel will be on hand to return SBLC to service if necessary.

Modification Test RHR Interlock M04-1-90-006A & B

DESCRIPTION:

No permanent change to plant: Temporary alteration to RHR system line-up to facilitate modification test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because 1) the RHR system will be out of service during performance of test. 2) RHR system valves will be in the closed position to prevent any possible drain paths. 3) Test will insure RHR system interlocks function as designed. 4) RHR LPCI mode is not required in this mode of operation with the CS system operational.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Replace chimney stack sping monitor pressure indicator mounting block with a tee fitting.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because tee installation weigh less than existing mounting block, is equally resistant to adverse environmental conditions, and the tee will eliminate the pressure differential that currently exists across the mounting block.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because flow path will be established in accordance with Tech Spec requirements.

Procedure Change for QTS 150-1, 8 (Delete) S2, S3 (Delete)
S4, S5, S10,S11 (Delete) S12, S20, T16

DESCRIPTION:

Revision to IPCLRT procedure block to incorporate double verification/editorial changes.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the plant will not be in an operable mode during the performance of this procedure. Systems necessary to add water to the vessel will be left in an operable condition.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Operability Evaluation Checklist #91-6

DESCRIPTION:

The SBLC pumps are not able to pump the SBLC test tank below 20 inches when the water temperature is at 133 degrees Fahrenheit or greater.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change in NPSH does not create the possibility of an accident different than those evaluated in the FSAR. SBLC will still inject 600 ppm of boron into the reactor as the FSAR describes.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Preliminary UFSAR Submittal Review

DESCRIPTION:

Change Section 10.6 of the UFSAR - Station Fire Protection.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire	UFSAR SECTION	10.6
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the new coverage provided by the Fire Protection System as identified in this UFSAR revision does not increase the credible potential for occurrence of any accidents involving release of radiation to the public. The coverage for the Visitor's Center, Standardized Training Facility, and new warehouse involve areas outside the fence which contain no radioactive materials. The remaining UFSAR changes only clarify the type of coverage provided by the existing fire protection system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure Change to QCEMS 350-5

DESCRIPTION:

Change procedure to add directions for WSO to load the diesel generator following auto-start during Core Spray logic testing.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change increases the reliability of the Diesel Engines, thereby decreasing the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the change increases the margin of safety for the EDG's during core spray logic testing. During extended EDG runs, the engine is better protected by being loaded.

DESCRIPTION:

Modification Test for Partial Mod M04-1-87-059C. New Drywell Penetration for Reactor Vessel Water Level Instrumentation System (RVWLIS) reference log flashing modification. This mod test makes no change.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the IPCLRT is an approved procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Special Test 90-154

DESCRIPTION:

Special test to establish baseline data of voltage and current readings when operating the M01-1301-61, 1-2301-8, 2-2301-3 and 2-2301-14. Following this, discharge resistors/varistors will be inserted and test repeated to determine their effectiveness in reducing the voltage spikes and eliminating the ground alarms.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system, or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because Special Test will not change the RCIC or HPCI systems during Reactor Power operations when the systems are required to be operable. Therefore, possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR is not increased.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test M4-1-87-059D

DESCRIPTION:

Modification Test for Partial Mod M04-1-87-059D new drywell penetration for Reactor Vessel Water Level Instrumentation System (RVWLIS) reference leg flashing modification. This mod test makes no change.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the IPCLRT is an approved procedure and the mod test requires that the IPCLRT passes and that the welds on penetration X-109, be snopped at a minimum pressure of 2 psig during the performance of the IPCLRT. The plant will not be placed in any adverse conditions a result of this test except for any conditions already evaluated for the IPCLRT.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Votes test of MOV's for minor design changes, mods, minor and major maintenance, and information only.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because votes testing is non-intrusive. It does not change function of the valve or system being tested. It does not remove any components from the actuator therefore votes testing does not affect any previously evaluated accident and does not introduce any accidents or malfunctions different from those evaluated.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because votes testing does not alter stoke time, therefore safety margins are not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Verify calibration and functional test procedures for Chlorine Analyzer were done. Also, verify visual inspection of flow in flow indicator after installation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test will not alter any current plant conditions because it only involves verifying that 2 procedures have already been performed, and also that flow was and is observed in the new flow indicator after installation.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This Safety Evaluation is for the review of Work Package Q85908-6.01. Installation of electrical supervision for the Unit 1 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System Panel (2251-64).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire	UFSAR SECTION	10.6
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because Section 10.6 of the UFSAR does not specifically identify which fire protection detection systems are required to have electrical supervision only that "all alarm circuits are either electrically supervised or are tested to assure operability". The two new TRX modules are being installed to monitor existing fire protection equipment and will not affect the operation of the existing equipment or the fire protection system. Therefore, providing this additional electrical supervision will not present any new credible accidents from those previously analyzed.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-1-90-176

DESCRIPTION:

Perform a minor design change test on the filter circuit added to the Main Generator SI Backup fault detector relay. The test will verify that the OAD construction test have been performed, that a 100% wiring verification has been performed, and that the filter circuit has been properly mounted.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the fault detector relays function has not been changed by the addition of the filter circuit. The test is only a visual inspection.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST M4-1-87-027

DESCRIPTION:

Ground was lifted from the bucket in MCC 17-1 and a new SBM switch for 1-5740-113 has been replaced.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created even though the drywell cooling fans will be inoperable, during refuel or shutdown these fans are not needed. This test has no other effect on other systems and does not increase the possibility of an accident or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This modification was to add a limitorque operator to valve 1-1901-112. The limitorque operator would allow remote operation of the valve. Station Management decided that it was more beneficial to cancel the electrical portions of the modification and only the mechanical portion was completed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the valve will remain a manually operated valve. However, with or without the electrical portion of the modification and remote operation of the valve the function of the valve would not have changed in any operating mode of the plant and no new failure modes will be created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

To pressurize the IC1 heater in order to perform a leak test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test will only pressurize the heater to 15 psig at ambient temperature. Under normal operations the heater sees much higher pressures and temperatures. Therefore the pressure test will not exceed the design limits of the heater.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-85

Minor Design Change MC4-1-90-162
Work Request Q80138

DESCRIPTION:

Mod test will consist of visual inspection/verification that cable tray addition was installed per drawing requirements.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because mod test is a visual inspection. This will not increase the possibility of an accident or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform mod test to visually verify installation of repair for extraction/steam turbine nozzle line 1-3107-24".

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the mod test is a visual inspection. The system configuration will not be changed such that an unreviewed safety concern will be created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Special Test 1-155

DESCRIPTION:

Test and timing of the Unit 1 Diesel Generator Auto-Start Logic.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the special test will not have any permanent affects or changes to the Unit 1 Diesel Generator. The test is only to gather information on the logic circuit actuation upon receiving an Auto-start signal.

The jumper and recorder used will be disconnected after the test, prior to declaring the Unit 1 Diesel Generator operable. Therefore, no possibility exists of creating an accident or malfunction different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change Test P04-1-91-013

DESCRIPTION:

Mod test to visually verify that all temporary test equipment associated with the Dirivent modification has been removed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this mod test does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident. This mod test does not interact with any other system in the plant.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

To repair a steam leak on the U-2 HPCI Steam drain Line by using a pipe clamp fitting.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Slow Depressuring	UFSAR SECTION	1.3.5, 6.2.2,
Loss of Coolant Accident		6.2.5, 6.2.7

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the proposed change will not reduce the ability of the HPCI system to operate in a slow depressurizing LOCA. The pipe clamp has been evaluated above the design conditions of the system and found acceptable for operability. In the event of the clamp failing, the radiological release would be directed into the Reactor Building where the flow would be monitored and processed through Stand-by Gas Treatment System. This would limit exposures below regulation limits if necessary. The overall piping of the steam drain line is increased.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because there are no Technical Specifications required that involve steam drainline operability.

Procedures QOA 912-1-C, QOS 005-S14, and QTP 400-5

DESCRIPTION:

Revisions to QOA 912-1-C, QOS 005-S14 and QTP 400-5. Special test to be performed per NRC concerns to verify SBLC system performs properly during two-pump operation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change revises procedures which monitor new equipment installed under Modification M04-0-89-066.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Special Test 1-159

DESCRIPTION:

This special test will drain the SBLC tank to temporary storage tanks, using both SBLC pumps. The test may be run multiple times at different SBLC tank temperatures.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Anticipated Transient Without Scram (ATWS), including Loss of CRD System without other transient.	UFSAR SECTION	6.7, 6.7.1 (and 10CFR50.62)
---	---------------	--------------------------------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test only temporarily disables the SBLC system to perform testing to verify the system will function properly. The SBLC system will not be required to be operational during the testing period, and will be returned to its normal configuration when testing is completed.

A loading evaluation has been performed to verify the refuel floor can support the temporary tanks. Floor drains will be isolated to prevent leakage of boron solution into the floor drains, and chemistry will verify the SBLC solution is adequate after the test.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure QTS 160-7, S8

DESCRIPTION:

Update to procedure and change the time interval on the data sheet from 30 seconds to 15 seconds.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because changing the frequency of the readings for the Control Room Emergency Filtration System for Six-Place DOP leak test will give more stable readings. This will insure more accurate results that need to be obtained per TS 3.8.

This reading change will not affect the efficiency of the Control Room Emergency Filtration System or the Control Room HVAC System.

Therefore, this procedure change will not create the possibility of an accident.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure Change "Suppression Chamber to Drywell Vacuum
Breaker Preventative Maintenance"
QMPM 1600-1, QMPM 1600-1-S1

DESCRIPTION:

Change limit switch position tolerance and clarify proper placement of test instruments. Additional instructions for new switch type.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change makes the limit switch setting more conservative, thus safety is improved. The switches provide indication only, and would not adversely affect other systems by producing improper control signals. Two switches per valve provide redundancy. If both were to fail, the conservative setting would not be a contributing factor to the failure, and the changed setting could not be associated with any new accident scenario. Switch operation does not affect valve operation, so the vacuum breaker will function as intended.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because previously, the affected procedure stated that a 1/8" setting at the bottom of the disc was sufficient to meet Tech Spec requirements. This parameter will be changed to 1/16" at or below the midpoint of the disc. This is a conservative change, increasing the present margin of safety.

Modification Test Splined Adapter Retainer P04-1-91-006

DESCRIPTION:

Stroke the 1-3905 valve full open and full closed 3 time.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION	10.8
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because during the refuel/shutdown mode, the cooling loads due to the MG Sets Oil and the TBCCH heat exchangers are not that great and the test will last at most an hour.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Quad Cities A Model System Field Computer Test

DESCRIPTION:

On Section 7.3 Invariant Test of this temperature. Procedure changes a plant. The normal operation of removing computer points from scan by the process computer will be used for both R226 and R232 Met Tower Delta temperatures. Once removed from scan two fixed valves will be inserted for a 4 hour time period. After 4 hours the two computer points will be returned to normal scan.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test has been designed to demonstrate the operation of the A-Model program and selected option of computer programs that are apart of the A-Model program that interface with the program. The program had all of the option tested in the corporate computer. This test demonstrates their operation using the station computers, printers and terminals.

Section 7.3 removes two computer points from Scan R226 and R232. They are the computer points that store the met tower differential temperature data. Once removed using normal control room functions two fixed valves will be inserted for four hours. This test will demonstrate the operation of the A-Model Subroutines on the Invariant signal test for met tower delta temperatures. After the test section is complete the computer points shall be returned to a normal scan status as required by the test procedure.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Quad Cities A-Model System Integrated Field Test

DESCRIPTION:

Install jumpers to bypass the Gr-II isolation signals from both Drywell High Radiation Monitors. Install bypass line to bypass Main Chimney SPING causing high range noble gas and sampler flow rate monitor to be inoperable. Disconnect cable from process computer to prime computer causing point history to be inoperable.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

GrII Isolation of Drywell High Radiation	UFSAR SECTION	7.7.2.3
---	---------------	---------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because with the reactor in shutdown and depressurized drywell integrity is not required, nor are the Gr-II isolation signals. Installation of the jumper to bypass the Drywell High Radiation GrII isolation signals will prevent cycling the valves, systems and components when section 7.4 of the test is implemented. This will prevent undue stress on those items.

Implementation of the A Model Integrated Field test is needed to validate operation of the A Model Software in the plant computer using plant systems that feed information to the program. There is isolation between the A Model Software and the plant equipment input signals in that the data is feed to the process/PRIME computer system computer point data base. This information then is read by the A Model program and used for calculations and evaluations.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because when the main chimney SPING monitor is included with the test in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 the GE monitor will be available for operation. Also the equipment will be returned to service after each test section(s) is completed. The SPING monitor for the main chimney can be returned to normal operation status within 72 hours.

Procedure QAP 1170-19
Administration Requirements for Fire Protection

DESCRIPTION:

New procedure being developed to supersede the requirements stated in Technical Specifications 3.12/4.12.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:

- The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
- The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
- Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire	UFSAR SECTION	10.6
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change does not affect the inspection or testing requirements that already exist. The purpose of this procedure change is to replace Technical Specification 3.12/4.12 with an administration procedure that can be controlled by the station. All requirements currently stated in Technical Specification are described in this procedure change.

The only affect to the fire protection system is that the requirements will now be tracked and controlled through an administrative procedure.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because all changes to the administrative program are in a conservative direction as the change is the method of controlling the surveillance requirements.

Minor Design Change Test MC4-1-89-018

DESCRIPTION:

There is no change. This evaluation is for a minor design change test on the Extraction Steam non return check valves. The test simply involves doing a visual inspection of the modified valves.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the minor design change test is only a visual inspection of the extraction steam non return check valves which were modified during the Refuel Outage. The valves are not required to be operable in the Refuel or Shutdown modes. These valves are out of service in the closed position. This MDC Test will in no way create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Verify that two transducers replaced in the Reactor Building vent system and their associated power supply is working correctly.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because mod test will verify calibration and operation of replaced transducers and then associated power supply. This mod test will not adversely affect Reactor Building ventilation or any other system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-1-90-165

DESCRIPTION:

This minor design change test will consist of opening and closing the valves and of visually inspecting for leaks.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because if the valve fails by not closing the other end of the valve will be capped and no loss of fluid from the system will occur. There will be no new failure modes created that will impact the system. The visual part of the test is a passive function.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test for MC4-1-90-91

DESCRIPTION:

Perform a visual verification of the installation of the new hypochlorite sparger support.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is for a visual inspection of a new hypochlorite sparger support. This test will not affect any system in a manner that will cause a malfunction or an accident.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The mod test is a visual inspection of the repairs for the Feedwater Heater Shells 1C1-3104, 1C2-3104, 1C3-3104 and 1B1-3103.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the mod test is a visual inspection only. The system configuration will not be changed such that an reviewed safety concern will be created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test MC4-1-90-157
Reactor Recirc Pump Whip Restraint

DESCRIPTION:

Mod test for Minor Design Change. Test only involves verification that construction tests were performed. No in-plant activity or system interaction required.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test involves no plant interaction. Only documentation of construction testing is involved.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test for M4-1-85-5

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification test and operability test to verify proper performance of installed and modified wiring.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test is to be performed while the reactor is in a cold condition. In this condition the HPCI system is inoperable. Changes performed during mod test will not adversely impact the system or function.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

During the performance of this test there will be no change from a normal configuration. This also includes the Operability test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test is passive and has no impact on any plant system. It will require no change of any safety system. Plant operation will be unaffected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

DCR is to change low/hl level alarm settings and pump initiation/trip setting on appropriate drawing to match existing signal settings.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the DCR is to get the alarm and pump operation setpoints for the DG fuel oil day tanks to agree with present settings.

The present settings agree with all FSAR and Technical Specification requirements, and were used in all supporting calculations.

The change does not adversely impact systems nor functions.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because per ABB Impeil Calculation 0591-171-020, Rev. 1 the settings (existing) are adequate to satisfy the Technical Specification requirements. Margin of safety is increased since the drawing shows a lower tank level than presently exists.

Suppression Chamber to Drywell Vacuum Breaker
Preventive Maintenance
QMPM 1600-1-T2, QMPM 1600-1, QMPM 1600-1-S1

DESCRIPTION:

Change limit switch position tolerance and clarify proper placement of test instruments. Additional instructions for new switch type and vacuum breaker limit switch mounting bracket diagram including bill of material.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change makes the limit switch setting more conservative, thus safety is improved. The switches provide indication only, and would not adversely affect other systems by producing improper control signals. Two switches per valve provide redundancy. If both were to fail, the conservative setting would not be a contributing factor to the failure, and the changed setting could not be associated with any new accident scenario. Switch operation does not affect valve operation, so the vacuum breaker will function as intended.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because previously, the affected procedure stated that a 1/8 inch setting at the bottom of the disc was sufficient to meet Technical Specification requirements. This parameter will be changed to 1/16 inch at or below the midpoint of the disc. This is a conservative change, increasing the present margin of safety.

PO4-1(2)-90-152, MODIFICATION TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Determine the effectiveness of the new float-type isolation valves in the reactor building sumps to prevent backflow of sump water into the reactor building corner rooms.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Flooding

UFSAR SECTION: 6.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the valves being tested by this procedure are designed to provide better flood protection than previous valves. If the valves were to fail during this test, personnel will be available to reinstall the floor drain plugs if flooding were to occur due to backflow from the sumps.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test M4-1-84-017

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification test on Unit 1 Main Generator HI/LO Minimum Exciter Limit lights. This test verifies the satisfactory completion of OAD Construction testing, Users's Walkdown, and performs DC Ground Checks.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test does not affect plant conditions due to the fact that the plant is shutdown. No relays will be picked up or protective devices actuated by this modification tests. This test performs energized and de-energized DC Ground checks, an evolution which is often performed during normal operation of the plant, to verify proper installation of this modification.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Allows the operator two methods to open bypass valves for the Relief Valve test. One method is using Load Set and the other method is adjusting Pressure Set below Reactor pressure OR withdrawing Control Rods to increase Reactor Pressure and pressure setpoint.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change allows two methods of opening Turbine Bypass Valves for the purpose of testing ADS Valves when the turbine is not on line. The first method is to lower pressure set on the EHC System to below Reactor pressure. This method has not changed from the method used in the Revision 0 procedure. The other method is to withdraw Control Rods to increase Reactor pressure above pressure Set pressure. This is covered under QGP 4-1 for control rod withdrawal and is a normal method to open Bypass Valves during a unit startup when this surveillance may be performed. All control rod movements made to accomplish opening BPV's are done per QGP 4-1 and therefore done in compliance with the UFSAR. Therefore this change does not create any new unevaluated events that are not already addressed within the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Install new heat trace to 2-2401B (2B C.A.M) to meet the design criteria of 280 degrees Fahrenheit.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION	5.2.3.4.C
------	---------------	-----------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because This work replaces faulty heat trace. The existing 2B CAM is inoperable. The work will be confined to the C.A.M. system and no components of other systems will be affected.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the work can be completed without reducing the margin of safety. One operable channel complies with Technical Specification Requirements.

Minor Design Change Mod Test P04-1-90-126

DESCRIPTION:

Visual dimensional verifications and labeling visuals, plus performs approved procedure QIS 36-1 functional test to verify off-gas timer reset switch operation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the functional test is an approved procedure performed on a moninly basis as required in Technical Specifications. The visual portions affect no system or function.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test M4-1-89-71

DESCRIPTION:

There is no change involved with the performance of this test on the Off Gas Condenser Level Controllers. This test performs a visual examination and verifies that the proper program is stored in the controllers.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test is a visual examination of the Off-Gas Condenser Level Controllers and the internal program. No other equipment is affected by this test. This mod test will in no way create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

UFSAR Changes, Sections 6.2.7.2.5 and 6.2.7.11

DESCRIPTION:

The UFSAR is being changed to indicate that the MAPLHGR limits are in the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR) not the Technical Specifications. Also, the SAFER/GESTR reference needs to be changed to the current revision.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no systems or functions are affected by the changes. The MAPLHGR limits for the various fuel types are now located in the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR) instead of the Technical Specification. There is no change in how the limits are calculated or how they are used. Section 3.5.I of the Technical Specification even requires that the limits not be exceeded as given in the COLR. The change in the SAFER/GESTR reference to the new revision is needed since FSAR Section 6.2 is written to the new revision, yet the reference wasn't updated. This change has no affect on any material in the FSAR since the sections had previously been updated to the new revision of SAFER/GESTR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The purpose of this minor design change is to provide a line in the radwaste solidification system which will bypass both the radwaste mixing tank and the radwaste pump. This will allow bead resins to be sent directly to a High Integrity Container or steel liner in the radwaste truckbay without using the mixing tank or radwaste pump. New operating procedures have been written to accomplish this new type of processing.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change only provides an alternative routing for radwaste resins from the spent resin tanks to a liner/High Integrity Container not using the radwaste pump. The radwaste pump was intended to pump resins out of the mixing tank and since the mixing tank has already been bypassed, the pump is not required for this alternative.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA Dose Reduction Sheet #331

DESCRIPTION:

Place 20 1' X 4' lead blankets on carts in the North Storage Room E1 647'.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the approved method of doing floor loadings is based on UFSAR section 12.0 and are by S&L's account, conservative in nature.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

WORK REQUEST Q90054

DESCRIPTION:

Repair damaged jacket on cables in cable pan located near cable route point 342B2 342T (Cable 12353 lifted).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling Accident	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.2
Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the standby train of SBTG will be fully operable during work on the "B" SBTG Train for the cables. The SBTG "B" Trouble Alarm will be disconnected. This may cause an auto start of SBTG being worked on.

Operability of the SBTG will be determined after work is completed.

These conditions will not create the possibility of accident of a different type than addressed in the UFSAR.

3. The margin of safety, as not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Temporary Procedure #6689

DESCRIPTION:

This Temporary Procedure Change provides a method for utilizing the 1B Instrument Air System as a Backup Air Source to the Unit Two System. Unit Two reactor requires Instrument Air for operation. Unit One is in Refuel Outage.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because Instrument Air is required for Unit Two Reactor Operation. This change will make Unit Two Instrument Air Lines failure less likely. Instrument Air Failure does not jeopardize safe shutdown of the Reactor.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification testing on newly installed IE signal isolators which isolate Division I safety related signal loops from non safety related computer points. This test simulates faults in the non safety related computer points and verifies no changes to signal loop outputs.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test does not adversely affect systems or the functions of systems due to the test being performed on the non safety related computer point side of the isolators. The Division I safety related signal loops will not be affected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification testing on newly installed IE signal isolators which isolate Division I safety related signal loops from non safety related computer points upon a fault in the computers. This test simulates faults in the computer points and verifies no changes to the signal loop outputs.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test does not adversely affect systems or the functions of systems due to the test being performed on the non safety related computer point side of the isolators. The Division I safety related signal loops will not be affected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #6691

DESCRIPTION:

Implement a temporary procedure to resolve the discrepancies associated with the most recent performance of QCEMS 350-1, Automatic Blowdown Logic Test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the temporary procedure verifies that the Automatic Blowdown 110 second timers function as designed by simulating the initiating signals for timers. There is no change to the logic or equipment in the Automatic Blowdown system. The temporary procedure will be performed only when Unit 1 is in the Refuel or Shutdown mode and the Automatic Blowdown is not required to be operable.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE

DESCRIPTION:

Create and implement a temporary procedure to resolve a discrepancy that occurred during a recent Unit 1 HPCI Logic Functional Test, QCEMS 350-4. The discrepancy pertains to the Unit 1 Gland Seal Leak Off Exhauster.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the temporary procedure, which implements portions of the HPCI Logic Test that pertain to the Gland Seal Leakoff Exhauster, does not create an increased probability of accidents or equipment malfunction. The temporary procedure will be performed in a refuel or shutdown mode, and it tests for proper starting and stopping of the Gland Seal Leakoff Exhauster.
3. The margin of safety, as not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change Test MC4-1-90-059

DESCRIPTION:

This evaluation is for MDC Test MC4-1-90-059. This test will verify that the Turbine-Generator Load reject pressure switches will actuate in 30 seconds from start of TCV fast closure. This test will also verify that the RCVs will fast close in greater than 150 msec but less than 300 msec.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there are no new failure modes introduced to the turbine or EHC systems by the performance of this MDC test. Secondary Containment integrity will be maintained during this test. The scrams associated with the Turbine and EHC systems (See Step 8) are not required to be operable in the REFUEL or SHUTDOWN modes. This test simply involves stroking each TCV one at a time to determine response times of the RPS pressure switches associated with T/G load rejection and to determine the full stroke time of the TCVs in the Fast Closure Mode. Based on the above reasons, this test will not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification & Operability Tests for M04-1-88-009

DESCRIPTION:

Modification testing will verify proper operation and separation of division for the Torus to Drywell vacuum breaker closed limit switches.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the testing will ensure the function of the vacuum breaker closed indication functions properly. The test will also verify the vacuum breakers close properly. This will ensure no new accidents or malfunctions are possible.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the modification and operability tests will verify the above limit is met and all closed indication and alarms are accurate.

DESCRIPTION:

Operation of Unit One with Circuit #6 (4E-1015A) of Standby Liquid Control Heat Tracing inoperable. (Operability assessment for Unit One SBLC System)

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

ATWS/Loss of CRD System	UFSAR SECTION	6.7
-------------------------	---------------	-----

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the lack of heat tracing on this 12 inch section of pipe on one of the two suction lines does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than those evaluated in the UFSAR. The purpose of the heat tracing is to ensure that the solution in the pipes does not fall below Tech Spec limits and the saturation temperature. Analysis has shown that this can be accomplished with the existing plant configuration as long as the ambient temperature is maintained above 66 degrees fahrenheit. The ambient temperature will be monitored daily to ensure the pipe does not fall below Technical Specification limits. Monitoring of the pipe itself on a more frequent basis will be initiated if the ambient temperature drops below 66 degrees fahrenheit, and appropriate actions will be taken if the pipe temperature falls below Technical Specification limits.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the margin of safety is not reduced unless the ambient temperature in the SBLC area drops below 66 degrees fahrenheit, and subsequent measurements of the pipe temperatures verify that the piping has in fact dropped below the Technical Specifications limits listed above.

DESCRIPTION:

This safety evaluation is for the work package to allow rerouting of line 1/2-20714C around the radwaste pump.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because during the time this work package is being done the affected line and radwaste pump will be out of service.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SETPOINT CHANGE NUMBER 414

DESCRIPTION:

Changing the chart speed of the new IRM/APRM and SRM recorders to 1600 mm/hr in fast speed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change is needed to get the fast speed of the new recorders to be equivalent to the fast speed of the old recorders. The old recorders had a fast speed of 1524 mm/hr. The new recorders due to a setting restriction could be set to either 1500 mm/hr or 1600mm/hr to get into that speed range. The faster speed setting was chosen since that would be the more conservative setting. The change is therefore setting the fast speed of the new recorder so that operations will have the same type of indication as they had on the old recorders.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This is the modification test of P04-1-90-172. It will include verification of proper reconnection of cables to the detector and monitor. It will also verify the detector has been correctly positioned inside the X 107B penetration. The Fire Protection Engineer will inspect all fire barriers that were resealed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test will not adversely impact systems or functions. The only interaction resulting from this test would be a 1/2 Group II isolation coming from the handling of the detector cables during the termination verification steps.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #6694

DESCRIPTION:

Create and implement a temporary procedure to resolve a discrepancy that occurred during a recent "A" loop RHR logic test, temporary procedure #6675.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the temporary procedure, which implements portions of temporary procedure #6675 that pertain to relay 10A-K13A, will be performed during a refuel or shutdown mode. It tests that the relay 10A-K13A performs properly when receiving a simulated high drywell pressure signal.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Temporary Procedure #6697

DESCRIPTION:

Create and implement a temporary procedure to resolve a discrepancy that occurred during a recent "B" Loop RHR Logic test, Temporary Procedure #6675.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the temporary procedure will be performed during a refuel or shutdown mode. In implementing portions of temporary procedure #6675, regarding RHR "B" loop heat exchanger control, the current temporary procedure does not create an increased probability of an accident or equipment malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA DOSE REDUCTION SHEET 333

DESCRIPTION:

Place lead shielding around the 1/2-20780-1 1/2" line. The lead will be hung from the pipe support.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the added weight of the lead shielding is within the allowed loading of this support.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

HPCI deluge system functional test will be performed by activating the individual manual pushbuttons to verify the integrity of the circuitry. The integrity of the protectowire will be verified by taking resistance measurements and comparing these to baseline values determined during the modification tests.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

FIRE UFSAR SECTION: 10.6

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because verification of integrity of the detection portion of the system is made prior to placing the suppression system back into service. When the detection system is placed back into service (resetting breaker #8 at the 125 VDC reactor building dist. panel), any new failures (shorts, etc.) created by this test will be observed by the alarm system. This is done prior to placing the suppression system back into service to prevent accidentally setting off the deluge system and spraying the HPCI turbine.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION

DESCRIPTION:

Remove the automatic reset card from the ACAD Flow Control Valve controller. Then jumper terminal 3 and terminal 4.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change only bypasses and removed an unused component of the ACAD FCV controller. The controller will maintain its function after the change is in place. The change will eliminate spurious noise spikes introduced by the unused card, thus increasing the reliability of the controller.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-153

M4-0-86-11E

DESCRIPTION:

This modification test is being performed to assure that there will be no detrimental effects to other systems.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test does not adversely impact any systems or functions.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALTERNATE REPLACEMENT EVALUATION Q-91-007-0138-00

DESCRIPTION:

Replace the existing two-ply bellows in the 18" tandem expansion joint identified as X025. The original bellows material was ASTM A240 Type 304; the replacement bellows material is ASME SA240 Type 321.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant Accident UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the replacement bellows is being installed on Safety Related Work Request Q90521 in accordance with the ASME Repair/Replacement Program CWE-53-078, Rev. 0, and ECN 04-00409M. It has been procured in accordance with Nutech Design Specification CWE-53-077, Rev. 1, which meets the original design requirements contained in Sargent & Lundy Specification R-2330, Section 3.16.

When this repair is complete, the 1-X025 Tandem Expansion Joint will be returned to its original design configuration. There will be no change in system function, and no new or different failure modes will have been created. Therefore, the accident analysis contained in the UFSAR will not have been altered.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

To take the 1201-2 valve OOS for the worm-gear motor change out MDC PO4-1-91-040, this valve will be taken OOS open.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because even in a line break the 1201-5 valve would isolate the system and the feed pumps would supply make-up water.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This is for the Modification test of the relocation of the condensate pump discharge sample probe.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because if the newly installed probe were to break off in the condensate discharge header, the farthest the probe could go is to the condensate demineralizers. The probe would then be filtered out, causing very little flow obstruction. This in turn would have no effect on the condensate booster or feedwater systems. The rest of the test will not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR. No other new failure modes will be introduced because the test utilized existing components in their intended configuration.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Modification Test for recorders TR-1-1640-200B, TR-1-1640-200A and TR-1-1640-9.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there is no impact on any system or function from taking instrument readings.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OPERABILITY TEST - MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-90-120

DESCRIPTION:

This test verifies proper operation of new recorders by performing a channel check between Div. I recorder and Div. II recorder.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there is no impact on any system or function from taking instrument readings.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Replace existing cooling water biocide injection system.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because replacement of the biocide injection skid will not create any new system interactions, and services the same design function.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-160

04-1-91-009 - MOD TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Stroke MO 1-1301-22 and MO 1-1301-26. Verify VOTES traces of MO 1-1301-22 and 1-1301-26. Verify current strip charts of MO 1-1301-22 and MO 1-1301-26.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Condense; Accident UFSAR SECTION: 4.5

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test is to be performed during cold shutdown. The valve function will not change. RCIC system function will not change.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 250-6, VENTING REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL VIA MAIN STEAM LINE DRAINS

DESCRIPTION:

When the drywell is flooded as a means to assure adequate core cooling, the RPV must be vented to insure that the drywell and RPV water levels are equal. This procedure provides the guidance to vent via the main steam line drains.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in these steps are not discussed in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require implementation of these procedure steps are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents described in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, as not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ADDITION OF WATER TO THE REACTOR VESSEL - QCOP 300-16

DESCRIPTION:

Allows use of both CRD pumps.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the increased flow rate will aid in RPV level recovery.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

CRD PUMP CROSS-TIE OPERATION - QCOP 300-19

DESCRIPTION:

Add instruction for valving in both sets of suction filters concurrently.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because procedure provides greater system operation flexibility.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 300-28 - ALTERNATE CONTROL ROD INSERTION

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure provides direction on inserting control rods when an ATWS has occurred. It incorporates guidance on deenergizing scram solenoids, depressurizing the scram air header, draining the SDV and performing a manual scram or scram using individual scram test switches, using RMC to drive rods and venting the CRD overpiston areas.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

ATWS UFSAR SECTION: 10.5

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in these steps are not described in the UFSAR. The actions which would require implementation of the procedure steps are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 1200-2 - BYPASSING ALL RWCU ISOLATION SIGNALS

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure provides direction on bypassing the Group 3, high temperature and SBLC injection isolation signals. This allows use of the system as a backup to SBLC injecting boron or as a pressure control system.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 14
ATWS	UFSAR SECTION: 10.5

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because bypassing the high temperature trip is procedurally done concurrently with bypassing the RWCU filter/demins.

Bypassing the SBLC initiation interlock is procedurally done concurrently with bypassing the RWCU filter/demin. Therefore, the function of this interlock is accomplished and does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type.

Bypassing the Group III isolation is procedurally backed up by QGA 300, which will direct isolation of the system if high temp., radiation or water levels occur which indicate a primary system leak. This does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

INJECTION OF BORON USING THE RWCU SYSTEM - QCOP 1200-10

DESCRIPTION:

The change incorporates guidance in this procedure for BW of the demin rather than referencing and expands direction on how to start the RWCU system.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure addresses a situation beyond that considered in the UFSAR, failure of SBLC. The UFSAR relies on proper functioning of SBLC system. The SER written on the Emergency Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the action described in this procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

RWCU SYSTEM STARTUP - QCOP 1200-11

DESCRIPTION:

Implement a procedure that gives operator direction on putting the RWCU system into operation following a pump trip or system isolation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is a normal operating procedure and is consistent with the method of operation described in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 1300-10 - BYPASSING RCIC LOW PRESSURE ISOLATION

DESCRIPTION:

Systems used to inject into the RPV are listed in QGA 100 and include RCIC. This procedure provides guidance which allows bypassing of the RCIC low RPV pressure isolation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the capability to automatically isolate primary system leakage from a RCIC steam line break has not been changed. The purpose of the RPV low pressure isolation is not the same as for those isolations. This procedure will allow the operator to operate RCIC and in so doing, the barometric condenser will be operated which will mitigate and control steam leakage that might occur at the seals. A prerequisite in the procedure required Shift Engineer authorization prior to implementing this procedure and requires that the S.E. base the authorization on the unavailability of other injection sources and the inability to maintain RPV level above -142 (TAF). By including this prerequisite, it defines the accidents within which this will be implemented as those beyond our design basis accidents due to the multiple system failures and LOCA which must occur to meet that criteria.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 1300-11 - VENTING REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL VIA RCIC STEAM LINE DRAINS

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure allows use of RCIC steam line drains to vent the RPV as the drywell is flooded to assure adequate core cooling.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Large Break LOCA

UFSAR SECTION: 14

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the UFSAR does not run this accident out to the point of re-establishing RPV level above TAF. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 1600-26 - POST LOCA DRYWELL PURGE WITH AIR FOR HYDROGEN CONTROL

DESCRIPTION:

The change incorporates use of SBT as a means to purge the containment of hydrogen.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the UFSAR describes a method to combat hydrogen in the containment. The vent and purge method is authorized in the SER on the Emergency Procedure Guidelines issued by the NRC. SBT is one option in this procedure and is used to maximize the flow rate to reduce and control hydrogen as quickly as possible.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 2300-6 - HPCI SYSTEM MANUAL STARTUP (INJECTION/PRESSURE CONTROL)

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure revision includes manual suction swap from Torus to CCST and cautions about HPCI lube oil temperature.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the system is designed to operate with either suction lineup. Therefore, providing direction on how to swap suction does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST MC4-1-90-55

DESCRIPTION:

Perform Mod test to visually verify installation of repair for feedwater heater extraction steam nozzles on lines 1-3107B-16", 1-3108B-16", 1-3109B-16" and 1-3109A-16".

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the boundary conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system, or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function normally after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the mod test is a visual inspection only. The system configuration will not be changed such that an unreviewed safety concern will be created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 2300-9-BYPASSING HPCI AND RCIC HIGH TORUS LEVEL AUTOMATIC SUCTION TRANSFER

DESCRIPTION:

Actions to bypass the automatic transfer of HPCI/RCIC suction when torus level is high.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because it causes no threat to the containment or equipment. Bypassing the signal allows injection of higher quality water for a longer period of time.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 2300-10 -- REACTOR VESSEL INJECTION VIA HPCI COOLING WATER PUMP

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure provides operator direction on the use of the HPCI cooling water pump to inject into the RPV.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is an enhancement of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR. This procedure is written to make use of the HPCI cooling water pump for injection, a purpose that was never originally intended. It would be used when HPCI is not being used for injection or pressure control.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 2300-11 - VENTING REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL VIA HPCI STEAM LINE DRAINS

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure allows use of HPCI steam line drains to vent the RPV as the drywell is flooded to assure adequate core cooling.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Large Break LOCA

UFSAR SECTION: 14

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the UFSAR does not run this accident out to the point of reestablishing RPV level above the TAF. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 2400-2 - CAM SUBSYSTEM PREPARATION FOR STANDBY OPERATION

DESCRIPTION:

Allow one monitor to be selected to sample the drywell and the other to sample torus.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this increases the usability of the system and does not impact anything else. This allows readily accessible readings when the system initiates rather than relying on manual operation actions.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOI 2900-2 - SAFE SHUTDOWN MAKEUP PUMP SYSTEM STARTUP

DESCRIPTION:

Add direction to the procedure for suction lineup swap and local manual operation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this action is described in the UFSAR and has previously been an option but this proceduralizes this function.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 3200-10 - BYPASSING REACTOR FEED PUMP HIGH REACTOR LEVEL TRIP

DESCRIPTION:

Bypasses the high RPV level trip of the RFP when RPV level instrumentation is not functioning properly and the RPV is to be flooded to assure adequate core cooling.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in these steps are not described in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require implementation of these procedure steps are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This is to evaluate the test to be performed on the 1-1201-2 valve. The gear set and motor have been replaced.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change brings the 1-1201-2 valve stroke time back into specification. The operation and function of the valve remain the same.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE - MOD TEST PO4-1-90-123

DESCRIPTION:

Visual verifications of critical dimensions, wiring and labeling.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this mod test has no impact on any system or function. This mod test is a visual inspection of critical dimensions docs., labeling and wiring terminations.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OPERABILITY TEST - MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-90-123

DESCRIPTION:

This test verifies proper operation of new recorders by performing a channel check of the new recorders against other indications of the same variable, and by selecting each speed of the dual chart speed feature on the applicable recorder and verifying recorder recognizes new speed selected.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because taking readings for a channel check and selecting chart speeds have no impact on any system or function.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-90-125 - MODIFICATION TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Visual verifications of critical dimensions, wiring and labeling.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the modification test is a visual inspection of documents, wiring and control room labeling. No systems or functions are manipulated to accomplish inspections.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OPERABILITY TEST - MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-90-125

DESCRIPTION:

This test verifies proper operation of new recorders by performing a channel check of the new recorders against other indications of the same parameter, and by selecting each speed of the dual chart speed feature recorder and verifying recorder recognizes new speed selected.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there is no impact on any system or function from taking instrument readings, assigning computer points to trend or changing recorder chart speed.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST - MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-90-153

DESCRIPTION:

Visual verifications for dimensional requirements, wiring, labeling and painting. Functional test of RCIC turbine reset switch. Limited test of RCIC logic.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the inoperable status of RCIC system during applicable mode(s) does not impact any other systems or functions. Completion of testing restores RCIC system to operable state. Test has no further impacts.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OPERABILITY TEST - MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-90-153

DESCRIPTION:

Performs a channel check of the affected instruments.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because taking readings from instruments, with no controls operated, wires affected, etc., will have no adverse impact on any system or function. This test has no adverse impact on any system or function.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OOS 1732 OR OTHER OOS ASSOCIATED WITH 1(2)-263-57(58) A(B)

DESCRIPTION:

Take OOS the LT 1(2)-263-57 A(B) or 1(2)-263-58 A(B).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because if reactor water level were to decrease all of the required actuations would occur unless another instrument failed. If reactor water level continued to decrease ECCS pumps would inject enough capacity to exceed the leakage through any valve that failed to close.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION FOR Q90948

DESCRIPTION:

To cut and cap drain pipe 1-3623B-2"-L. This is a temporary alteration until next refuel outage Q1R12.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there will be no new failure modes created or failures of equipment since the drain line is not needed during run or start-up/hot standby. The drain line and valves will be repaired at the next refuel outage, Q1R12.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE 89-001 (125 VDC)

DESCRIPTION:

Minor design change test MC4-1-89-001 for the 125 VDC breakers that were replaced in the reactor building 125 VDC distribution panel #1.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because equipment will not be taken OOS or put into a condition other than normal. Minor Design Change test is to verify equipment fed from the reactor building 125 VDC distribution panel number 1 is energized with DC power. In some cases a voltmeter will be used to verify and in other cases light indication or equipment actuation will be used.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QUAD-CITIES A-MODEL SYSTEM

DESCRIPTION:

Permanently install the A-Model computer software on the Quad-Cities station computers.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created since A-Model provides an automated calculation to be used instead of the present manual calculation. Therefore, it does not directly interact with any plant equipment important to safety. A-Model provides no information or recommendations on the status of plant safety systems. Information provided deals with off-site dose projections. This information will effect GSEP classification and emergency response actions, but will not alter plant systems. Plant automatic actions are not effected by A-Model and operator actions with regards to plant safety systems. Failure of A-Model will result in calculations and classification being done manually as it presently is without A-Model.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MSIV ACTUATOR REPLACEMENT MINOR DESIGN CHANGE AND OPERABILITY TEST
PO4-1-90-109

DESCRIPTION:

Institutes the procedure to test the MSIV actuator replacement minor design change.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there are no new failure modes introduced by this test. This test makes no changes to the MSIV's and only verifies the functional responses and operability of the MISV's. Secondary containment will remain intact throughout this test. Stroking the MSIV's will have no effect on secondary containment.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification tests on MCC 15-2-1 to verify proper installation of line to neutral control power. This test involves voltage checks and functional verification for each load powered from MCC 15-2-1. Mod Test satisfies Operability Test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no accident or system malfunction will be created for this test due to the shell side of the heaters being drained and all piping is intact as to provide a drain path to the condenser.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification test on MCC 16-3-1 to verify proper installation of line to neutral control power. This test involves voltage checks and function verification for each load powered from MCC 16-3-1. Mod test also satisfies operability test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no accident or system malfunction will be created for this test due to the shell side of the heaters being drained and all piping is intact as to provide a drain path to the condenser.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-90-175 MOD AND OP TESTS

DESCRIPTION:

This evaluation is for PO4-1-90-175 mod and operability tests. These tests will verify the installed flange bolt disc springs have been installed properly, torqued appropriately and do not leak.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because these Mod Tests do not create any new failure modes. The Mod Test verifies the flange bolt disc springs are properly torqued. There is no loss of integrity of the feedwater lube oil system. The operability is a visual examination for leakage. Neither test will have any affect upon operation of the feed pump.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Change allows for use of portable gasoline powered fuel oil transfer pump and for "Cross-Filling" in emergency situations.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the portable pump and/or tanker truck specified in the procedure are totally independent units, and they have no ties to the plant. This procedure provides an alternate method to add fuel oil to the diesel generator fuel Oil Day Tank. They are only used as an emergency fuel supply to the diesel generator day tanks.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Stroke and time MO 1-2301-8 per QOS 2300-3.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Large/Small Break LOCA UFSAR SECTION: 6.2.5

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test does not change any parameters of the HPCI system. This test will be performed at cold shutdown as part of approved procedure QCOS 2300-3, HPCI will be in standby line-up of QCOP 2300-1.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST PO4-1-91-004

DESCRIPTION:

There is no change involved. This safety evaluation is for a Minor Design Change test which is purely verification only.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test is simply a visual verification. There are no action steps required to be taken to complete the test.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Revise the minimum level and maximum temperature requirements for the SBLC main tanks.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

ATWS/Loss of CRD System UFSAR SECTION: 6.7

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change in the SBLC tank level and temperature requirements will provide additional net positive suction head to the pumps to ensure the required amount of solution can be put into the reactor. Further, the additional level will provide extra solution available to be pumped. This will further ensure complete reactor shutdown, due to the additional boron injected into the reactor.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification test to verify proper performance of installed MO 1-2301-10 valve.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test will be performed when the reactor is in cold shutdown condition. HPCI is not required to be operable during cold shutdown thus the test will not affect system operation.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OPERABILITY TEST FOR PO4-1-90-054

DESCRIPTION:

Perform operability test to verify proper performance of installed HPCI test return MO-1-2301-10 valve.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Slow Depressurizing Loss of Coolant Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 1.3.5, 6.2.2 6.2.5, 6.2.7
Inadvertent Injection of HPCI	UFSAR SECTION: 4.3.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the operability test will not reduce the ability of the HPCI system to operate in a slow depressurizing LOCA. Failure of the valve MO 1-2301-10 would render HPCI inoperable just as it would with the previous installed valve. The ability of the other ECCS systems remain operable. The overall reliability of the system will improve by elimination of cavitation in the valve.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

M4-1-89-052 MODIFICATION TEST

DESCRIPTION:

This change replaced the existing containment valves with a new type of valve.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because performance of this test will not alter operational requirements of the valves with the unit in shutdown. The mod test only checks the valves for closure on loss of power. Additionally, only construction tests and surveillances are reviewed for successful completion.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

M4-1-89-117 MODIFICATION TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Determine the capacity of the new drywell floor drain and equipment sump pumps.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because performance of this test will not alter operational requirements of the sump pumps with the unit shutdown. The new pumps are replacement for the old sump pumps and use the same power source, are of the same capacity and the control logic is also the same. They were replaced merely for ease of removal for any future maintenance.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This change is to establish correct acceptance criteria. The criteria is to be changed from alarm "Verify and record threshold setpoint is between .09 and .11" to "record threshold setpoint", and acoustic monitor alarms when threshold setpoint is exceeded.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change is only to adjust the acceptance criteria to its intended level set forth by the vendor of this equipment.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA DOSE REDUCTION SHEET #334

DESCRIPTION:

Place 2 lead blankets on the 1-2001-4" line.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because an analysis, using PbShielding, has shown that the pipe and its supports are capable of this increased load, and thus system operation will be unaffected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOS 1000-2 - MONTHLY RHR PUMP/RHR SW PUMP OPERABILITY TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Verifies RHR SW pumps meet Tech Spec requirements of flow and pressure monthly. Also verifies RHR pumps meet Tech Spec requirements of flow and pressure in the LPCI Mode.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change to this procedure is consistent with the UFSAR and does not change the design or function of any component in the RHR system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SETPOINT CHANGE NUMBER 415

DESCRIPTION:

Change main chimney sampler flow rate meter low flow alarm setpoint to 0 liters/min.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Rod Drop	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.1.7 & Table 14.2.1
Fuel Loading	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2.5 & Tables 14.2.3, 14.2.4
Steam Line Rupture	UFSAR SECTION: None (14.2.3)
Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.9 Table 14.2.10

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is a passive system which provides indication and therefore cannot increase the possibility of an accident or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-90-169 MOD TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Perform modification test for minor design change PO4-1-90-169. MDC repaired damaged section of RHR-Fuel Pool Cooling assist line and repair hanger.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no actual testing is performed by this mod test. The modification testing performs a verification that proper inspection of the repaired piping was performed during the hydrostatic testing.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QOA 700-2 - LOCAL POWER RANGE MONITOR FAILURE

DESCRIPTION:

Have an operator place a LPRM bypass card on a LPRM when it is bypassed and changed the number of LPRMs that need to be verified operable to 13 from 14.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the use of an LPRM bypass card has no affect on anything associated with accidents and malfunctions. Having a different type of card on a bypassed LPRM is just an administrative change. The change in the number of operable LPRMs to 13 from 14 is so that the procedure agrees with way the APRMs are set up. Also the change in the number makes the procedure consistent with the discussion (step E) in the procedure. There is no impact on any system or function from this change.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 1000-B - POST ACCIDENT CONTAINMENT SPRAY INITIATION

DESCRIPTION:

Revise procedure to allow flexibility of system operation for various combinations of containment spray and RHR modes. Remove restriction of 1 RHR pump during Drywell Spray. Revise Drywell Spray Initiation Limit information. Provide flexibility, based upon time and power, for starting RHR SW.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA

UFSAR SECTION: 6.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the UFSAR analysis considers the LOCA both with and without containment spray. This procedure does not contain any actions which would change the results of the analysis or create any new type of accident.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURES 6725, 6726

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary procedure for removing the U1 reserve aux transformers (T12) from service and subsequently returning to service T12.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Diesel Generator Failure UFSAR SECTION: 8.2.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because all auto-start signals for the U 1/2 diesel generator to U2 are unaffected by this temporary procedure, thus U2 operation during a LOCA event remains bounded by the analysis.

The signals for U1 and U 1/2 diesel generator auto-start signal to U1 are being altered with respect to the main feed breakers to Bus 13 and 14, UV on 13 and 14, as well as breakers between buses 13-1 & 13 and buses 14-1 & 14. All remaining auto start signals (high DW press, low-low reactor water level, UV on Bus 13-1 & 14-1 etc.) will be disabled, the U1 & U 1/2 diesel generator will remain available to supply power to the unit emergency buses as required with the loss of a single diesel generator analysis still bounding.

Additionally, U1 is required to have the no control rod movement allowed during the time that T12 is OOS and no work is being performed that may drain the reactor vessel.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

PROCEDURE--TRANSFER AND DEWATERING OF MAX-RECYCLE SPENT RESIN TANK
VIA "B" TRANSFER HEADER

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure provides the steps necessary to transfer the Max-recycle spent resin tank to a high integrity container or liner and dewater with Chem Nuclear Rapid Dewatering System-1000.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure only provides an alternative method of processing radwaste resins from max-recycle. The station process control program already describes the vendor system being used and has previously been on-site reviewed.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

PO4-0-90-166 - MODIFICATION TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Ensure that the construction test for minor design change PO4-0-90-166 was successfully completed. Construction test is to verify no leaks.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this mod test does not affect plant equipment.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

WORK REQUEST Q90309

DESCRIPTION:

Remove tubing and braze fitting in support of mechanical maintenance valve replacement.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss-of-coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Refueling Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because having one train of SBGT out-of-service to replace the flow control valve will not create the possibility of an accident due to the fact that the other train of SBGT will remain operable while the other train is out-of-service. Operability of the train will be checked daily according to Technical Specifications.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary procedure verifies the RCIC manual power operated, or automatic valves in the direct flow path, suction and discharge of the RCIC system are in proper position. (excluding secured or locked in valves).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this will not affect RCIC system or plant operation. Temporary procedure will test operability of valves in direct flow path of RCIC system ensuring proper position of valves. This procedure excludes valves that are locked in or secured already. This safety evaluation reflects the NRC safety evaluation for Amendments 130 (DPR 29) and 124 (DPR 30) of Tech Specs.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary procedures verifying the HPCI pump operability, monthly venting of the HPCI, and new HPCI system outage report.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the frequency of pump operability testing is reduced, thus increasing reliability of the systems operations, as documented in NRC safety evaluation for Tech. Spec. amendments 124 (DPR-30) and 130 (DPR-29). Also, more recently licensed BWR's current Tech. Specs. reflect that taking the other subsystems out of service for testing creates the risk of the second system failing and therefore have reduced their frequency of testing.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary procedures verifying RCIC pump operability, monthly venting of systems, and new RCIC system outage report.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the frequency of pump operability testing is reduced, thus increasing reliability of the systems operations, as documented in NRC safety evaluation for Tech. Spec. amendments 124 (DPR-30) and 130 (DPR-29). Also, more recently licensed BWR's current Tech. Specs. reflect that taking the other subsystems out of service for testing creates the risk of the second system failing and therefore have reduced their frequency of testing.
3. The margin of safety, as not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary procedure is verifying the HPCI manual, power operated or automatic valves in the direct flow path of suction or discharge are in proper position (excluding secured or locked valves).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure does not affect HPCI system operations or plant operation. Temporary procedure will test operability of valves in direct flow path, suction and discharge, of the HPCI system. The procedure excludes those valves which are already secured or locked in. This safety evaluation reflects the NRC safety evaluation related to amendments 130 (DPR 29) and 124 (DPR 30) of Tech Specs.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The test will consist of verification of orientation and location of newly installed supports and repaired supports in accordance with ECN design.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is a passive test, a visual inspection test that will not impact systems or functions.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform a minor design change test on a minor design change. The test will consist of flushing the high and low level switches on the "IA" and "IB" MSDTs and tripping the level switches.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test will be performed during plant shutdown or refueling and the MSDTs will drain. The idea of the test is to make sure that the level switch functions as intended so that it does not fail during plant operation, run or startup/hot standby.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The minor design change test will consist of visually inspecting newly installed thermocouples and pressure test tap valves.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the visual inspection test is a passive function. There will be no new failure modes created that will impact the system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform minor design change test of HPCI linear heat detector with deluge system O/S, actuate detection system by heating protectowire and use of manual pull/push button stations.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change is only a routine test that will prove the newly installed linear detector to be functional. The steps needed to be performed during this test do not differ from the current surveillance for the HPCI detection system except that this test will be performed on out-of-service equipment.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-2-91-004

DESCRIPTION:

Install a 300K (approximately) resistor in the bypass valve positioning units of #1, #2 and #3 bypass valves.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Electrical Load UFSAR SECTION: 11.2.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the failure mode of the bypass valves are not being changed with this minor design change. The bypass valves will still function as designed. The possibility of a failure of the #1, #2, and #3 bypass valves is actually being decreased by this minor design change because the current oscillation problems with these valves at low power levels are being reduced. The wear on the valves and associated hydraulic actuators will be reduced with the reduction in oscillations.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST FOR P04-2-90-178

DESCRIPTION

Perform modification test to verify correct installation of new modified supports for HPCI steam drain line.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test consists solely of performing a visual inspection of the new modified pipe supports as per the ECN. This will not impact any system's function to create a possibility of an accident.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Change the scale range on the hydrogen addition off-gas O₂ analyzers from 0-5, 0-10, and 0-25% to 0-25, 0-50, and 0-100%.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change only changes the scale on a local indication for the O₂ analyzers.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Change the scale range on the hydrogen addition off-gas O₂ analyzers from 0-5, 0-10, and 0-25% to 0-25%, 0-50%, and 0-100%.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change only changes the scale on a local indication for the O₂ analyzers.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Modification and operability test for the relay installed in MC4-1-90-136.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there are no action steps in the test. UFSAR is not affected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE PO4-1-91-050 TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Stroke MOV 1-1301-25 verify light indication.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Condenser

UFSAR SECTION: 4.5

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because test is performed during cold shutdown. RCIC functions do not change due to test, and the valve function remains the same. All conditions are unchanged.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOP 1300-2, RCIC SYSTEM MANUAL START-UP (INJECTION/PRESSURE CONTROL)

DESCRIPTION:

Direction on switching suction from torus to CCST. Direction on using RCIC for RPV pressure control when an initiation signal is present.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure. The UFSAR describes the initiation signal and use of RCIC as an RPV level consideration. If used in the pressure control mode, it would still have HPCI and in some accidents Cond/F.W. as alternate methods of injecting water into the RPV. Use of RCIC in pressure control increased the flexibility of operator response to various combinations of system failures which many times are beyond the bound of those failures assumed in the design basis accidents. While accomplishing this purpose, it also provides for adequate core cooling through the redundant systems which inject into the RPV but if RCIC was needed for injection, it would still be used to inject and the combination of steam used to drive the turbine plus cooling provided by injection water would continue to aid in depressurization.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

UFSAR UPDATE

DESCRIPTION:

The proposed changes to the UFSAR are:

Section 9.5.5.2 Personnel Monitoring Systems: This change would remove the exact description of the type of dosimetry required. It would be replaced by referring to the requirements of 10CFR20.

Section 9.5.5.7 Bio-assay and Medical Examination Program: The change would delete a Dresden Station reference, add contractors and visitors for CECO to provide Whole Body Counting services and add that medical examination are performed yearly.

Section 13.1 Personnel Descriptions: Split the Rad/Chem department into two separate groups. This will effect the descriptions of the Technicians, Foremen and the department supervisors.

Section 13.4.3 Radiation Control Standards: The change would change the title of this section to "Radiation Protection Procedures" and any references to this title in the body of this section. Additional title change would be from the Radiation-Chemistry supervisor, to Radiation Protection Department.

Section 13.4.3.2 Personnel Monitoring: Remove the requirements of Film badges and replace with TLD badges.

Section 13.4.3.3 Dosimeters: Add the use of electronic dosimetry and give a choice of using electronic dosimetry or direct-reading pocket dosimeters. Remove the requirement of any person exceeding 200 mrem to report to R.P. too any person exceeding their approval will report to R.P.

Section 13.4.3.4 Monitoring of Visitors: Change film badge to TLD badge.

Section 13.4.4.5.1 Protective Clothing: Add the word contaminated to the first sentence. Change film badge to TLD badge.

Section 13.4.3.5.2 Access to High Radiation Areas.

Section 13.5.8 Radiological and Chemical Records: Change the title of the Rad-Chem Supervisor to the Radiation Protection and Chemistry Supervisors.

UFSAR UPDATE

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is an administrative change to the UFSAR, and does not affect plant systems or operation.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST P04-1-91-004

DESCRIPTION:

There is no change involved. This safety evaluation is being written for a Minor Design Change Test which is purely verification only. There are no action steps involved.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test is simply a visual verification. There are no action steps required to complete the test.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OPERABILITY TEST FOR PO4-1(2)-91-004

DESCRIPTION:

There is no change involved. This safety evaluation is being written for a operability test in which the first three steps are purely a visual verification and the last step is part of an approved station procedure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because steps 1, 2 and 3 of this test are simply visual verifications requiring no action steps. Step 4 of this test is part of an approved station procedure which has previously had a 10CFR50.59 evaluation performed on it.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure verifies the alarm and automatic start/stop features associated with the 1/2 diesel generator day tank and related fuel oil transfer equipment.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the EDG is not required to be operable during this procedure. Protection is provided via the Day Tank overflow line the vent of overflow of the day tank. This overflow line is routed back to the main fuel storage tank therefore, the likelihood of a spill is minimal with the EDG inop the lowering of the day tank does not create an operability concern. A spill while draining the day tank down is prevented by limiting inventory in the main storage tank to 95% (volume).
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST M4-1-89-074A AND OPERABILITY TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Added a photocell assembly and auto-sensor to supply rollomatic filters to identify when a new media material is needed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test will not adversely affect any systems.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION

DESCRIPTION:

To connect a strip chart recorder to 6 point of connection in order to monitor pump suction and discharge pressures, steam supply and exhaust pressures, RPM from Tachometer and flow from 901-3 panel.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Slow Depressurizing Loss of Coolant Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 1.3.5, 6.2.2, 6.2.5, 6.2.7
Inadvertent Injection of HPCI	UFSAR SECTION: 4.4.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the potential failures are bounded by the analysis in the UFSAR. The strip chart recorder will be connected in-parallel to the required circuits for monitoring HPCI pump suction and discharge pressures, steam supply and exhaust pressures, flow and turbine RPM's. The control room indicators will function the same as before. There is no identified failure modes or interactions more severe than a steamline break or loss of HPCI system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

A stopping point, during the normal startup, needs to be added to allow for HPCI and/or RCIC pump testing.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this is a normal startup procedure and is consistent with the methods of operation described in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safe'y, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Revise the low limit temperature of the Unit 1(2) SBLC tanks to 90°F on the equipment attendant surveillance sheets.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

ATWS/Loss of CRD

UFSAR SECTION: 6.7

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the surveillance limit change assures that the proper boron solution concentration exists at all times so that if the system is required, it may fulfill its design purpose which is reactor shutdown.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

2B CAM HEAT TRACE UPGRADE MODIFICATION TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Modification Test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the new heat trace will be tested in its normal configuration. The test simply takes current, voltage, and temperature measurements when the system is functioning normally.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-252
FSAR UPDATE

DESCRIPTION:

FSAR change to remove exact requirements of the Environmental program from the FSAR's, so that ODCM is the only document describing exact requirements. The ODCM will be referenced in the FSAR's.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change to the UFSAR will not affect plant operations.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SOFTWARE INSTALLATION H-91-08 (Scram Timing)

DESCRIPTION:

Change the scram timing program to include an initialize statement to clear error conditions from previous rods before starting the next rod.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change does not change any timing functions of the program and will not change results of scram timing.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

UFSAR CHANGES FOR GE 8 x 8 NB FUEL

DESCRIPTION:

Changing the UFSAR to take into account GE 8x8 NB fuel. The changes were made to Sections 1,3 and 14. Typos and errors found in these sections were also corrected.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
Main Steam Line Break outside Drywell	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.3
LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Turbine Trip w/o Bypass	UFSAR SECTION: 3.2.5.4.2/4.4.3
Load Rejection w/o Bypass	UFSAR SECTION: 3.2.5.4.1
Feedwater Controller Failure	UFSAR SECTION: 3.2.5.4.6/11.3.3
Loss of Feedwater Heater	UFSAR SECTION: 3.2.5.4.3
Inadvertent start of HPCI	UFSAR SECTION: 3.2.5.4.4/4.4.3
Rod Withdrawal/Error	UFSAR SECTION: 3.2.5.4.5

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

UFSAR CHANGES FOR GE 8 x 8 NB FUEL

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the GE 8x8 NB fuel design was reviewed and generally approved by the NRC (NRC letter, A.C. Thadan (NRC) to J.S. Charnely (GE) "Acceptance For Referencing of Amendment 18 to General Electric Licensing Topical Report NEDE-24011-P-A", dated May 12, 1988). Also the fuel type has been incorporated into GESTAR (GE document NEDE-24011-P-A-9, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel (GESTAR-II), dated September 1988) and evaluated by NFS (Nuclear Fuel Services Report, NFSR-0067, Rev. 4, "Technical Evaluation of GE 9B fuel design", dated March 1989). The core reloads using GE 8x8 NB (GE 9B) was analyzed using approved GE methodology (Supplemental Reload Licensing Submittal, SAFER/GESTR-LOCA(NEDC-31345P)) and the cycle specific results reviewed by the station (OSR 90-4, OSR 90-38). The referenced documents and the analysis done supports the rationale the GE 8x8 NB fuel will not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those already evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Install and terminate cables and jumpers to provide electrical supervision for the Unit 2 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire UFSAR SECTION: 10.6

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because Section 10.6 of the UFSAR does not specifically identify which fire protection detection systems are required to have electrical supervision, only that "all alarm circuits are either electrically supervised or are tested to assure operability". Wiring changes included in this scope of work are performed in panels 2252-70A, 2252-70C, 2212-113 and 2212-59; Junction boxes 2-TB-49, 2-TB-232; and Mux's #2, 6, and 7. All terminations are to provide an electrical circuit from the water flow and tamper switches to the XL3 panel. Any failures in this circuit (either new or existing equipment) will be identified to the Control Room by the XL3 supervisory system. Therefore, providing these terminations (and additional electrical supervision) under this scope of work cannot reasonably be expected to create any new credible accidents from those previously analyzed.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 100 - RPV CONTROL

DESCRIPTION:

1. IF cannot stay inside Primary Containment Pressure Limit, THEN prevent injection from outside primary containment until you can stay inside Primary Containment Pressure Limit (found in QGA 100, 101, 200, 500-3, and 500-4).

The Primary Containment Pressure Limit is a combination of two curves; the Primary Containment Pressure Limit Curve and the Maximum Primary Containment Water Level Limit Curve. The curve is enforcing a primary objective or philosophy taken in the Emergency Operating Procedures which is stated: When a mutually exclusive decision between maintaining adequate core cooling and assuring primary containment integrity must be made, the EPGs preferentially choose to maintain primary containment integrity in order to protect against the uncontrolled release of radioactivity to the general public from a degraded core condition. (Appendix A: A-20, A-46 and Calculation WS-9 and Appendix B: B-6-23).

2. IF cannot hold indicated level above -59 in., THEN Inhibit ADS. (QGA 100).
IF cannot hold level above -142 in. (TAF) Inhibit ADS. (QGA 100)

QGA 100, RPV Control, provides operator actions to deal with RPV level control problems. The ADS logic is designed to evaluate parameters and provide a depressurization of the RPV in the event that a LOCA has occurred and high pressure sources of injection are insufficient to maintain RPV inventory. The QGAs also deal with this possibility but expand the concept to encompass a wider range of equipment failures and possible level control complications that could occur. Due to this expanded amount of direction and the fact that many variables are considered as input to the decision for RPV depressurization, the ADS automatic function is defeated and the operating crew, using the logic provided by the QGA procedures, evaluates the situation and initiates RPV blowdown when required.

QGA 100 - RPV CONTROL

3. IF cannot hold level above -142 in. (TAF)..... further expanded direction of RPV level control is directed.
WAIT until level drops to -142 in. (TAF).....direction given to specify either RPV Blowdown or Steam Cooling.

QGA 100, RPV Control, provides operator actions to deal with RPV level control problems. The first focus is to maintain level between +8 and +48 inches. This is accomplished by use of normal and ECCS type systems. If level cannot be maintained above +8 then direction is given to maintain above -142 and use of alternate injection systems is allowed. If level drops to -142, then adequate core cooling could soon be challenged and the RPV will either be blowdown to allow low pressure injection or held at pressure to maximize steam cooling of the uncovered portion of the core.

4. IF anticipate doing blowdown.....Depressurize RPV rapidly using main turbine bypass valves. "OK to exceed 100F/hr cooldown".

If plant conditions exist such that the operator believes that the procedures are going to require a Blowdown of the RPV, using ADS valves, then permission is given to commence the blowdown and use the main condenser as the heat sink to reduce impact on the primary containment. Since the blowdown through the ADS valves will result in exceeding the cooldown rate permission is given here so that the operator will not be hampered in the attempt to reduce this containment heat load.

5.OK to defeat low pressure isolation

Systems used to inject into the RPV are listed in QGA 100 and include RCIC. Permission is given to defeat the RCIC isolation signal from RPV low pressure (50 psig).

6.OK to defeat high torus level transfer.

Systems used to inject into the RPV are listed in QGA 100 and include RCIC and HPCI. Permission is given to defeat the automatic suction transfer which occurs at +5 inches in the torus.

QGA 1C - RPV CONTROL

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Primary Containment Pressure Limit	
ADS Inhibit	UFSAR SECTION: 6
Small Break LOCA	
RPV level at Top of Active Fuel (TAF)	UFSAR SECTION: 14
Large Break LOCA	
Exceeding RPV Cooldown	
RCIC Low Pressure Isolation	
HPCI/RCIC Suction Transfer	UFSAR SECTION: 6
CCST Failure	
RWCU Isolation Bypass	

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

Primary Containment Pressure Limit - The actions described in these steps are not discussed in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require implementation of these procedure steps are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedures Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.

QGA 100 - RPV CONTROL

ADS Inhibit - The intent of the automatic logic is to provide depressurization of the RPV when HPCI is unable to maintain RPV level and RPV pressure must be reduced to allow low pressure ECCS to inject. The procedure steps provide information to the operating crew which form the basis for determining when to manually perform the depressurization. Allowing use of actual plant parameters and operator control rather than automatic logic allows a response to a wider range of transients and is therefore more likely to result in adequate control of the evolution. Since the logic was designed to accommodate one specific scenario, it may result in a plant response that is not the most applicable to the current plant status. Events beyond the design basis of the plant would be the best examples of this. If a loss of RPV injection sources occurred, and the only method of maintaining adequate core cooling was to allow steam updraft through the core to cool the fuel, then the pressure must be conserved in order to extend the amount of time available to restore injection systems to operation. For accidents within the design basis, the intent of the automatic logic is still carried out by procedural direction and manual operator action but the form this takes also accounts for the possibility of accidents beyond the design basis. The FSAR accounts for this method of system use and stated "the operator can prevent automatic ADS actuation by use of a separate ADS inhibit switch if he anticipates level recovery after the 8.5 minute timer setting is reached". Due to these factors, this change does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.

RPV level at TAF - Adequate core cooling is assured with RPV level as low as 2/3 core height and therefore the integrity of the fuel is not impacted. Implementation of this step does not change the function of systems and therefore does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR. The SER states that; Both test and analysis have shown that maintaining the water level above the top of the active fuel is sufficient to assure adequate core cooling, provided the reactor is tripped. The EPGs are designed to give preference to covering the core with water to cool it. Further, test and analysis have shown that flooding to 2/3 core height with low pressure systems is adequate to maintain core cooling if the reactor is tripped but the core cannot be completely covered. The EPGs recognize this mode of cooling as an alternate to the preferred mode of cooling.

QGA 100 - RPV CONTROL

Exceeding RPV Cooldown - ADS is a system designed for and considered in the analysis of plant accident. If it actuated, it would result in a cooldown rate in excess of 100F/hr. The QGAs give direction to the operating crew to use as a basis for determining when RPV blowdown is required. One of the circumstances is the accident for which ADS was designed and therefore this direction causes no possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR. All other circumstances where this action would be implemented are circumstances that are not discussed in the UFSAR. The accident, which should require implementation of these procedure steps are beyond the bound of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedures Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.

RCIC Low Pressure Isolation - The capability to automatically isolate primary system leakage from a RCIC steam line break has not been changed. The purpose of the RPV low pressure RCIC isolation is not the same as for those isolations. This step will have the operator operate RCIC and in so doing, the barometric condenser will be operated which will handle any steam leakage that might occur at the seals. Therefore it does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.

HPCI/RCIC Suction Transfer - The FSAR states the torus suction is a backup and that the operator may manually make the suction transfer. If the DCST was lost, suction transfer would still occur automatically. Since an alternate suction is still available, this change does not adversely impact the systems or their functions and does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 101, RPV CONTROL (ATWS)

DESCRIPTION:

Implement a procedure that provides direction on responding to an ATWS accident.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in these steps are not described in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require implementation of these procedure steps are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 200 - PRIMARY CONTAINMENT CONTROL

DESCRIPTION:

1. This procedure places restrictions and sets guidelines for the operation of Containment Spray. Torus spray is initiated before torus pressure reaches 6 psig. Drywell Spray is initiated when torus pressure reaches 6 psig. Containment spray is terminated when the respective airspace drops to 2.5 psig and Containment Spray is not allowed unless adequate core cooling is assured.
2. Drywell spray initiation can be prohibited if drywell parameters do not fall within the bounds of the Drywell Spray Initiation Spray Limit Curve. This curve compares the drywell temperature and pressure to make this determination.

Torus spray initiation can be prohibited if torus level is above 27 feet.

Operator is directed to terminate drywell sprays if torus level cannot be maintained below 17 feet.

Operator is directed to exceed offsite radiation release rates if venting is required to maintain the Primary Containment below the Primary Containment Pressure Limit.

Operator is directed to defeat vent isolation interlocks if venting is required to maintain the Primary Containment below the Primary Containment Pressure Limit.

Operator is directed to initiate containment spray, even if adequate core cooling would be lost, if the Primary Containment cannot be maintained below the Primary Containment Pressure Limit.

Operator is directed to exceed the 100F/hr cooldown rate if either torus temperature cannot be maintained below the Heat Capacity Limit or torus level cannot be maintained below the ADS Valve Tailpipe Limit.

Operator is directed to terminate ALL injection if torus level cannot be maintained below the Primary Containment Pressure Limit.

Operator is directed to terminate HPCI operation if torus level cannot be maintained above 11 feet.

QGA 200 - PRIMARY CONTAINMENT CONTROL

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA

UFSAR SECTION: 6

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

Containment Spray - These steps provide direction on the operation of containment spray. The FSAR discusses that the assumed time for initiation of containment cooling is based on an arbitrary value. These steps will most likely lead to initiation of sprays within that time interval for the DBA LOCA due to the rapid rise in containment pressure that results from the RPV depressurization through the break. Even if it did lead to a delay in the initiation of sprays, the FSAR states that it will take about eight hours to reach the containment design pressure with no sprays operating. The FSAR also states that containment spray is not to be placed into operation unless adequate core cooling is assured. Due to these factors, the steps fall within the guidelines of accidents described in the FSAR and the system operation described. Therefore this does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated.

QGA 200 - PRIMARY CONTAINMENT CONTROL

Item 2 - The actions described in these steps are not discussed in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require implementation of these procedure steps are beyond the bound of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedures Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 200-5 - HYDROGEN CONTROL

DESCRIPTION:

Implement a procedure that provides direction on responding to hydrogen within the primary containment.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in this procedure are not discussed in the UFSAR. The UFSAR states that "Although small quantities of hydrogen are produced during a design basis accident the containment has the inherent ability to accommodate much larger amounts...". The accidents that could lead to hydrogen production that requires implementation of these actions are beyond the bounds of design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Operating Procedures Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 300 - SECONDARY CONTAINMENT CONTROL

DESCRIPTION:

Reactor building vent - If secondary containment parameters indicate that actions must be performed to control secondary containment temperature, radiation levels or water level, then the operator is directed to start the reactor building vents. As long as ventilation radiation levels are less than the 3 mr/hr setpoint, then permission is given to bypass the high drywell pressure and low RPV water level isolation signals.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling Accident

UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

Reactor building vents - Bypassing the high drywell pressure and low RPV level signal for the reactor building ventilation isolation logic removes a signal which could limit operator response to an accident condition. The purpose of the isolation signal is to prevent radioactive release to the environment. This function is still functional and is based on radiation detectors in the ventilation ductwork. If conditions in the secondary containment required operator action to control reactor building temperature and pressure, then the operator needs a way to reestablish ventilation in order to control these parameters. The operator would evaluate the actual radiation level and if it was less than the trip setpoint, reestablish vent flow and then rely upon the radiation monitoring to initiate an isolation if required. Due to these factors, this change does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the FSAR.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 400 - RADIOACTIVE RELEASE CONTROL

DESCRIPTION:

If a radioactive release is in progress, that is approaching the level of a General Emergency, and a primary system is discharging outside the primary and secondary containment, then direction is given to scram the reactor and perform an RPV blowdown.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in this procedure are not discussed in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require implementation of this procedure are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Procedures Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in this procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Implement a procedure that provides direction on how to depressurize the RPV.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in this procedure are not discussed in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require implementation of this procedure are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Procedures Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in this procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 500-2 - STEAM COOLING

DESCRIPTION:

Implement a procedure that provides direction on maintaining adequate core cooling when the RPV is at pressure and no injection sources are available.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in this procedure are not discussed in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require implementation of this procedure are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Procedures Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in this procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 500-3 - DRYWELL FLOODING

DESCRIPTION:

Implement a procedure that provides direction on flooding the primary containment in order to provide core submergence.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in this procedure are not described in detail in the UFSAR. The UFSAR states that "Capability is provided in the containment structure design to withstand the forces exerted in the event that it is necessary to flood the containment vessel to a level which would flood the reactor core". No further description of this evolution is provided. These actions are implemented based upon the Emergency Procedure Guidelines which are covered by the SER issued by the NRC.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 500-4 - RPV FLOODING

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure provides operator direction on maintaining adequate core cooling when all means of determining RPV level are lost.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY.

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the actions described in this procedure are not described in the UFSAR. The accidents which would require RPV flooding are beyond the bounds of the design basis accidents discussed in the UFSAR. The SER written on the Emergency Procedure Guidelines provides authorization from the NRC to support the actions described in this procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

FSAR UPDATE

DESCRIPTION:

Update FSAR to include Swing Bus exemption from General Design Criteria 17 of Appendix A 10CFR50.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there is no physical change to the plant. The addition to the FSAR, documents that the LPCI swing bus design is exempt from General Design Criteria 17, Appendix A of 10CFR50. The NRC acknowledges that the swing bus design does not meet the single failure criteria, yet due to system specification the design is acceptable. FSAR update will provide documentation of this exemption.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Change procedure to require discharge routing to be aligned to the discharge flume when the diffuser house composite sampler is inoperable and a temporary sampler is being used in its place.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the station will be making use of installed systems lineup options in order to maintain provisions to obtain representative samples during discharges, which is what is intended in the UFSAR. This alternate discharge routing is mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGP 1-1, NORMAL UNIT STARTUP

DESCRIPTION:

Insert statement with QGP 1-1 allowing the main turbine to be rolled so as to proceed with testing and surveillances while simultaneously verifying HPCI/RCIC operability.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because at a reactor power < 40%, ie (within bypass capability) no accident or malfunction other than those addressed in the UFSAR are created.

Performance of HPCI/RCIC surveillances at this power level will not result in any inadvertent or unplanned reactor power changes. The EHC system will control reactor pressure and turbine load such that effects of running HPCI/RCIC in this condition have a negligible effect on reactor power.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

HYDROGEN ADDITION SYSTEM TEMPORARY ALTERATION (CONSTANT BLEED DRAIN)

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary alteration to provide a constant bleed drain for 2 Balston type 85 coalescing filters and a constant bleed drain for 2-2701B and 2-2702B coalescing filters.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Main Condenser Vacuum UFSAR SECTION: 11.2.3b

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because even in the worst case scenario this temporary alternation is evaluated and bounded by the current UFSAR analysis in Section 11.2.3b. The worst case scenario would be for the 1/2" stainless steel tubing to break downstream from the regulating or metering valves. This could cause a loss of main condenser vacuum.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA MANUAL PREFACE

DESCRIPTION:

To delete. All information has been transferred to the applicable new procedure and only the form and presentation has changed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change has no affect on plant conditions. All information from this deleted procedure has been transferred to other procedures as applicable to implementation of Revision 4 of the EOPs.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 100-2, 100-2, 100-3, 100-F1, 100-F2

DESCRIPTION:

To delete. Procedures replaced by QGAs written consistent with EOP Revision 4.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because these changes have no affect of plant operations. All information from these deleted procedures has been transferred to other procedures as applicable to Revision 4 of the EOPs.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Procedure deletions. All information has been transferred to the applicable new procedure and only the form and presentation has changed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because these changes do not affect plant operations. All information from these deleted procedures has been transferred to other procedures as applicable to implementation of Revision 4 of the EOP.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Delete procedures. All applicable procedures have been implemented with EOP Revision 4.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because these changes have no affect on plant operation. All information from these deleted procedures has been transferred to other procedures as applicable to implementation of Revision 4 of the EOPs.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Delete procedures. All information has been transferred to the applicable procedures consistent with Revision 4 of EOP.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because these changes have no affect on plant operation. All information from these deleted procedures has been transferred to other procedures as applicable to implementation of Revision 4 of the EOP.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Delete procedure. Replaced by equivalent procedure written in compliance with Revision 4 of EOP.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change will have no affect on plant operation. All information from this deleted procedure has been transferred to a new procedure written to comply with Revision 4 of the EOP.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 500-6-1, 500-6-2, 500-7-1, 500-7-2, 500-7-3.

DESCRIPTION:

Delete procedures. Information from this procedure incorporated into new procedures in compliance with Revision 4 EOP.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because these changes have no affect on plant conditions. Information has been transferred to other procedure in compliance with Revision 4 of EOPs.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 500-T2 - BYPASSING THE LOW REACTOR WATER LEVEL GROUP III ISOLATION SIGNAL

DESCRIPTION:

Delete procedure. All information transferred to new procedure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change has no affect on plant condition. All information from this deleted procedure has been transferred to another procedure as applicable to implementation of Revision 4 of the EOPs.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST #1-137

DESCRIPTION:

Special test to determine feasibility of moving RTD TE-1/2-5741-317 from the return air duct into the Control Room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Fire	UFSAR SECTION: 10.6

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test does not introduce new operating modes for the "I" train of control room HVAC. Also, since the test will be aborted, if necessary, well within design temperature limits, this also does not create new accident or malfunction possibilities.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-283

M4-0-89-19

DESCRIPTION:

A modification test to visually verify that ductwork for boiler burners was installed correctly per design sketches.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:

- The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
- The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
- Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test is simply a visual verification.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-284

M4-0-89-19

DESCRIPTION:

This is an operability test to determine if detrimental negative pressure was experienced in the boiler house during the 1990-91 winter operational cycle of the boiler burners.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety, as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test is simply verifying certain conditions in the past did not occur. Since it involves no changes to any current configurations, this test cannot adversely affect any systems or functions.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

PROCEDURE CHANGE QOS 6600-1, REVISION 22, QOS 6600-S1, REVISION 15

DESCRIPTION:

Add steps to verify that air start check valves open and close properly during monthly diesel generator operability surveillances.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Total Loss of Off-Site Power UFSAR SECTION: 8.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the overall function and redundancy of the diesel generator system is unchanged. The redundancy of the diesel generators is not reduced in two ways. First, the redundancy of the air start system is kept intact since only one bank is isolated and tested. Second, the redundancy of the extra diesel generator is not affected since only one diesel generator is tested at a time.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QUAD CITIES UPDATED FINAL SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT (UFSAR)

DESCRIPTION:

In section 7.7.1.4 (page 123), the fifth test is clarified to include testing of trip channels and verification of trip points and electrical independence of trip channels initiated by position switches, thermal switches, and radiation monitors.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this revision clarifies the UFSAR such that all RPS trip channels are adequately tested and verified to function as designed.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE 6824

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary procedure verifies and records Unit 2 diesel generator day tank Hi and Low alarm setpoints, and transfer pump start/trip setpoints.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

Unit 2 diesel generator day tank level will not be allowed to drop below normal pump auto-start level.

Temporary procedure has limitation statement that if Unit 2 diesel generator operation is required, restore configuration to normal.

1/2 diesel generator will be operable during test.

Overflow line is available to keep from overpressurizing (overfilling) day tank.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA DOSE REDUCTION SHEET 339

DESCRIPTION:

Place 2 lead blankets on each of the following lines: 2-1901-6", 2-1910-6", and 1/2-20168-3".

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this evaluation takes into account all plant modes and any applicable Tech Specs and UFSAR sections and the evaluation approves up to 13 pounds of lead per foot and the additional weight will only be 10 pounds of lead per foot. The PbShielding program takes a conservative approach to evaluating lead shielding.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST PO4-0-90-053

DESCRIPTION:

The minor design change test involves running the SBT and testing for inleakage and loss of air test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Refueling Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because testing on the "B" train of SBT will not affect plant operation due to the fact that the "A" train will remain operable during the testing. Operability of the "A" train must be proved at least once daily while the "B" train is inoperable. The test on the "B" train of SBT will not affect operation of the "A" train. The two trains are independent when running.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OPERABILITY TEST/MODIFICATION TEST M-4-0-90-002

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test - Circ water biocide skid replacement test uses the same valve line-ups as approved procedures operability test - using approved procedure QCP 1400-2.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the addition of biocides and/or water to the circ. water system does not change or impact systems or their functions.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURES 6833

DESCRIPTION:

Change Unit 1 Cable Tunnel sprinkler continuous fire watch, to a twice per shift fire watch.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because Unit 1 Cable Tunnel has redundant back up equipment to satisfy a twice per shift inspection while its sprinkler system is inoperable. Per letter dated 3-22-78 from George Lear to C. Reed; Tech Spec 3.12.C.2 has been modified to require a continuous fire watch only in the Unit 2 Cable Tunnel.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #6837

DESCRIPTION:

Changes 1st speed setpoint from 3900 rpm to maximum speed at high speed stop.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change only affects where the HPCI system parameters are set for data collection, the overall function of HPCI is not affected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

WORK REQUEST Q90095 for P04-0-90-053

DESCRIPTION:

All work associated with replacing the 7510 valve which include removing air tubing, installing valve and then retubing to the positioner.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Refueling	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the installation of the new flow control valve will cause that train of SBT to be inoperable. The other train of SBT will be run for operability daily according to Technical Specifications.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 300-T2 - OPERATING VALUES OF SECONDARY CONTAINMENT RADIATION

DESCRIPTION:

Increase the maximum normal operating value for the HPCI area from 20 mR/hr to 50 mR/hr.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the UFSAR does not address any accidents or malfunctions where this QGA action is addressed. This changes the value at which the QGAs would be entered and therefore the point at which discharge into the area would be terminated. The action will still occur but at a slightly higher radiation level. There is still ample conservatism to the radiation levels that would start to affect equipment operability.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Improve configuration of pipe supports on U-2 diesel generator air start piping. There are two new supports added, two existing supports modified, and one existing support removed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there is no functional change to any systems. This minor design change enhances the Unit 2 diesel generator air systems resistance to structural failure as it adds additional supports.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Makes use of test switch for fail safe testing and includes a additional limitation and action as a result of DVR 04-1-90-007.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the changes does not affect the operation of the MSIV's and the valve stroking is performed at less than 75% power in order to prevent an inadvertent reactor scram due to high steam flow.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST PO4-O-90-053

DESCRIPTION:

The minor design change test involves running the Standby Gas Treatment System train and testing for leakage and a loss of air test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Refueling Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test on the "A" train of Standby Gas Treatment system will not effect plant operation, due to the fact that the "B" train will remain operable during testing. Operability of the "B" train must be proven at least once daily while the "A" train is inoperable. The test on the "A" train of the Standby Gas Treatment system will not effect operation of the "B" train. The two trains are independent of each other when running.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QTS 680-1, REVISION 3 - ROD WORTH MINIMIZER CONTROL ROD SEQUENCE VERIFICATION

DESCRIPTION:

Added additional description to the procedure on what needs to be checked. And added a check to the procedure so that a Qualified Nuclear Engineer checks the sequence.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no systems or functions are affected by the procedure change. The procedure change just makes sure a Qualified Nuclear Engineer reviewed the new sequence and adds the criteria the sequence should meet.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QTS 1311-S1, REVISION 5 - LPRM CALIBRATION COVERSHEET

DESCRIPTION:

Added steps to the LPRM calibration coversheet so that the calibration is verified to occur within 1000 full power hours.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change has no affect on any equipment, systems or functions. The procedure change documents that the LPRM calibration is done within the 1000 Full Power hour requirement.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QTP 1130-2, REVISION 6 - JET PUMP BASE DATA
AND QTP 1130-S9, JET PUMP BASE DATA COVER SHEET

DESCRIPTION:

Changed the procedure to indicate what procedures need to be changed for verifying jet pump integrity and operability using the new normalized jet pump data. And added a new coversheet for Lead Nuclear Engineer review of the data taken.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no systems or functions are impacted by the procedure change. The procedure change documents the range the normalization is done and the procedures that are changed using the new data. Also the procedure change adds a new coversheet so a qualified individual reviews the data.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

CORE MONITORING CODE (Fit Adaptive)

DESCRIPTION:

While a TIP set/LPRM calibration is in progress, CMC cases that are run will utilize the FIT adaptive mode. Currently, such cases would be performed in the Non-Adaptive mode.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change will have no impact upon plant functions. Using FIT Adaptive instead of Non-Adaptive will eliminate unnecessary conservatism which currently must be added to the thermal limits. Therefore, this change does not adversely impact or create an accident different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the margin of safety is not reduced. The use of FIT Adaptive parameters provides a more accurate determination of thermal limits. This method is recommended by GE and Nuclear Fuel Services and is used at LaSalle.

MODIFICATION TEST FOR WORK REQUEST Q37504 (M4-2-82-49)

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test to verify anchors on battery chargers are installed correctly. No proposed change.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because modification test is a visual test of battery charger and does not involve a change to the system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION

DESCRIPTION:

At the 902-3 panel in the Control Room, connect a temporary recorder with digital indication in series with existing torus narrow range pressure indication to provide digital indication of torus pressure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because failure of the existing torus pressure indicator is a single failure of monitor instrumentation. No automatic safety system actuations are provided by this instrumentation. Also, wide range torus pressure is available for monitoring purposes on separate and accurate instrumentation. This wide range torus pressure indication, while quite accurate, is not accurate enough to use during the calibration.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test for reversing the interlock doors #176, #177, EL. 647'6".

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test will not adversely impact systems or functions. The interlock doors have electrical interlocks incorporated in their logic. Also sufficient persons will be present during the test to minimize the affects of a malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Installation of pressure taps on existing instrumentation air lines to accommodate data collection during the 3rd heater string study.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the intended function of the system will remain the same, and plant operation will not be affected. The installation of these pressure taps will have a pass function with respect to the system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE "TESTING THE UNIT ONE MODE SWITCH OPERATION"

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary procedure to test each contact of the newly replaced reactor mode switch. Jumpers and finger blocks will be required on certain relay contacts to facilitate the test. These jumpers and blocks will not affect the full SCRAM or Group One Isolation. No control rod movement will be allowed during the test. The Mode Switch will be moved to all positions during the test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

A full SCRAM is inserted and will be maintained throughout the test. A full Group One Isolation will be maintained throughout the test. All control rods will be maintained fully inserted throughout the test. The jumpers and finger blocks installed on relay contact to facilitate the proper testing of the reactor mode switch contacts will not affect the full SCRAM or the full Group One Isolation. By stipulating no control rod movement, the affects the test will have on control rod blocks will have no affect on the control rods remaining fully inserted. The movement of the reactor mode switch to all positions during the test will likewise have no affect on the full SCRAM inserted, full Group One Isolation, or all control rods fully inserted condition because no control rod movement is stipulated by the test.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Performance of modification and operability tests for minor design change which replaced aux oil pump motor.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no new failure modes are created by this test. This test verifies power operation of the RFP Aux Oil Pump Motor. A loss of feedwater accident has been analyzed in the UFSAR but is not impacted by this test.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST M4-1/2-86-11M

DESCRIPTION:

Hydrogen addition off-gas monitoring system upgrades: 1) Install two new backpressure regulating valves, two pressure indicators and two isolation valves. 2) Replace the existing water trap with a condensate sample tank and level indicator.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change does not effect any systems other than hydrogen addition system which is not mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION #91-1-109

DESCRIPTION:

Install three 0-1000 psig pressure transducers on existing pressure taps to measure turbine throttle first stage and steam chest pressures.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because a failure of a pressure transmitter which is monitoring turbine throttle or steam chest pressures would only affect control room indication for these pressures. A failure is assumed to be the transmitter actually falling off the test tap allowing a steam path to the atmosphere. This is no more likely to occur than is the existing sensing line or sensing line cap to all off or break. A failure of the pressure transducer which is monitoring first stage pressure would affect control room indication for this pressure and also likely affect pressure switches 504C and 504D. These pressure switches bypass turbine stop valve 10% closure, turbine control valve fast closure, and EHC Fluid low pressure scrams below 45% power. Therefore, failure of the pressure transducer monitoring 1st stage pressure would bypass scrams from turbine stop valve closure, control valve fast closure, and EHC Fluid low pressure. As stated above, failure of this pressure transducer is no more likely to occur than failure of the existing sensing line or sensing line cap.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Change SRM upscale HI Rod Block setpoint from 0.95×10^5 cps to 9.0×10^4 cps.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the function has not been changed. The UFSAR requires the rod block setpoint to be less than 10^5 cps. This is a more conservative change, we are lowering the setpoint.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Graphs used in operating surveillances changed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because change is used for surveillances only.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

UFSAR UPDATE OF TABLE 5.2.5

DESCRIPTION:

Update UFSAR to include and specify all valves tested in the 10CFR50 Appendix J local leak rate test program.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA) UFSAR SECTION: 5.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the update to the UFSAR has no effect on systems or functions. The change merely specifies which valves are included in our type C Local Leak Rate Test program. This ensures that the proper valves are tested to determine the condition of primary containment.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST ON 1A RHRSW PUMP

DESCRIPTION:

Perform special test on the 1A RHR Service Water Pump. Test requires attachment of pressure transducers and vibration measurement equipment to the 1A RHRSW pump. The 1A and 1B pumps will be out-of-service. All secondary flow paths (flow not through RHRSW flow meter) will be isolated. The 1A RHRSW pump will be run at flows of 3000 to 3700 gpm.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

While Unit One is in the cold condition the RHRSW system may be removed from service. Removal of the 1A loop of RHRSW will not affect the B loop of RHR and the A loop of RHR pumps will not be affected during this test.

The isolation of the secondary flow paths will prevent flow to the Control Room HVAC, RHR pump coolers, and the 1A vault room cooler.

The control room HVAC has alternate supplies and will not be degraded in any way.

The RHR pump coolers are only required during startup or shutdown cooling while the system is pumping hot fluids. The unit being in the cold condition will not require this.

Isolation of flow through the vault room cooler will temporarily stop cooling flow. Test personnel will be present at all times during the test and will prevent any excessive heating of vault air.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DC GROUND CHECK VERIFICATION TEST FOR PANELS 912-2, 7, 8, 901-53 THRU 56

DESCRIPTION:

Remove fuses for each panel listed above (one panel at a time) and check for grounds.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:

- The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
- The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
- Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because plant operation will not be adversely affected. The annunciator system is not described in the UFSAR. This special test will temporarily make inactive the windows on one panel at a time. The operator has the ability to monitor the system(s) for which annunciation is not available.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Install a sink and floor drain for the Chemistry Equipment Room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Seismic Event

UFSAR SECTION: 12

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the work scope involves drilling a core hole, but no new accidents will be introduced since a seismic event is already analyzed. The core boring is done in accordance with approved station procedures, therefore the integrity of the floor will be maintained. The seismic analysis of the structure will be unchanged.
3. The margin of safety, as not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

PO4-1-91-074 MODIFICATION TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Proposed change is the modification test for PO4-1-91-074, which is the replacement of unit 1 main transformer fire protection (deluge) system. Test is a verification of Hydro and Construction Testing.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test does not adversely effect systems or functions. This test is a verification that the Hydro test and Construction testing have been performed satisfactorily.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 1-163

DESCRIPTION:

The change will connect a 6-pen recorder to Bus 14 circuitry in order to monitor certain bus parameters during an auto bus transfer.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because special test prerequisites and precautions prevent any adverse impact to systems or functions. Recorder will only monitor the following circuit parameters:
 - Main feed breaker trip coil voltage.
 - Reserve feed breaker close coil voltage.
 - The time at which the reserve feed breaker is closed.
 - The time that the transfer signal is initiated.The recorder does not change the function of the circuit. Certain leads will be lifted in the process of connecting the recorder.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST MDC PO4-2-90-101

DESCRIPTION:

Hydrogen addition Off-Gas Oxygen Analyzers 2-2741-33A and 2-2741-33B scale range change from 0-5, -10 and 0-25% to 0-25, 0-50, and 0-100%.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the scale change does not affect any systems other than the hydrogen addition system which is not mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST MDC PO4-2-90-100

DESCRIPTION:

Hydrogen addition off-gas analyzer plastic components replacement with stainless steel components and installation of stainless steel probe retainers (2-2741-33A and 2-2741-33B).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the hydrogen addition system is not mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-339

M4-0-87-018

DESCRIPTION:

This modification installed a new CRD Crane and Bridge assembly for working inside the CRD Repair Room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the JFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the crane will not interact with any other systems. The installation of the CRD crane is to facilitate maintenance of the control rod drives.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-339

M4-0-87-018

DESCRIPTION:

This modification installed a new CRD Crane and Bridge assembly for working inside the CRD Repair Room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the crane will not interact with any other systems. The installation of the CRD crane is to facilitate maintenance of the control rod drives.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Performance of modification and operability tests for minor design change which replaced aux. oil pump motor.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no new failure modes are created by this test. This test verifies proper operation of the RFP Aux. Oil Pump Motor. A loss of feedwater accident has been analyzed in the UFSAR but is not impacted by this test.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 2-100

DESCRIPTION:

Throttle down on the service water through the stator water cooler.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this will just return the system to its rated design flow. The butterfly valve will need to be monitored to assure it does not fail before the next Unit Two outage. (Flow rated through the stator water heat exchanger will be checked periodically by the Tech ^c ff.)
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This minor design change will install constant bleed drains on coalescing filters 1-2701A, 1-2702A, 1-2701B, 1-2702B, 2-2701A, 1-2702A. This change would also remove Temporary Alteration 91-105 and make the constant bleed drain installation permanent on coalescing filters 2-2701B and 2-2702B.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the system will continue to function in the same manner as originally designed. This minor design change provides an alternate path to the condenser for moisture removal. This minor design change is an improvement to the system reliability and availability.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This minor design change will install coalescing filters with constant bleed drains on oxygen analyzers 1-2741-33A, 1-2741-33B, 2-2741-33A. This change would also remove Temporary Alteration 91-106 and make the coalescing filters with constant bleed drain installation permanent on Oxygen Analyzer 2-2741-33B.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the system will continue to function in the same manner as originally designed. This change will not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of any type. This minor design change installs two filters and provides an alternative path to the condenser for moisture removal. This minor design change is an improvement to the system reliability and availability.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 1-161

DESCRIPTION:

Perform special test on the 1A RHRSW pump to measure pressure pulsations and measure seal deflation due to pressure. Will remove one RHRSW pump from service during test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

During the preparation, performance and recovery of the special test only one RHRSW pump will be OOS at a time. This is allowed by Tech Specs for a period of 30 days, all OOS will be returned to service in less than 24 hours.

The isolating of all secondary RHRSW flow paths affects the ability to run SDC with the A-loop of RHR. The B-loop of RHRSW will not be affected by the special test, and will be available if required. Isolating of the A-loop cooling flow does not effect any other mode of operation for the RHR system. Under Limitations and Actions it is specified that SDC can not be run on the A-loop while flow is isolated.

The 1A RHRSW Pump will be monitored at all times while running of the special test is performed. Any adverse pump performance will be immediately detected.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QGA 300 - SECONDARY CONTAINMENT CONTROL

DESCRIPTION:

Change the maximum normal operating value for the HPCI room from 20 mr/hr to 40 mr/hr.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because raising this value from 20 to 40 mr/hr does not affect any automatic functions. It establishes the value which we would not exceed due to normal operating conditions. If this value was exceeded, the system would be manually isolated to terminate the increase and prevent possible plant/equipment damage. This is consistent with the methodology of the Group Isolation that would occur if a break would occur on the HPCI system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION

DESCRIPTION:

The 20 AMP spare breaker for circuit #14 of 4E-1842G to be replaced with a 100 AMP breaker.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because there is no significant effect to plant operation, since only the fish house equipment is involved. Also, the 800 A rating of the 480V/277V transformer breaker (for 480V distribution panel) will not be exceeded by changing the spare breaker from 20A and 100A.
2. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

EQUIPMENT OPERABILITY DETERMINATION, QAP 300-39
FOR SEVERED DRAIN LINE ON U2 3E ERV

DESCRIPTION:

The 2-203-3E electromatic relief valve (ERV) drain line was found to be severed from the valve body during a drywell walkdown. Evaluate safety concerns of operating in present condition.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA

UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the drain line being severed does not adversely effect the ability of the 3E ERV to perform its function or relieving reactor pressure. Leakage of steam into the drywell from the drain line during actuation of the 3E ERV would be bound by reviewed steam line break scenarios. As a conservative, precautionary measure, operations and Tech Staff management personnel have decided to take the 3E ERV out of service administratively. Even though the 3E ERV is found to be operable, these persons decided that it would be prudent to place the 3E ERV controller in the off position and disconnect the electrical circuitry in order to prevent the possibility of steam escaping to the drywell. Taking the 3E ERV out of service does not degrade the pressure relieving capability of the APRS system. Tech Specs permit continued reactor operation with four of the five relief valves operable.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test for the Unit 2 diesel generator room door monitor fire protection system upgrades.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire

UFSAR SECTION: 10.6

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because with the door monitors inoperable and thus the Unit 2 diesel generator room CO2 system inoperable, the requirements identified in the Unit 2 Tech Spec Section 3.12.D.4 (backup suppression and twice per shift fire watches) will be maintained for the duration of this test.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #6961

DESCRIPTION:

Implement superceded revisions of QOS 250-8 and QOS 250-S4. This is a supplement to the current revisions of the procedures.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change is a superceded revision to a previous O.S. R. procedure (QOS 250-8, Revision 4, and QOS 250-S4, Revision 4). No other changes were made to the temporary procedure and the possibility of an accident or malfunction has not been created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALTERNATE REPLACEMENT EVALUATION Q-91-007-0244-00

DESCRIPTION:

Replace the existing 4" 300# mission duo-check valve currently utilized for the HPCI turbine cooling water pump discharge check valve with an alternate dual-plate check valve manufactured by C & S Valve Co.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant Accident UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

The replacement HPCI Turbine Cooling Water Pump Discharge Check Valve has been procured from C & S Valve Co. on P.O. 334699 in accordance with the requirements of 10CFR50 Appendix B and 10CFR Part 21. Nutech Engineers, Inc. has performed a review of the suitability of this replacement valve as documented in their Report No. XCE-074-017 dated 5/17/91. This review included an evaluation of the HPCI cooling water system, and the seismic report for suitability to install the C & S Valve Co. 4" Dual Plate Check Valve in the cooling water system. This review also included a review of the manufacturing and testing procedures, and, a Code of Construction reconciliation as required by ASME Section XI. These reviews concluded that the C & S Valve Co. 4" Dual Plate Check Valve was a suitable replacement for the Mission Check Valves originally installed in 1(2)-2301-51. BWR-NED has concurred with this review as documented on Site Engineering Services Request (SESR) No. 4-0482.

Per the reviews that have been described above, it can be concluded that the installation of the replacement C & S Valve Co. 4" Dual Plate Check Valve will not result in a change to the system function, and no new or different failure modes will have been created.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

FSAR CHANGE

DESCRIPTION:

The operation of both trains simultaneously must be changed to prohibit this mode of operation in the event of a design basis accident.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the UFSAR change addresses Standby Gas Treatment System configurations in a post-accident condition.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST M4-1/2-86-11

DESCRIPTION:

Hydrogen addition off-gas monitoring system upgrades: 1) Install two new backpressure recirculating valves, two pressure indications and two isolation valves. 2) Replace the existing water trap with a condensate sample tank and level indicator.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change does not effect any systems other than hydrogen addition system which is not mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE FOR QGP 2-1

DESCRIPTION:

Adding a caution statement to alert operator not to start a reactor cooldown unless there is a high pressure source of makeup water usable for reactor level control.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure will not effect plant operations except to ensure the operator has a high pressure source of make up water to the reactor before a controlled cooldown commences. It will not effect equipment failures or create any new failure modes.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE FOR QGP 2-3

DESCRIPTION:

Adding a caution statement to alert operators not to start a reactor cooldown unless there is a high pressure source of make up water usable for reactor level control.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Note

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure will not effect plant operations except to ensure the operator has a high pressure source of make up water to the reactor before a controlled cooldown commences. It will not effect equipment failures or create any new failure modes.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Provide steps to perform Tech Spec monthly fill and vent verification of RCIC discharge piping.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure does not alter the RCIC system. This new procedure is to provide the steps to perform Tech Spec monthly vent verification of the RCIC system discharge piping. The high point vent valves are used to accomplish this surveillance. After test completion, the valves are independently verified to be in the correct position and documented within the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

New procedure to perform monthly Tech Spec verification of each RCIC manual, power operated or automatic valve in the direct flow path of suction or discharge of the pump and turbine that is not locked, sealed, or otherwise secured in position are in their proper position.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no manipulations of any valves is required that could adversely impact RCIC function. This procedure is a new procedure to verify monthly that all RCIC valves (manual, power operated or automatic) in the direct flowpath of the suction or discharge of the pump or turbine are in the correct position.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST MOC PO4-1-90-100

DESCRIPTION:

Hydrogen addition off-gas analyzer plastic components replacement with stainless steel components and installation of stainless steel probe retainers (1-2741-33A and 1-2741-33B).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the hydrogen addition system is not mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST MDC PO4-1-90-101

DESCRIPTION:

Hydrogen addition off-gas oxygen analyzers 1-2741-33A and 1-2741-33B scale range change from 0-5, 0-10 and 0-25% to 0-25, 0-50 and 0-100%.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the scale change does not effect any systems other than the hydrogen addition system which is not mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE TEST PO4-1-91-088

DESCRIPTION:

Hydrogen addition system off-gas monitoring system coalescing filters 1-2701A, 1-2702B and 1-2702B constant bleed drain installation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this minor design change does not effect any systems other than hydrogen addition system which is not mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change Test P04-1-91-089

DESCRIPTION:

Hydrogen Addition System Off-Gas Oxygen Analyzers coalescing filters with constant bleed drain installation (1-2741-33A and 1-2741-33B).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this Minor Design Change does not affect any systems other than the Hydrogen Addition System which is not mentioned in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Place Lead Blankets on the 1913-10" and the 1936"-4" Fuel Pool Cooling pipes.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the technical evaluation shows that the pipes are capable of with standing the increased stress due to the lead shielding. Technical Staff will control the placement of the temporary supports to ensure that no new modes of failure will be created and that no unwanted system interactions occur.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced

Alternate Replacement Evaluation Q-91-007-0293-00

DESCRIPTION:

Replace the existing valve disc in the Standby Liquid Control Isolation Valves, 1(2)-1101-15, 16 with a disc that has been manufactured from an alternate material, original material was ASTM A182GR.F316, Replacement Material is ASTM A479 TP 316.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant Accident	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.4
--------------------------	---------------	--------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the replacement valve disc for the Standby Liquid Control Isolation Valves is being procured from the Original Equipment Manufacturer, Crane Aloyco, with the requirements of 10CFR50 Appendix B and Part 21 invoked on the supplier. Crane Aloyco is a QABL supplier for this equipment, and as such, is required to perform an alternate replacement evaluation to satisfy the design control provisions of Appendix B. A copy of their 'Engineering Evaluation of Material Change' is attached to this safety evaluation, which documents the close similarity of the replacement disc material to the original disc material. The chemical and physical properties of these two materials is almost identical, as would be expected from forged stainless steel material which conforms to AISI Type 316. Due to these similarities, it can be concluded that the installation of the replacement valve disc in either of the Standby Liquid Control Isolation Valves will not result in a change to the component or system function, and no new or different failure modes will have been created.

SE-91-378 CONTD

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the affected Standby Liquid Control Isolation Valve will be returned to it's original design configuration.

DESCRIPTION:

Partial Modification Test for Control Room Lighting upgrades.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the Control Room Lighting System is not described in the UFSAR. This modification test is a partial test that will test the lighting system only and will not affect any other systems.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Temporary Procedure/Change #6976

DESCRIPTION:

Add temporary procedure for operating overhead crane in refueling floor to work on overhead lighting.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because operating and riding the overhead crane in order to perform maintenance of the lights above the refuel floor will not adversely affect the operation of any system. Therefore, no accidents should occur to any system, structure or components as a result of electricians operating and riding the crane. To protect the electricians from the possibility of falling from the crane or otherwise being injured, safety precautions are addressed in the work instructions such as using only qualified crane operators and using equipment such as safety harnesses.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Setpoint Change #436

DESCRIPTION:

New setpoints and tolerances for FS-23 of Cl₂ Analyzer 1/2-5700-XEIT-26.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Toxic Gas Release	UFSAR SECTION	10.10.4.2.3
-------------------	---------------	-------------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the system will continue to operate as designed within design limits, this setpoint change to FS-23 of the Cl₂ Analyzer will not adversely impact other systems or functions so as to create an accident or malfunction not evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOS 2040-1 Quarterly Testing of Reactor Building Sump Check Valves

DESCRIPTION:

Implement procedure to test check valves on room drain lines.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Reactor Building Flooding	UFSAR SECTION	6.2
---------------------------	---------------	-----

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because procedure establishes a method to verify operability of the check valves. The method used for this test does not affect their operability, only verifies that they will function when required. It does not have an impact upon the possibility of an accident or malfunction but does increase the reliability of equipment required to respond to an accident or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because Technical Specifications do not specifically address the check valves but does address protecting the rooms from flooding by use of water tight doors. Operability of the check valves is consistent with the intent of this Technical Specification and does not reduce the margin of safety.

DESCRIPTION:

Change steps to allow for performance of Technical Specification low pressure and high pressure RCIC Flow rate tests following an outage in which work was performed that affects RCIC operability.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change implements the new Technical Specification surveillance requirements for RCIC. The surveillance now tests RCIC after maintenance or refuel outage where work has been done that could affect RCIC operability. This flow rate testing is now required at two pressures - 325 psig and at rated pressure. This combination provides a reasonable assurance that RCIC will meet or exceed its designed function throughout the reactor pressure that it is required to be operable. No change to system design, structure, or function of RCIC has been done by this procedure change. Therefore, the possibility of an accident or malfunction not previously evaluated in the UFSAR has not been created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because this procedure change only incorporates the new Technical Specification surveillance requirements for the RCIC System and does not reduce the margin of safety.

DESCRIPTION:

Provide steps to perform new Technical Specification requirements.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change implements the new Technical Specification surveillance for the HPCI System. The surveillance now tests HPCI after maintenance or outage under two pressures - 325 psig and at rated pressure. This testing combination provides a reasonable assurance that HPCI will operate as designed. Throughout the reactor pressure range that it is required to operate. No change to system design, structure, or function of HPCI has been done by this procedure change. Therefore, the possibility of an accident or malfunction not previously evaluated by the UFSAR has not been created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because this change only incorporates the new Technical Specification Surveillance requirements for the HPCI System and does not reduce the margin of safety.

DESCRIPTION:

New procedure to perform Monthly Technical Specification verification of each HPCI manual, power operated or automatic valve in suction and discharge path of pump and turbine to insure valves are in proper position.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this new procedure will implement the new Technical Specification requirement to verify HPCI System valve position once every 31 days. This procedure does not change HPCI System alignment which could create an accident or malfunction that was not previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because this procedure only implements the new Technical Specification requirements for the HPCI System.

DESCRIPTION:

New procedure to perform Technical Specification monthly verification that HPCI discharge piping is filled and vented when suction is from the CCST.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this new procedure will implement the new Technical Specification requirements for HPCI to verify HPCI is filled and vented monthly. No change to HPCI function (automatic or manual) was created by this procedure that could create an accident or malfunction that is not already addressed in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because this procedure only implements the new Technical Specification requirement for monthly vent verification.

LOADING EVALUATION 91-011

DESCRIPTION:

Install scaffolding and place lead shielding on the scaffolding.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the evaluation approves a maximum load of 58,800 lbs in the proposed area, while the total weight of equipment and personnel was determined to be 12,120 lbs. If the scaffolding were to fail, the only affected equipment is the radiation monitors in trackway 1. The failure of these monitors will in no way affect either Unit One or Unit Two.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

These modification and operability tests are an administrative verification of satisfactory completed construction tests. No action steps are performed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the test is only an administrative verification of the satisfactory completion of OAD construction testing.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-405

M4-1-84-015

DESCRIPTION:

These modification and operability tests are an administrative verification of construction test completed satisfactorily. No action steps are performed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test is only a verification that OAD construction testing was performed.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

These modification L.O. operability tests are an administrative verification of satisfactorily completed construction testing by OAD. No action steps will be performed.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because are an administrative verification only. No action steps will be performed. No action items will be performed.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

LOADING EVALUATION 91-013

DESCRIPTION:

Place 24 lead blankets on scaffolding near the 1-12114-2" (CRD Repair Room Drain Line).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because based on Commonwealth Edison Company Structural Project Design Criteria, the floor on which the scaffolding will be built is capable of the additional weight due to the lead shielding. The worst case accident would be a scaffolding failure that would transfer the weight of the lead to the CRD repair room drain line. This additional weight might cause the drain line to break. The consequences of the drain line failure are minimal, because the line is not safety related and its failure would not cause damage to any safety related systems or components.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SETPOINT CHANGE #443

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary change of the flow rate of Standby Gas Treatment system to maintain the $-0.25''$ H₂O for secondary containment. Change setpoint of 1/2-7541-7A(B) to 4300 scfm.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because running Standby Gas Treatment system at 4300 scfm does not exceed the Technical Specification limit of 3600 to 4400 scfm. The accident analysis in the UFSAR assumes the same flow at Standby Gas Treatment system. The margin of safety will not be reduced for off-site does as described in UFSAR accident analysis and 10CFR100. This setpoint change is temporary.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 1-164 - TORAY ION EXCHANGE FIBER OVERLAY TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Test toray ion exchange fiber as an overlay material for the condensate demins. as an altern to graver ecocote fiber overlay.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY.

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because testing the toray ion exchange fiber as an overlay material does not change the function or operation of the condensate demineralizer system. The condensate demineralizer system is not a safety related system.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE (RECIRCULATION OF SBLC TO THE SBLC MAIN TANK)

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure outlines steps necessary to recirculate the standby liquid control (SBLC) system back to the main tank.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Control Rod Motion/ATWS UFSAR SECTION: 6.7, 10.5.1

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the SBLC system will be made temporarily inoperable in a manner similar to normal monthly testing. This is allowed under the time constraints in Technical Specifications and is a normal occurrence. The system was designed with the ability to recirculate to the main tank. This procedure only ensures it is performed properly, and with adequate administration supervision.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE FOR QGP 2-3

DESCRIPTION:

Adding a caution statement to alert operators not to start a cooldown unless there is a high pressure source of water usable for reactor level control and adding a step to reset Group II RBEDT and RBFDS reset switches and if unable to do so, to monitor area water levels.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change will not effect plant operation. This procedure adds a caution statement and a step to reset the Group II RBEDT and RBFDS reset switches.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE FOR QGP 2-1

DESCRIPTION:

Adding a caution statement to alert operators not to start a cooldown unless there is a high pressure source of make up water usable for reactor level control and adding a step to reset Group II RBEDT and RBFDS reset switches and if unable to do so, to monitor area water levels.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Note

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change will not effect plant operation. This procedure adds a caution statement and a step to reset the Group II RBEDT and RBFDS reset switches.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE 7022

DESCRIPTION:

This temporary procedure is an abbreviated version of QTS 160-5. It will be used to determine secondary containment performance in order to document the progression of maintenance activities.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this temporary procedure changes the flow of SBGTS from 4300 cfm to 4000 cfm in order to evaluate secondary containment capability. The UFSAR evaluation addresses 4000 cfm SBGTS flow. Therefore, this procedure does not take the systems into an unevaluated condition by the UFSAR. The other portions of the procedure simply isolate the Reactor Building Ventilation system and initiate operation of the Standby Gas Treatment System. This evolution is the normal path for these systems to take in the event of an accident. This is the evaluated function of these systems as stated in the UFSAR. Based on Secondary Containment test results from 08-13-91, the secondary containment was determined to be in a degraded condition and a waiver of compliance was issued (08-13-91). Pursuant to that waiver the Standby Gas Treatment system flow control setpoint was increased to 4300 cfm. The waiver also contained provisions to conduct testing at 4000 cfm.
3. The margin of safety, as not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Perform administrative verification of construction testing.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change does not adversely impact systems or functions. Due to no action items being taken, the test is merely an administrative verification of construction testing.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCAP 230-8 - STATION PAINTING CONTROL

DESCRIPTION:

New administrative procedure to control painting in the station while running either train of Standby Gas Treatment (SBGT) or the Control Room Air Filtration Unit (CRAFU).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the station painting control procedure defines when, where and how much painting can be done in the station in order to protect the HEPA filters and charcoal adsorbers of Standby Gas Treatment and Control Room Air Filtration Unit. Painting can be done in a "communicating zone" when neither Standby Gas Treatment train is running nor the Control Room AFU as stated in the Technical Specifications. Painting done in a closed contaminated area while either filter unit is running is permissible because those areas do not "communicate" with Standby Gas Treatment or Control Room Air Filtration Unit while they are running. How much painting permissible was determined by Sargent & Lundy letter from S. Mehto to M. Schreim dated 09-07-88.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

We want to add a basket to contain the used SRM/IRM/TIP in the spent fuel pool.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling Accident/Components Dropped	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2.4
Cask Drop/Seismic Event	UFSAR SECTION: 10.1.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change will not effect plant operations or change current failure modes. The container welds have been inspected. The welds are good, no fault can be identified. The evaluation looks at:
 - 1) Drop on fuel. The UFSAR is analyzed for a drop bundle of 617 lbs. This container only weighs <100 lbs.
 - 2) Corrosion and fuel pool temperature limitation. The container material is made of aluminum to reduce corrosion. Aluminum melting temperature is 1220°F. The fuel pool temperature limitation is 150°F.
 - 3) Puncture Liner. The UFSAR is analyzed for a drop cask of 100 tons. This container only weighs < 100 lbs.
 - 4) GME - Clean all burs. All burs will be removed before placing the container in the fuel pool.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SETPOINT CHANGE #450

DESCRIPTION:

Return the Standby Gas Treatment system flow indicating controller 1/2-7541-7A(B) to its original setpoint of 4000 scfm.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because returning the setpoint flow of Standby Gas Treatment to 4000 scfm will return it to its normal operation following the NRC waiver for secondary containment. Returning the Standby Gas Treatment system flow to normal will have no effect on Standby Gas Treatment or normal plant operation as described in the UFSAR and Technical Specifications.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE

DESCRIPTION:

This temporary procedure will conduct a test of secondary containment capability.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Instrument Line Break	UFSAR SECTION: 5.3.4.1

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this portion of the procedure will be used to determine the operating margins for secondary containment to comply with Technical Specifications. Standby Gas Treatment, and reactor building ventilation will not be placed in an unanalyzed condition. Fire protection and secondary containment also will not be placed in such a configuration as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR. The systems impacted by this procedure are Standby Gas Treatment, Reactor Building Ventilation, Fire Protection, and Secondary Containment. Standby Gas Treatment will be operated within 3600 scfm to 4400 scfm as called for by Technical Specifications. Reactor Building Ventilation will be isolated, and then later restarted. The procedure utilizes the outside Fire Main and its internal piping for the induced leak. Operators will be stationed both inside and outside the Reactor Building by valves, to be able to isolate the leak.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 1-165

DESCRIPTION:

This special test will test the pick-up and drop-out voltages for six CR109CO contactors located in MCC's 18-1A-1 and 19-1-1. The contactors are in SPARE cubicles which will be isolated from the MCC's.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the testing done in the MCC's will not create a possibility for an accident not described in the FSAR as the equipment being tested will be electrically isolated from MCC's 18-1A-1 and 19-1-1. The particular cubicles are "racked out" so that they are electrically isolated from MCC's. No MCC power will be used during the testing.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION #91-1-114

DESCRIPTION:

As part of temporary alterations, the heat detectors (the mostat switches) of main transformer T1 will be isolated from the 125 VDC system. Also jumpers between terminals 3 & 5 and 4 & 6 of IR ITB-68 (of main trans T1) are needed to permit manual deluge of the transformer, if necessary.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the inoperability of the heat detectors at Unit 1 Main Transformer will not increase the likelihood of creating an accident. At worst, the transformer could be destroyed in a transformer fire. However, the transformer is not needed to control or prevent accidents involving the safe operation or shutdown of the plant. Nor is it needed to control or prevent accidents which would put the public health at risk.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALTERNATE REPLACEMENT EVALUATION Q-90-007-0018-03

DESCRIPTION:

Replace the original MSIV actuator springs with alternate springs that will provide approximately 46 percent more available spring force.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Full Closure of All MSIV's	UFSAR SECTION: 11.2.3
Main Steam Line Break Outside the Drywell	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the replacement MSIV actuator springs are being procured from the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM), Crane Company, in accordance with the requirements of 10CFR50 Appendix B and 10CFR Part 21. These replacement springs represent a vendor recommended upgrade, as presented in Crane's Product Improvement Package Report #DI-006, Rev. 0, dated Feb. 28, 1989. General Electric Co., the BWR-NSSS, has also endorsed this upgrade in their report PED-06-0289, Main Steam Isolation Valve Product Improvement Package, dated Feb. 1989. This General Electric Report was specifically prepared for Dresden Station, but has been deemed applicable for Quad Cities Station by General Electric in their letter to R. Gayley dated July 12, 1991. BWRSD Site Engineering has concurred with the MSIV product improvements contained in the Crane Company and General Electric reports as documented on Site Engineering Services Request No. 4-0694.

ALTERNATE REPLACEMENT EVALUATION Q-90-007-0018-03

Based on the above recommendations and concurrence, it can be concluded that the installation of the replacement MSIV actuator springs will not result in a change to the component or system function, and no new or different failure modes will have been created. The replacement springs constitute a product improvement, providing approximately 46 percent more available spring force than the original springs. Furthermore, this increase in spring force will be accomplished by the use of an improved spring material of larger diameter spring wire, which will actually experience a reduction in the allowable stress as compared to the original springs (95.3% for the improved material versus 96.2% for the original spring material). The free length, mean diameter, installed height, working height, and working deflection of the replacement springs is identical to the original springs, which will preclude the need to modify or alter the existing associated equipment. The tandem pneumatic-hydraulic cylinder (actuator) has also been shown by calculation to have ample opening force to open the MSIV against the increased spring force.

The specific accident and transient analysis reviewed in this evaluation did not yield any new or different failure modes, and the probability or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the UFSAR have not been increased. In the Loss of Coolant Accident Analysis, all of the MSIV's are assumed to close within 3.5 seconds of the initiation of the accident (the actual closing time for the MSIV's could be as long as 9.0 seconds after the initiation of the accident, but 3.5 seconds was chosen for the analysis as being more conservative since the reactor vessel would be maintained at a higher pressure during the blowdown). While the springs provide the majority of the closing force to close the MSIV's, the actual speed at which the valve's close is determined by the speed control valve for the hydraulic cylinder. The speed control valve is adjusted and set prior to each startup. This assures that the closing time for each MSIV is verified to be within Technical Specification limits. The replacement springs will not affect the closing time of the MSIV's, once the speed control valve has been properly adjusted for the correct closing time.

ALTERNATE REPLACEMENT EVALUATION Q-90-007-0018-03

The Full Closure of All MSIV's transient described in the UFSAR will not be affected by the replacement springs. In this analysis, it is assumed that all (eight) of the MSIV's close and a reactor scram does not occur based on the MSIV position switches. The scram signal is postulated to come from high neutron flux, which shuts down the reactor. This analysis is included in the UFSAR to verify the adequacy of the Safety Relief Valves to relieve reactor pressure in accordance with ASME Section III Code requirements. Since the closure of the MSIV's is the initiating event in this analysis, the replacement springs will have no effect of this transient condition. It has been thoroughly documented in the referenced product improvement packages that the replacement MSIV springs have adequate spring force to close the MSIV's.

In the Main Steam Line Break Outside The Drywell accident analysis, it is assumed that the MSIV's close at 10.5 seconds after severance of the steam line (0.5 second detection time plus 10 second closure time). A reactor scram would be initiated by the MSIV position switches at approximately 10 percent closure of the valve stem. It is also postulated that there is a simultaneous loss of normal ac power, so the accident analysis assumes there is no feedwater flow. The net effect of the MSIV closure time of 10.5 seconds without feedwater flow to the reactor vessel will result in 85,000 lbs. of water/steam loss from the vessel, which is less than the approximately 120,000 lbs. of water/steam loss that would be required to expose the top of the core. Since the replacement springs will provide an approximately 46 percent increase in spring force, it can be concluded that they will be able to close the MSIV's within the parameters presented in this accident analysis. Also, as previously mentioned, the actual closing time of the MSIV's is determined by the adjustment of the hydraulic speed control valve.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The full modification is a Commonwealth Edison commitment to perform a Detailed Control Room Design Review (DCRDR) in accordance with NUREG 0737, Supplement 1. Items which did not conform to the requirements of NUREG 0700 were documented as Human Engineering Discrepancies (HED's).

Partial 'C' modification consists of the installation of mechanical and structural work associated with the main HVAC ductwork and ceiling inside and outside of the control room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test is a partial test that will test the Control Room HVAC "A" & "B" Train only and will not affect any other systems because no physical alternations are required.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test M4-0-84-16G Q85914-6.01, 6.02, 6.03

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test for the Computer Room Halon Fire Protection System upgrades.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire	UFSAR SECTION	10.6
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because fire watches will be maintained for the computer room as a compensatory measure during the time the halon system is out-of-service.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This new procedure provides the operator with more guidance on EGC operation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because FSAR Section 7.3.6 and 7.3.3 discuss the operation of the system. This procedure does not change or alter the way EGC operates; therefore, this procedure does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction different from those previously evaluated.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical specification, is not reduced because this procedure does not change or alter these limits. The changed procedure specify more clearly these limits and the surveillance intervals. Therefore, the margin to the limit is not decreased.

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change goes into more detail on how to trouble shoot SBLC storage tank solution abnormal temperature. It also gives a more conservative temperature band to control the solution temperature to.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure gives the operator actions to perform to correct an abnormal temperature of the SBLC storage tank. It will not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Monthly SBLC Pump Operability Test QCOS 1100-6

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change will give the operator more guidance on how to perform the SBLC monthly surveillance which is required by Technical Specifications.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change only gives more guidance on how to prove the SBLC provides the Technical Specifications required for flow and pressure from the pumps through the test tank and local flow and pressure indicators. No new accidents or malfunctions are created of a type different from those evaluated previously in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change has the operator go through a more detailed procedure to ensure that the SBLC system will be aligned to standby readiness.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change only gives operator guidance on how to line-up SBLC system to standby readiness and does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change allows the operator to use existing piping at first when draining the tank and then to use a submersible sump pump.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure only give operator guidance on how to drain the SBLC storage tank. It does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change deals with increasing SBLC tank Boron concentration and lists new temperature and volume limits.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure ensures the operator has enough guidance on how to set up the SBLC system so the Chemistry Department can increase the Boron concentration. This change does not impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure QCAN 901(2)-5 F-6

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change gives the administrative limit of 3800 gallons as a minimum level. The low level alarm setpoint is set at approximately 3915 gallons so this procedure is using the conservative setting.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change only gives operator guidance on how to respond to a SBLC storage tank abnormal level and will not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This change gives more operator guidance on how to respond to a SBLC tank solution high or low temperature alarm. The needed temperature band is now more conservative based on adequate NPSH tests.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR. This procedure directs the operator on how to respond to the annunciator.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Temporary Alteration 91-2-32

DESCRIPTION:

At the 902-3 panel in the Control room, connect a temporary recorder with digital indication in series with existing torus narrow range pressure indication to provide digital indication of torus pressure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because failure of the existing torus pressure indicator is a single failure of monitoring instrumentation. No automatic safety system actuations are provided by this instrumentation. Also, wide range torus pressure is available for monitoring purposes on separate and accurate instrumentation. This wide range torus pressure indication, while quite accurate, is not accurate enough to use during the maintenance activity.

The temporary recorder provides isolation between its power supply and the instrumentation loop.

The temporary recorder will be securely fastened to a cart and placed near the 902-3 panel in the Control Room. The wheels of the cart will lock. The recorder is a safety-related, seismically qualified component.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical specification, is not reduced because there is no change to the parameters used to establish the Technical Specification limits. The parameters are drywell to torus dp and torus pressure. The temporary alteration will have no affect on the margin of safety because the LCO's will provide the margin of safety identical to the margin of safety before the change.

DESCRIPTION:

This evaluation is for the work installation to relocate the electrical supervision and alarms for Unit One Main Transformer from the main control room annunciators to the XL3 system.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire	UFSAR SECTION	10.6
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the worst case scenario is that Unit 1 Main Transformer is lost due to fire. It has been evaluated as an accident in the FSAR, and it fits within that scope. Compensatory fire watch will be started and maintained throughout this work, as a means to provide detection.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Loading Evaluation 91-015

DESCRIPTION:

Place 4 lead blankets on the floor of the Unit 1 Dryer-Separator Pit.
(temporary)

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because based on S&L Drawing B-974 Rev. A the allowable floor loading in the Unit 1 Dryer-Separator Pit (E1. 665'-6") is 1,500 lbs/ft². A maximum of 40 lbs/ft² will be added to the floor. There is no equipment located in this pit, so no safety related systems or components could be affected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Injection of Standby Liquid Control

DESCRIPTION:

When injection of SBLC is required, either 2 pump combination may be selected.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

ATWS	UFSAR SECTION	10.5.1
------	---------------	--------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this action is taken in response to an accident. It does not change the action which occurs, just the order that the switch position is selected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test M04-1-84-36H

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test for the Unit 1 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire	UFSAR SECTION	10.6
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the only system impacted by this test is the fire protection system, specifically the local alarms for the Unit 1 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System. The loss of these alarms (flow and tamper) will be compensated by maintaining hourly fire watches for the Unit 1 Cable Tunnel for the duration of this test. Therefore, no new credible accidents can be envisioned outside those previously evaluated.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical specification, is not reduced because hourly fire watches will be maintained for the duration of this test.

Temporary Alteration #91-1-118

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary replace DPISH 1/2-5741-311 with STD 027110Q so that DP across the "R" Train AFU can be measured properly.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the temporary alteration involves replacing a defective dP indicator with an operating, QA certified, identical scale dP indicator, the possibility of an accident or malfunction of the indicator does not increase and is the same as the probability of the original indicator. This is a passive device that does not affect the proper operation of the AFU.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Special Test #1-166

DESCRIPTION:

Connect "Fluke" devices to take mA readings on the RTDs that measure heater dT for the CR AFU and also to take mA readings on the Flow Transmitter for the air flow through the AFU.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.4
------	---------------	--------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the indicators being added do not provide inputs to the AFU and are passive in function. Also, a failure of them would not cause the AFU to fail since flow is preset and not dependent on the flow transmitter, and the RTDs provide only temperature readings for purposes of conducting the monthly surveillance. Additionally, this special test does not cause the AFU to be operated in a manner inconsistent with its design so no new failure modes are introduced.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

FSAR

DESCRIPTION:

Add replacement bolting specification 21A3537 and ASME code reconciliation for Quad Cities I & II to the FSAR.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Control Rod Drop	UFSAR SECTION 14.2.1
MSL Break outside the Drywell	UFSAR SECTION 14.2.3
Loss of Coolant Accident	UFSAR SECTION 14.2.4
MSL Isolation Valve Closure	UFSAR SECTION 11.2.3
Turbine trip with failure of bypass system	UFSAR SECTION 4.4.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the mechanical properties of the bolting components are the same as the original materials. The components will perform the same function as the original components.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical specification, is not reduced because the bolting components will perform the same safety function as the original components. The margin of safety as described in the Technical Specification is not reduced.

Special Test Diesel Generator Fuel Consumption Test

DESCRIPTION:

Special test procedure to calculate the diesel fuel consumption rate of the EDG's.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Offsite Power	UFSAR SECTION	8.2.2 (Pg 11)
-----------------------	---------------	---------------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because testing diesel fuel consumption rate, will prove diesel's efficiency. Test duration to be approximately 1 1/2 hours/diesel. After test, all equipment is returned to normal.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-2-91-106

DESCRIPTION:

The purpose of this Minor Design Change is to install the new GE Model NF500 refueling bridge mast on the Unit 2 refueling bridge crane. The NF500 Model is a direct replacement for the triangular fuel mast used in the past. The refueling mast is suspended vertically from the refueling platform and functions as a telescopic arm of the platform to position and operate the fuel grapple.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Dropping of Fuel Assembly	UFSAR SECTION	14.2.2.4
---------------------------	---------------	----------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the new NF500 mast will function similarly to the previous mast, so an accident or malfunction different from those evaluated is not an issue.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical specification, is not reduced because the Technical Specifications will not be impacted by the installation of the NF500 Refueling Bridge mast.

Modification Test M04-0-80-002

DESCRIPTION:

Review and verify that functional testing has been performed for the technical support center interface modification.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the interface necessary for the TSC, will be by design isolated from any inplant equipment necessary for safe plant operation. This proposed change is to review and verify that functional testing has been performed.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA Dose Reduction Sheet 340

DESCRIPTION:

Maintenance is requesting the use of 4 lead blankets to be used in the CRD repair room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because these lead blankets will only be used in the CRD repair room and will not be placed on any equipment or pipes outside of that room. The posted live load for the floor in the CRD repair room is 400 lbs/ft² and the 160 lbs of lead is negligible with respect to this. Therefore, these blankets will not affect any accident analyses nor will they create any new accidents.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Temporary Procedure #7098

DESCRIPTION:

Change procedure to clarify the Technical Specification requirement 4.8.H.2.b and allow for proper verification of AFU heater operability.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change adds clarifying information to an existing procedure and does not cause or allow the system to operate outside of its design basis.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test for P04-0-91-108

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test to verify AFU heater is operable, filter train is operable, and a positive dP is maintained in the Control Room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the AFU will not be operated in a manner inconsistent with its design for this test. Since this is true and no design basis will be violated, the possibility of creating an accident or malfunction is not greater than at any other time the AFU is operating.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Procedure QIS 70-1 Rev. 6, QIS 70-S1 Rev. 4

DESCRIPTION:

Add steps to QIS 70-1, Rev. 6 and QIS 70-S1, Rev. 4 to verify acknowledge and clear fire protection alarms from the Control Room Fire Protection types during the semi-annual Instrument Maintenance surveillance for the Computer Room Halon System.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because prior to installation of the modification, QIS 70-1, Rev. 5 provided for the semi-annual testing of the new Computer Room halon system by (1) electrically disconnecting the halon tanks from the local panel, (2) smoking and disconnecting detectors to produce local alarm and trouble indication, (3) operating a local pull station to produce a local alarm, and (4) reconnecting the local panel to the halon tanks. This procedure revision only provides steps to verify, acknowledge and clear remote alarms produced in the Control Room as a result of the installation of modification M04-0-84-16G. The action steps required by this procedure revision are not outside the normal operational requirements of the XL3 computer and do not degrade its supervisory function either during or after the performance of this surveillance. Therefore, no new accident scenarios can credibly be envisioned as the result of this procedure change.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Temporary Procedure #7096

DESCRIPTION:

Delete references to QA qualification sticker and add a test equipment calibration checks to procedure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because adding steps to check the calibration of the instrument before and after the test and removing the reference to QA stickers cannot cause or create the possibility of an accident or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Modification Test M04-2-84-36H

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test for the Phase 10B Fire Protection upgrades to the Unit 2 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Fire	UFSAR SECTION	10.6
------	---------------	------

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the only system impacted by this test is the fire protection system, specifically, the Local alarms for the Unit 2 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System. The loss of these alarms (flow and tamper) will be compensated by maintaining hourly fire watches for the Unit 2 Cable Tunnel for the duration of this test. Therefore, no new credible accidents can be envisioned outside those previously evaluated.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical specification, is not reduced because hourly fire watches will be maintained for the duration of this test.

QAP 300-10 TEMP (OPERATING RECORDS)

DESCRIPTION:

Change QAP 300-10 to more specifically delineate expectations for log keeping. It also eliminates the SCRE's log.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no change to affect systems or their functions. Change only affects log keeping.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Chem-Nuclear Procedure SD-OP-090, Rev. 4
Process Control Program for Cement Solidification of Oil

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure is the most current revision that incorporates process control or cement solidification of oil. Oil sludges and oil residues previously these procedures were under separate titles.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because processing with vendor equipment as described in the UFSAR is same as will be used for this processing. This change is to procedures only and does not change any equipment or equipment usage.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification. therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Temporary Procedure #7115

DESCRIPTION:

Temporary deletes fail safe test and reorders steps to stroke and time MSIVS.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change does not introduce any new operating methods or techniques which may create the possibility of an accident. All Technical Specifications and FSAR Requirements are still met and the change does not affect the function of the MSIV's.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

On-site Review 88-66, FSAR Change

DESCRIPTION:

Remove requirement to have operable HPCI and RHR Room coolers to consider the ECCS Systems operable.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA

UFSAR SECTION 6.2.7

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because (10.a) the HPCI and RHR room coolers do not affect any accident precursors. A pipe connected to the primary system is no more likely to break due to the status of the ECCS room coolers.

(10.b.) The failure of RHR room coolers do not prevent the LPCI system from performing its function. Since LPCI still functions loss of the room coolers will not change the consequences of the accident.

The HPCI system is assumed to function for small break LOCA. As shown in the UFSAR, the reactor will depressurized within a short time to the pressure the the low pressure ECCS system can assure adequate core cooling. The room cooler study (OSR 88-66) shows that the room temperature will stay below HPCI isolation setpoint for 24 hours. This significantly longer than the time that the reactor pressure will be above the low pressure ECCS systems ability to protect the core. Therefore no change in consequences will occur.

(10.c) As the room cooler study (88-66) shows the temperature in both HPCI and RHR rooms remain under the Environmental Qualification (EQ) temperature for a substantial length of time. Since the equipment is rated for this temperature the probability of failure will not increase.

(10.d) The consequences of the failure of HPCI or RHR has not been changed by removing the need to have an operable room cooler.

(11) Since the failure of the room coolers to function could only affect the HPCI and RHR systems, there is no possibility of a different type of accident.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical specification, is not reduced because Technical Specification does not specify the room cooler operability requirements. The study and engineering evaluation document the lack of need for room cooler for HPCI and RHR to provide their function.

DESCRIPTION:

Place 11 40 lb lead blankets on scaffolding on the west side of the fuel transfer canal at 690' elevation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the additional load is less than 1000 lb/ft² allowed and there is no equipment that might be affected by this increased load, this will not create any new nor affect any previously evaluated accidents or malfunctions.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA Dose Reduction Sheet #358

DESCRIPTION:

Place 4 lead blankets on the steel checker plate above the 1A Reactor Building Floor Drain Sump.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the steel plate is capable of supporting a minimum of 200 lbs and a load of 160 lbs is being added, the steel checkers plate will still perform its intended function. Therefore, the operation of the 1A Reactor Building Floor Drain Sump will not be affected. Due to these reasons no new nor previously evaluated accidents or malfunctions will be created or affected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The change incorporates the ANSI and Technical Specification requirements for key station positions into procedures. These requirements are also listed in the UFSAR to a limited content. QCAP's 100-1, 2 and 3 are inter-related for this evaluation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because changes are more administrative in nature and do not involve plant components or systems. The changes reflect the requirements of the Technical Specifications and UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because procedure changes reflect Technical Specification requirements in the area of personnel qualifications.

QCAP 100-1, Deletion of QAP 200-1,2,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,14,20 & 21

DESCRIPTION:

The change incorporates the ANSI and Technical Specification requirements for key station positions into procedures. These requirements are also listed in the UFSAR to a limited content. QCAP's 100-1, 2 and 3 are inter-related for this evaluation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because changes are more administrative in nature and do not involve plant components or systems. The changes reflect the requirements of the Technical Specifications and the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because procedure changes reflect Technical Specification requirements in the area of personnel qualifications.

QCAP 100-3, Deletion of QAP 200-15, 51, 57, 58, 59, T1, T2 & T5

DESCRIPTION:

The change incorporates the ANSI and Technical Specification requirements for key station positions into procedures. These requirements are also listed in the UFSAR to a limited content. QCAP's 100-1, 2 and 3 are inter-related for this evaluation.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because changes are more administrative in nature and do not involve plant components or systems. The changes reflect the requirements of the Technical Specifications and UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because procedure changes reflect Technical Specification requirements in the area of personnel qualifications.

DESCRIPTION:

Connect Gould recorder at terminal blocks 901-37/TB4B-18, 901-37/TB4B-16, and 901-37/TB4B-14 to monitor the 901-37 channel B2 of APRM #6. A 1/2 scram on RPS B shall be taken when leads are lifted to install the recorder.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the recorder shall not affect plant operation once the recorder is installed. The B RPS shall take a 1/2 scram when the 901-37 leads are lifted to install the recorder. Immediately after the installation is complete, the 1/2 scram shall be reset and APRM 6 functional performed. This change does not adversely impact the APRM system. The chart recorder design contains multiple high impedance resistors assuring no alternate current path through the RPS contacts. Additionally, chart recorder failure mode is to that of "Open Circuit", assuring no "Short" would occur through the RPS contacts preventing their actuation.
3. The margin of safety is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Change the attachment/mounting details for the refuel bridge power cable pickup guidewheel assembly. The guidewheel assembly needs to be raised to a higher elevation to keep the kellum grip and power cable from being damaged during bridge use.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the design change does not change the operation of the refuel bridge. It has no effect on previously evaluated accidents, nor does it introduce any new accident or malfunction type. The relocation of the guidewheels will keep the kellum grip and power cable from being damaged during refuel bridge use.
3. The margin of safety is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This change jumpers the Accumulator alarm for control rod M-14. This will disable the rod block function for this accumulator only. Control rod M-14 will be fully inserted and electrically disarmed while the accumulator alarm is disabled. (allowed by T.S. 3.3.D)

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change does not adversely impact systems or create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type already analyzed in the UFSAR. This change disables the rod block for control rod M-14 accumulator alarm. The control rod will be fully inserted and electrically disarmed during the time the accumulator alarm is bypassed. Therefore, this control rod will not require the accumulator to function to insert the rod to the full in position, it will be fully inserted at all times this alarm is disabled.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because Technical Specifications allows disabling the rod block provide the rod is fully inserted and electrically disarmed. These conditions will be met.

SE-91-485

M04-0-87-001B/Q67886 & Q65563

DESCRIPTION:

Control Room "B" Train HVAC Upgrade Partial Modification Test.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this modification test for the Control Room "B" backup HVAC Train does not affect or create the possibility of an accident or malfunction in any manner different from the "A" normal HVAC train. No "B" backup HVAC train physical alterations are required during operation. The "B" backup HVAC train is fully capable of cooling and heating the Control Room plus maintaining the control room environment within desired specifications.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE CHANGE

DESCRIPTION:

Delete the prerequisites for calibration on the DOP detector. Clarify the test result requirements on the data sheet.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because deleting the prerequisites to the procedure does not affect normal plant operation. The DOP detector does not require a calibration. A field check of the instrument is done before each use to verify it is working correctly.

The station currently tests the HEPA filters to a Tech Spec limit of 99% efficiency. This 99% efficiency is assumed in the Reg. Guide 1.52 and the Control Room Habitability Study. The station is not committed to Reg. Guide 1.52 for DOP testing.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QAP 1100-5, Deletion QCAP 1100-12 Implementation

DESCRIPTION:

Change adds clarification to direction given in current procedure as well as pull together additional important issues into this procedure for easy reference.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because changes involve clarification and inclusion of procedure related items from other approved station procedures. Actual performance of evolutions or maintenance would be done with other station approved procedures if necessary. Direction given in QCAP 1100-12 is in accordance with corporate policy CVP Instruction NO 1-0-17r as well as other company and station approved documents. The direction given DOES NOT conflict with procedure expectations as outlined in the UFSAR or Technical Specifications.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Lift leads to isolate RHR 2A room cooler thermostat from control circuit.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the lifting of the cable leads will ensure the safety of the 2A RHR room cooler control circuit.

This will remove the auto start function from the circuit. To compensate this, the control switch will be placed in manual to ensure that the RHR pumps receive adequate cooling/vent. in the event of a DBA.

The continued operation creates the possibility of motor failures. The motor for the cooler is rated for continuous operation and associated cabling is acceptable.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the definition of operable, requires that for a system/component to be operable all necessary cooling be available. This change will remove the auto start function, yet the manual function will be maintained. Therefore, safety is maintained.

SETPOINT CHANGE 475 & 476

DESCRIPTION:

Change the setpoint of the heater flow switch 1/2-7541-8A(B) from 3 and 4 psig to 4 and 5 psig. This represents 1443 and 2040 scfm of flow.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
Loss-of-Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the setpoint change for the heater flow switch will insure that on a flow of less than 1443 scfm the heater will not operate. Operation of the heater on low flow conditions could damage the charcoal adsorber. Damage to the charcoal adsorber could cause an increase of off-site dose in the event of an accident.

This setpoint change will not affect the normal operation of the heater at $4000 \pm 10\%$ scfm. Therefore, there is no effect on normal SBGT operation.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA DOSE REDUCTION SHEET #360

DESCRIPTION:

Place 4 lead blankets on the steel checker plate above the 1B reactor building floor drain sump.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created since the steel plate is capable of supporting a minimum of 200 lbs. and a load of 160 lbs. is being added, the steel checkers-plate will still perform its intended function. Therefore, the operation of the 1B reactor building floor drain sump will not be affected. Due to these reasons no new or previously evaluated accidents or malfunctions will be created or effected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Whiting Co. to furnish motor, brakes, controls, gearing and mechanical/structural components to reduce the speed of the aux hook to the 46 ft/min. The control package will be changed to a GE DC300 series motor control. The changes will allow for better control moves of the hook.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the new motor and control system will reduce the possibility of failure by replacing original equipment. This slower speed of the crane will provide more accurate control of movement, thereby reducing the possibility of an accident caused by the crane operator.
3. The margin of safety, as not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

CHANNEL A REACTOR LOW LOW LEVEL
(QCAN 901(2)-5-B10)

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change goes into more detail on how to respond to a low low water level alarm, the initiating sensors, and the possible cause of the alarm.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change only gives operator guidance on how to respond to a low low water level, the initiating sensor which caused the alarm, and the possible cause of the alarm and does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

REACTOR VESSEL LOW LOW LEVEL ANNUNCIATOR ALARM

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change goes into more detail on where the signal comes from and more operator guidance on how to respond to this alarm.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change only gives operator guidance if a signal would be received that would cause the associated alarm annunciator and does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MODIFICATION TEST FOR WORK REQUEST Q90636

DESCRIPTION:

Modification test for M4-1-87-51B work request Q90636. This test will simulate an alarm condition for various alarm inputs by jumpering appropriate terminals in various panels.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this mod test will test operation of the annunciator system, only, by jumpering alarm device contacts to simulate alarm conditions. The device contacts affected by this test provide input to the annunciator system only and will not interact with any other system's operation. Jumpering of alarm device contacts simulates intended operation and therefore will not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA DOSE REDUCTION SHEET #361

DESCRIPTION:

Place 23 lead blankets on the 2-4811-8"-L.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no new accidents or malfunctions will be created, because the Pb Shielding program uses more conservative allowable stress limits than those specified by the FSAR/UFSAR. A maximum loading of 85 lbs/ft is approved, while a load of 80 lbs/ft is being added. Therefore, the design stresses are not being exceeded.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

ALARA DOSE REDUCTION SHEET 362

DESCRIPTION:

Place 16 lead blankets on grating in the 2A Core Spray Room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because drawing B-973 specifies the maximum floor loading for grating as 100 lbs/ft². The weight due to the lead shielding is only 20 lbs/ft². Therefore, the grating is more than capable of handling this additional load and the load will not affect any systems or their ability to perform their intended functions.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TESTS #1-168 AND #2-102

DESCRIPTION:

Test to verify the use of the MSIV test switch to perform a spring-only fail-safe closure of each MSIV.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the special tests only require stroking of the MSIVs using the test switch rather than the control switch. Since this test must be performed at a power level of less than 75% core rated power, no possibilities of accidents or malfunctions not already evaluated in the UFSAR have been created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

CHANNEL B REACTOR LOW LOW LEVEL

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change goes into more detail on how to respond to a low low water level alarm, the initiating sensor, and the possible cause of the alarm.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure changes only gives operators guidance on how to respond to a low low water level, the initiating sensor which caused the alarm, and the possible cause of the alarm and does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Add 3 Limitations and Actions statements. Two statements were for clarification of partial testing and satisfying criteria of more than one procedure. The third statement clarifies what actions should be taken upon failure of the Core Spray minimum flow valve (Tech Spec LCO's).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change does NOT create the possibility of an accident or malfunction that is not already evaluated in the UFSAR. Three Limitations and Actions were added to this procedure. The first Two statements are to clarify what the Shift Engineer will include in the prerequisites for partial testing and to clarify the actions to take if a surveillance fulfills the acceptance criteria of several surveillances. The third statement addresses the failure of the Core Spray Pump Minimum Flow Valve. If the min. flow valve fails either open or closed, the respective Core Spray Pump should be declared inoperable and the applicable Tech Spec LCO should be entered. This statement is being placed in this procedure due to "K. Graesser Letter to N. Kalivianakas dated 12-4-85, ECCS Pump Minimum Flow Valves". This states that when a ECCS Pump Min. Flow valve fails either open or closed then the associated pump or loop is inoperable.

Therefore, no change was made that would alter the intended function of the Core Spray System.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOS 1400-8, REVISION 1
QUARTERLY CORE SPRAY SYSTEM POWER OPERATED VALVE TEST

DESCRIPTION:

Three limitations and actions have been added. Two of the three were for clarification of Partial testing and satisfying the acceptance criteria of more than one procedure. The third one was for clarification of actions to be taken upon failure of the core spray minimum flow valve.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change does NOT adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

Two new limitations and actions were added to give operators guidance on what to do if partial testing of a system is required and if the acceptance criteria of that surveillance satisfies the acceptance criteria of other procedures.

The third limitation and action was added to give operational guidance on what to do if a minimum flow valve fails in the open or closed position.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Add 3 limitations and action statements.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change does NOT create the possibility of an accident or malfunction that is not already evaluated in the UFSAR. Three new Limitation and Action statements were added to this procedure. The first two statements are to clarify the information the Shift Engineer is to include in the prerequisites for partial testing and to clarify the actions to take if a surveillance fulfills the acceptance criteria of several surveillances. The third statement addresses the failure of the Core Spray Pump Minimum Flow Valve. If the min. flow valve was to fail in the open or closed position, the respective Core Spray Pump should be shutdown, declared inoperable and the applicable Tech Spec LCO initiated. This statement is being added because of "K. Graesser Letter to N. Kalivianakas dated 12-4-85, ECCS Pump Minimum Flow Valves". This letter states that when an ECCS Pump Min. Flow valve fails either open or closed, then the associated pump or loop should be considered inoperable.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Add three statements to Limitations and Actions.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change does NOT create the possibility of an accident or malfunction that is not already evaluated in the UFSAR. Three new Limitation and Action statements were added to this procedure. The first two statements are to clarify the information the Shift Engineer is to include in the prerequisites for partial testing and to clarify the actions to take if a surveillance fulfills the acceptance criteria of several surveillances. The third statement addresses the failure of the Core Spray Pump Minimum Flow Valve. If the min. flow valve was to fail in the open or closed position, the respective Core Spray Pump should be shutdown, declared inoperable and the applicable Tech Spec LCO initiated. This statement is being added because of "K. Graesser Letter to N. Kalivianakas dated 12-4-85, ECCS Pump Minimum Flow Valves". This letter states that when an ECCS Pump Min. Flow valve fails either open or closed, then the associated pump or loop should be considered inoperable.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Three new Limitations and Actions were added.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change does NOT create the possibility of an accident or malfunction that is not already evaluated in the UFSAR. Three new Limitations and Actions were added to this procedure. The first two statements are to clarify the information that the Shift Engineer will include in the prerequisites for partial testing and to clarify the actions to take if a surveillance fulfills the acceptance criteria of several surveillances. The third statement addresses the failure of the RCIC Minimum Flow Valve. If the min. flow valve fails to open or close, RCIC should be shutdown, declared inoperable and the applicable Tech Spec LCO initiated. This statement is being placed in this procedure due to "K. Graesser Letter to N. Kallivianakas dated 12-4-85, ECCS Pump Minimum Flow Valves". This letter states that when an ECCS Pump Min. Flow valve fails open or closed, then the associated pump or loop is inoperable.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Install new test weights in fuel pool. Hoist loaded weight - 344 lbs under water. Hoist jam weight - 1241 lbs under water.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refuel Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
Cask Drop	UFSAR SECTION: 10.1.2

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the addition will not increase the possibility of an accident or malfunction that was not analyzed in UFSAR. The evolution looks at: 1) Refuel accident the UFSAR is analyzed for a drop bundle of approx. 600 lbs. The hoist loaded test weight (the only weight that approaches the reactor cavity during testings) is 344 lbs. 2) Cask drop. This accident is analyzed for a cask weight of 100 tons. The larger of the two weights is 1242 lbs.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Install a temporary hose connection from 2B TBCCW (or 2A TBCCW) pressure indicator tap to the Unit 2 Instrument Air Compressor to allow installation of Unit 1A Instrument Air Compressor and Filter/Dryer Modification MO4-1-91-021A(B).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the cooling medium is still the same. Only the location has been altered so that the service water supply piping to the 1A and U-2 Inst. Air Compressors can be modified.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

REACTOR HIGH PRESSURE

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure is new. Previously operators had no procedural guidance of how to respond to a high pressure signal.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure only gives guidance to the operator on how to respond to a reactor high pressure signal. This includes investigating EHC pressure control, reactor recirculation pump speed control, and turbine/steam line valve positions. It does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

PRIMARY SYSTEM LEAKS (SLOW LEAKS) OUTSIDE PRIMARY CONTAINMENT

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure gives operator guidance on how to diagnose and respond to a slow leak of the primary system outside the primary containment.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure helps the operator diagnose and respond a slow leak outside the primary containment and will not adversely effect systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SLOW INCREASING DRYWELL PRESSURE - QCOA 201-1, REVISION 0

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change goes into detail on how to respond to a slow increasing drywell pressure situation. It also lists several possible alarms or causes of the increasing drywell pressure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change only helps the operator respond and contain this increasing drywell pressure. It does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

REACTOR COOLANT HIGH CONDUCTIVITY - QCOA 201-4, REVISION 0

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure change goes into detail as far as what alarms would annunciate and actions to help stop a high conductivity situation with the reactor coolant.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change only goes into more detail on how to respond to a reactor coolant above normal conductivity concern and does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Revise surveillance to incorporate data to be obtained to ensure adequate heat transfer across RCU heat exchanger to rotate thru each RHRSW loop to ensure flow to heat exchanger, add caution on proper method for securing RCU expound on manual valve locations for ease of the operator and to reflect these changes also in the S1 checklist. Also to incorporate narrower flow range and use of portable instrumentation to measure heater inlet and outlet temperatures.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analyses.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

DBA LOCA UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the system will be operated within the bounds of the design basis during performance of the surveillance.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because all equipment will be operated within the bounds of the design, and all changes are conservative in nature.

DESCRIPTION:

Change 4E-1608, 4E-1609 and 6593A to reflect as built wiring.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change does not adversely impact systems or functions because the physical condition of the actual system is not changing. The change corrects minor wiring discrepancies on 4E-1608, 4E-1609, and 4E-6593A to match as built conditions in the plant. The drawing changes do not affect plant operation.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Exchange the green and orange leads at A1 and A2 terminations of HPCI valve MO 2301-48 motor and at A1 and A2 terminations of MCC 1A, Compartment I01, also exchange leads 3 & 4 at A1 & A2 terminators of HPCI valve MO 2301-3 motor and at A1 & A2 terminations of MCC1A, Compartment G01.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the MO-2301-3 valve motor and AO-2301-48 valve motor presently operate properly (rotational direction & otherwise). The drawings are being upgraded to reflect on as-built condition, this not affecting functional operation of the valves.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Exchange green and orange leads at A1 and A2 terminations of RWCU recirc. shutoff isol. valve motor and at A1 and A2 terminations of MCC1A, Compartment FO2. (RWCU Recirc shutoff isolation valve is #MO 1201-5).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the RWCU recirc. shutoff isolation valve motor (valve MO 1201-5) presently operates properly (proper rotational direction & otherwise).
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

On CRD discharge valves MO-1-301-2A and MO-1-301-2B, the Node #4 of the circuits is located below the 2 overload contacts instead of above them.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the valves for CRD discharge will still be able to operate properly. The probability of accidents is not increased.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Provide administrative control of spring pack replacements that are not like for like.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 6
Isolation of Condenser	UFSAR SECTION: 4.5

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the operator is still functioning within its limitations and the system function remains the same. The new springpack has been evaluated by NED and has been found to be the component that will provide the operator with a range of thrust that will allow the valve to function under design basis conditions. This range of thrust is below the level that would produce locked rotor in the motor. Since locked rotor will not occur, the thermal overload will not trip. The level of thrust will also reduce the amount of thermal binding present in the valve when it is required to open. This provides increased reliability of the operator to function when required. Since the reliability of the valve is increased and the function of the system and valve remain the same, the changing of springpacks will not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction different from those evaluated in the FSAR.

A springpack is a component in an Motor Operated Valve that helps control the amount of force exerted by the valve disk on the valve body during the closing stroke. The springpack consists of a group of belleville washers stacked on top of each other to create a spring with a specific spring constant. When the valve seats, the stem of the valve will stop. The motor, however, will continue to provide force on the stem and valve disk. To control the amount of force produced by the actuator, a springpack and a torque switch are used to shut off the actuator at a predetermined amount of thrust. Springpacks are interchangeable components inside of the actuator, and come in different size spring constants. The size of the springpack is chosen by determining the amount of thrust that is required to close the valve under design basis conditions. This procedure will allow for the replacement of springpacks in MOVs which will not produce thrust in the range Nuclear Engineering Department has determined as necessary to close the valve under design basis conditions.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

FSAR REVISION

DESCRIPTION:

Revise the UFSAR to incorporate the Fire Protection Program by identifying the administrative procedures that outline the fire protection organization (QAP 1170-17) and the fire protection equipment LCO's (QAP 1170-19).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the fire protection program will be more conservative than that which was previously in place in the Technical Specifications and formed the basis for the UFSAR, because non-Tech Spec systems have been added to the new program/procedure QAP 1170-19.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Provide additional requirements for log keeping and eliminate the SCRE log.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:

- The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
- The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
- Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change is administrative in nature and does not affect plant operation or interaction of systems, structures or components. There is no affect on equipment failures or introduction of new failure modes.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 1-169

DESCRIPTION:

Support NALCO in connecting and collecting data from the tower scan unit.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the tower scan unit is taking a water source from the Grab Sample of the Service Water Composite Sampler Tank 1/2 3905 in the crib house. The water is normally dumped to a floor drain. The capability of getting a grab sample at any time is maintained. If the new 3/4" piping has a line break the flow lost would be the same as the normal grab sample flow. There is no equipment near here that would be affected and the water on the floor would be noticed by operating on their normal rounds.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

This is a new procedure to document RWCU 140°F isolation setpoint adjustment to allow for system fill, vent, and start-up.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure was created to provide instruction and documentation of the setup or setdown of the Non-Regen Hx outlet temperature isolation setpoint. The setpoint is setup from 140°F to allow for RWCU System fill, vent, and pump startup. The 140°F isolation closes the MO 1201-2, 5, and 80 to protect the Filter Demin resins from breaking down and possibly intruding the RPV. The Filter Demins are off-line and manually isolated prior to performing this procedure to ensure resin breakdown will not occur. The Group III isolation (+8" RWL) and the isolation from SBLC Injection are not affected by this procedure. After RWCU system is filled, vented, and on-line, the temperature is setdown to 140°F for normal system operation. The temperature is verified correct and documented in the procedure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOS 201-3, PRIMARY SYSTEM BOUNDARY PRESSURIZATION TEMPERATURE

DESCRIPTION:

This QCOS procedure gives the operator more and better guidance on how to monitor reactor vessel shell temperature and reactor coolant pressure when shell temperature is less than 220°F.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change only reformats the procedure and gives the operator more guidance on what and how to monitor and record reactor vessel temperatures and pressures when the vessel shell is less than 220°F.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOS 201-2, PRIMARY SYSTEM BOUNDARY THERMAL LIMITATIONS

DESCRIPTION:

The QCOS procedure gives the operator more guidance by listing the instruments that are to be used for temperature monitoring.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change only gives the operator more guidance on how to and what to monitor during reactor heatups and cooldowns and it ensures that the Tech Spec requirements for heatups and cooldowns are met.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-2-91-130

DESCRIPTION:

This Minor Design Change will install a new Beckman Model 755 Oxygen Analyzer in the 2252-43 panel to replace the broken Beckman Model F3 Oxygen Analyzer. The Model F3 Analyzer is not manufactured anymore and replacement parts are scarce. The Model 755 Analyzer has already been purchased by the station. The new analyzer is smaller than the existing analyzer and weighs approximately 1/2 as much. Due to its reduced size, the replacement analyzer will be mounted on a fabricated adapter plate. Parts cost will be \$0. The work will be performed under Nuclear Work Request Q82343.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the change installs a new component (Oxygen Analyzer) to replace an old component. All interfaces with the sample lines to and from primary containment are unchanged. Therefore the possibility of an unanalyzed UFSAR accident or malfunction is unchanged. From an electrical standpoint, the power requirements are similar but the signal cables for zeroing and spanning will not be connected. This will have no effect on the operation or reliability of the new analyzer.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical specification, is not reduced because the safety limit will have no effect of the installation. Alternate sources for sampling primary containment oxygen concentration are in place. The new analyzer still performs the primary function of oxygen monitoring.

SPECIAL TEST 1-170, 1-171, 2-103

DESCRIPTION:

Perform a manual actuation of CO2 flooding system for the emergency diesel generator and day tank rooms.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Offsite Power	UFSAR SECTION: 8.2.3.1/10.10.6
Fire In Diesel Generator or Day Tank Rooms	UFSAR SECTION: 10.6.2.6.e

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this test temporarily disables the ventilation fan and dampers to the diesel generator room being tested. Since the ventilation is normally available for room cooling during full load operation of the diesel generator, the diesel generator being tested will be 7 day LCO for continued operation provided that the redundant diesel generator and associated loops of RHR are demonstrated operable and that certain requirements are met for availability of offsite power. During CO2 injection, a momentary decrease in room temperature is expected to occur due to vaporization of CO2.

However, the atmospheric temperature is expected to rapidly return to normal due to the low specific heat of the CO₂ gas relative to the higher specific heat and mass of the equipment in the rooms. Therefore, the temperature is not expected to adversely affect the equipment in the protected areas. In addition, tests similar to this have previously been conducted at Dresden 2 & 3 and Braidwood 1 & 2 with no detectable problems related to temperature effects. During a portion of the test, the CO₂ system will be temporarily disabled to allow purging of the discharge lines. Tech Specs allow continued operation provided backup fire suppression is made available and twice per shift fire watches are in effect. These actions are prerequisites to the test procedure.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because backup fire suppression and fire watches will be established prior to performing the test. The margin of safety during the CO₂ test will not be reduced, since the redundant diesel generator and associated loops of RHR and low pressure core cooling will be demonstrated to be operable prior to declaring the affected diesel generator inoperable for testing purposes when the ventilation fan for the diesel generator being tested for CO₂ concentration will be tripped off. Also the system will be returned to normal within 7 days.

DESCRIPTION:

Fabricate and install piping and supports for Loop "A" of the reactor vessel water level instrumentation system (RVWLIS) in the reactor building outside of the drywell.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

DBA WCP	UFSAR SECTION:	14.2.4
Main Steam Isolation Valve Closure	UFSAR SECTION:	11.2.3
Turbine Trip with failure of Bypass System	UFSAR SECTION:	4.4.3
Instrument Air Failure	UFSAR SECTION:	10.7
Local Rejection without Bypass	UFSAR SECTION:	3.2.5.4.1
Loss of Auxilliary Power	UFSAR SECTION:	8.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no connections to existing piping or systems will be made until the upcoming Unit One Refueling Outage. The safety evaluation for M4-1-87-050A addresses the affect of the anchor bolts for the pipe supports on the exterior drywell. This is not a concern. Neither is pipewhip or seismic considerations. This safety evaluation only addresses the actual construction for this work package. The pipe supports and piping are located to have no affect on existing systems. Approved station procedures will be used for scaffolding construction and for fire protection. All safety systems will be unaffected in function by this work.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The change is that the acoustic monitor indicating (initial and the max) been added to the procedure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA (Small break) UFSAR SECTION: 6.2.6.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this change will record the initial reading for any ADS valve on safety/relief valve acoustic monitors on panel 901(2)-21. This will also record the maximum acoustic monitor reading. These readings will help in deciding the new setpoints of ADS valves.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SAFETY EVALUATION FOR Pb SHIELDING APPLICATIONS

DESCRIPTION:

This generic Safety Evaluation will be used for any lead shielding evaluations done using Pb SHIELDING.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
Main Steam Line Break	
Outside Drywell	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.3
Loss of Coolant Accident	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because failure modes such as those described in Step 6 have already been considered in the FSAR/UFSAR, Section 14.0. The use of PbSHIELDING to justify the amount of temporary lead shielding will not cause piping to fail. No new piping failures should be postulated due to the use of PbSHIELDING. PbSHIELDING stress limits ensure that piping system functionality and structural integrity will be maintained and that the systems will perform their intended function at the required flow during all safe shutdown events. PbSHIELDING meets the criteria specified by the NRC and INPO.

See Attachment B for further justification.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the basis for any technical specifications are independent of the actual stress level in a piping system. The bases are only dependent upon the determination of system operability. The use of PbSHIELDING program would ensure the piping system operability and structural integrity and meets the design basis for functional goals.

DESCRIPTION:

Removal of the existing outlet valve and the installation of a new isolation valve 1/2-3999-90.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Coolant	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Loss of Power	UFSAR SECTION: 8.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because all work will be completed within the 7 day time period and therefore it will not create an accident different from those described in the UFSAR and Tech Specs.

This work scope will remove the existing outlet valve and install a new-isolation valve 1/2-3999-90. During the work the 1/2 diesel will be out of service. Unit 2 will be shutdown and Unit 1 will be in a 7 day for the 1/2 diesel.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #7223

DESCRIPTION:

Add daily outside air temperature monitoring to step 44 of the procedure.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this addition will not affect the function or operation of any system. Therefore, the possibility of an accident or malfunction is not increased. This change adds the passive collection of outside air temperature to an already approved procedure with equipment that already exists to collect this data.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification. therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #7225

DESCRIPTION:

Change heater ΔT requirements and units of flow. Also add new outside air limitation for operability of AFU heater.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the procedure change does not alter the operation or function of the AFU. The clarification of the units of flow will not alter the operation or function of the unit. The new heater ΔT requirement is being added to comply with the new Technical Specifications. After the change, the AFU will continue to operate as in the past. Therefore, there is no change of an accident or malfunction different from those evaluated in the UFSAR happening. Additionally, the limitations statement for outside air temperatures is being added for clarification of Tech Spec acceptance criteria and does not affect the functioning or operation of the AFU so as to create the possibility of a malfunction or accident.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCOS 201-4, REACTOR VESSEL AND PRIMARY SYSTEM LEAKAGE TEST

DESCRIPTION:

This QCOS procedure change gives the operator more and better guidance on how to perform the leakage test of the primary system after a refuel outage.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure does not adversely impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those previously evaluated in the UFSAR. All control rods are fully inserted and the operator is only adding water to the vessel to eventually pressurize it to approximately 1000 psig. Then a walkdown of the primary system is performed to check for leaks.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

PROCEDURE CHANGE TO QTS 160-9

DESCRIPTION:

Change the procedure to add pulse mode injection testing.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because test criteria does not change and this change will not adversely impact any system structure or component required for normal operation. No physical change is made to the plant, therefore, the procedure change will not introduce the possibility of an accident.

This procedure change introduces the pulse made injection testing to charcoal adsorber leak tight testing. The pulse made injection testing is recommended for smaller systems such as the control room air filtration unit.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Place lead blankets on scaffold to shield IPM-8 in 1/2 track interlock.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true.
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the scaffold and floor are capable of supporting the weight of the lead blankets as shown in the technical evaluation. Therefore, the floor will still perform its intended function. Due to these reasons no new or previously evaluated accidents or malfunctions will be created or affected.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 1-163, REVISION 1

DESCRIPTION:

This change will connect a 6-pen recorder to Bus 14 circuitry in the 901-8 panel in order to monitor certain bus parameters during a bus auto-transfer.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Loss of Offsite Power UFSAR SECTION: 8.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created for the following reasons. The installed recorder will only monitor the following circuit parameters:
 - Bus 14 Main Feed Breaker (from Transformer 11) trip coil voltage.
 - Bus 14 Reserve Feed Breaker (from Transformer 12) close oil voltage.
 - The time at which the reserve feed breaker is closed.
 - The time that the transfer signal is initiated.
 - Bus 14 voltage during the transfer.

The recorder provides only monitoring function. It does not change Bus 14 control circuit function. Certain leads will be lifted (in the 501-8 panel) in the process of connecting the recorder. However, special test prerequisites and precautions by ensuring that the plant is in the proper operating configuration prior to removal and installations of the recorder. Generator will be off-line during recorder installation and removal. Bus 14 feed from transformer will be open and feed from transformer 12 will be closed. Recorder channels will be connected to the trip coil circuit for the feed breakers from Transformer 11 and the close coil circuit for the feed breaker from any inadvertent operation of the control circuitry during recorder installation or removal would have no affect on the system, as the feed breakers are in their conservative positions. Therefore, the possibility of a loss of Offsite Power have been minimized. The installed recorder has high input impedance and will have fuse installed in the channel leads to provide isolation protection for the Bus 14 circuitry. The fuses will isolate the recorder from the Bus 14 circuitry in the event of a recorder channel failure. Therefore the failure mode listed in question 6 will be eliminated, or become highly improbable.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QUARTERLY LPCI MODE FLOW RATE TEST - QCOS 1000-1, REVISION 1

DESCRIPTION:

Added 2 Limitation and Action statements for Shift Engineer clarification on partial testing and acceptance criteria. Also several procedure steps were changed for clarification and procedure usability.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR whe. any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no change was made to the RHR system or any of its components/functions. The RHR system will function as described in the UFSAR, therefore, the possibility of an accident or malfunction different from those evaluated in the UFSAR was not created.

This procedure change adds 2 Limitation and Action statements AND changes several procedure steps. The Limitations and Actions are: 1. To provide guidance to the Shift Engineer on what to document in the prerequisites for partial testing AND 2. If the acceptance criteria of one surveillance can be copied and used to satisfy the other surv./work requests.

Several procedure steps were changed for clarification and for better system operation. The major change was to change the step for transferring flow from one loop to the other. The way the step was previously stated could cause the RHR pumps to go into a runout (high flow-low pressure) condition. The procedure step now has a discharge pressure range for guidance and alternately throttles the MO 1001-36 A/B to accomplish the change-over. A step was also added to facilitate changing pump status. This step alternately starts and stops the pumps so the MO 1001-36A/B is not unnecessarily throttled and the possibility of runout operation is eliminated. Steps were also deleted that had unnecessary manipulations of MOV's.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

MONTHLY RHR PUMP/RHR SW PUMP OPERABILITY TEST - QCOS 1000-2, REVISION 2

DESCRIPTION:

Added 2 Limitation and Action statements for Shift Engineer clarification on partial testing and acceptance criteria. Also several procedure steps were changed for clarification, usability, and more efficient transfer of loop flows to prevent pump run-out conditions.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure revision did not change any RHR component or function. The RHR is tested in an analyzed condition and will function as intended under all plant operating modes. Therefore, no accident or malfunction of a type different from those already evaluated in the UFSAR was created.

This procedure revision adds 2 Limitation and Action statements AND changes several procedure steps. The Limitation and Actions are: 1. To provide guidance to the Shift Engineer on what to document in the prerequisites for partial testing and 2. If the acceptance criteria of one surveillance satisfies the acceptance criteria of other surveillances/work requests, then that surveillance can be copied and used to satisfy the other surveillance/work request.

Several procedure steps were changed for clarification and system operation. The major change was to change the step for transferring flow from one loop to the other. The step now has a discharge pressure range for guidance and alternately throttles the MO 1001-36A/B to accomplish the flow change-over. This will eliminate the possibility of the RHR pumps from entering a run-out (high flow-low pressure) condition. A step was also changed to coordinate starting and stopping the RHR pumps to minimize manipulations of MO 1001-36A/B and eliminate possible pump runout conditions. Also several steps were deleted to avoid unnecessary MOV manipulations.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Several procedure steps were changed for clarification and system operation. The major change was to change the step for transferring flow from one loop to the other. The step now has a discharge pressure range for guidance and alternately throttles the MO 1001-36A/B to accomplish the flow change-over. This will eliminate the possibility of the RHR pumps from entering a run-out (high flow-low pressure) condition. A step was also changed to coordinate starting and stopping the RHR pumps to minimize manipulations of MO 1001-36A/B and eliminate possible pump runout conditions. Also several steps were deleted to avoid unnecessary MOV manipulations.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Place 12 lead blankets on scaffold to provide shielding the U2A RHR room NW corner.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the Loading Evaluation showed the floor can accept a load of 19,600 lbs. while only 480 lbs is being added. Therefore, the design stresses are not being exceeded.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Place lead blankets on the SPUD end of CRDs. The CRDs will be staged on 595 prior to movement to 3rd floor.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the floor can easily support the additional weight. The lead blankets weigh 40 lbs (10 lbs/ft^2 , blankets are $1' \times 4'$). Drawing B-972 shows the floor capable of handling up to 350 lbs/ft^2 . Therefore, since the floor can handle 350 lbs/ft^2 , and blankets weighing 40 lbs total are being used, no new accidents or malfunctions will be created.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-1-91-135

DESCRIPTION:

This minor design change involves modifying the HU-1 relay output to the GIT Trip Bus by adding a diode to prevent deluge of the Unit 1 Main Power Transformer when the trip bus is energized. The original intentions of the deluge initiation circuitry is unchanged by this minor design change.

Initiation of the Main Generator Reverse power relay energized the GIT Trip Bus which backfeed through the HU-1 Differential Current Relay and energized the Unit 1 Main Transformer Deluge Circuitry. A Diode IN 3678 will be installed on the HU-1 Relay to prevent backfeeding to the Deluge circuitry.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the addition of the diode in the HU-1 relaying will prevent the deluge of the transformer on a generator lockout relay trip signal. It will allow the transformer to be deluged only on differential, sudden pressure or fireeyes. The addition of the diode is being added when the unit is down and the transformer is de-energized. If the diode fails, other protective relays such as the sudden pressure relay for the transformer will energize the generator trip bus and trip the 86G1 or 86G1B lockout relay. The transformer will also be protected from fire with the deluge system which will be energized by the sudden pressure relay and the fireeyes.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Fabrication and installation of piping and supports for Loop "B" of the Reactor Vessel Water Level Instrumentation System (RVWLIS) outside of the drywell.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

DBA LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Main Steam Isolation Vlv Closure	UFSAR SECTION: 11.2.3
Turbine Trip with Failure of Bypass System	UFSAR SECTION: 4.4.3
Instrument Air Failure	UFSAR SECTION: 10.7
Load Rejection without Bypass	UFSAR SECTION: 3.2.5.4.1
Loss of Auxiliary Power	UFSAR SECTION: 8.2.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the pipe supports and piping are located to have no affect on existing systems. Approved station procedures will be used for scaffolding construction and for fire protection. All safety systems will be unaffected in function by this work. No connections to existing piping or systems will be made until the upcoming Unit One Refueling Outage. The safety evaluation for M4-1-87-059B, addresses the affect of the anchor bolts for the pipe supports on the exterior drywell. This is not a concern. Neither is pipe whip or seismic considerations. This safety evaluation only addresses the actual construction for this work package.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCGP 1-1, REVISION 0 - NORMAL UNIT STARTUP

DESCRIPTION:

1. a. Prerequisite added to require Chemistry Department to sample and analyze reactor water chemistry per approved procedure, QCP 200-Si.
b. Precautions and steps added to state the requirement for maintaining Reactor water dissolved oxygen concentration <300 ppb when water temperature is >284°F OR to stop the reactor startup.
2. Incorporates a Limitation and Action for use of the Turbine Vacuum Breaker if turbine vibration reaches 12 mils or a step increase or rapid rise in vibration occurs. Limits decrease in backpressure to 5 inches Hg.
3. a. During shell warming, first stage pressure is limited to less than 85 psig vs 70 psig to prevent rolling the Turbine off Turning Gear.
b. To terminate shell warming, Differential Expansion Rotor Long must be >.145 in. vs .150 in.
c. At the discretion of the S.E. the Generator may be synchronized if vibrations are greater than 5 mils to allow rotor heating to reduce vibration readings.
4. A Caution is added prior to steps placing Hydrogen Addition into operation, which alerts Operating management to consider delaying operation of Hydrogen Addition to accommodate personnel performing inspection, etc. in areas where radiation dose rates will increase.
5. A step is added to monitor for MFLPD > FRP, and notification of a QNE if that condition occurs.
6. Incorporates Tech Spec requirements for HPCI/RCIC testing at 325 psig and 920 psig during startup. THIS CHANGE PREVIOUSLY EVALUATED IN SE-91-219 (FOR HPCI) AND SE-91-220 (FOR RCIC).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.

- Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because :
 - a. Prior to commencing a reactor startup, reactor water samples will be drawn and analyzed. Checks will be performed prior to startup and during startup to verify that the dissolved oxygen concentration is acceptable. Monitoring of reactor water chemistry will reduce equipment failures and decrease the possibility of an accident or malfunction. This type of guidance does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - b. This change incorporates direction on turbine operation. Standard operating practices used to maintain the turbine/generator in good operating condition over a long period of time does not impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - c. This change incorporates direction on turbine operation. Standard operating practices used to maintain the turbine/generator in good operating condition over a long period of time does not impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - d. During reactor startup, work and inspections may be continuing in areas that will be subjected to higher radiation dose rates when Hydrogen Injection is initiated. This change alerts the crew to this fact so that personnel exposure can be considered prior to initiating Hydrogen Injection. Making a crew aware of a personnel hazard cannot impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.

- e. Currently approved operating guidance at QCNPS enforces this Tech Spec requirement. Tech Spec required that MFLPD remain less than or equal to FRP or that corrective action be initiated. This restriction is imposed to protect the fuel cladding. This procedure change states that requirement as something to monitor as reactor power is increased. Implementing this change will serve to help protect fuel cladding integrity and does not create the possibility of an accident of malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - f. SE-91-219 and SE 91-220.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

OCGP 1-2, UNIT STARTUP TO HOT STANDBY

DESCRIPTION:

1. a. Prerequisite added to require Chemistry Department to sample and analyze reactor water chemistry per approved procedure, QCP 200-S1.
- b. Precautions and steps added to state the requirement for maintaining Reactor water dissolved oxygen concentration <300 ppb when water temperature is >284°F OR to stop the reactor startup.
2. A procedure section has been revised and expanded which deals with maintaining the RPV in a Hot Standby condition. For direct control of pressure, use of HPCI is directed and if pressure cannot be controlled, a reactor scram is directed. A more controllable band was established for control of reactor pressure, 600 to 800 psig vs the previous 850 to 920 psig band. Further guidance is given on use of the IRMs and SRMs for monitoring power.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:
 - a. Prior to commencing a reactor startup, reactor water samples will be drawn and analyzed. Checks will be performed prior to startup and during startup to verify that the dissolved oxygen concentration is acceptable. Monitoring of reactor water chemistry will reduce equipment failures and decrease the possibility of an accident or malfunction. This type of guidance does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - b. This change provides increased direction to the operating crew for steps which have essentially been performed similarly any time this evolution has been performed in the past. Increasing the allowable band for RPV pressure control provides more flexibility for operation and is conservatively below high pressure scram setpoint. Allowing the use of HPCI as a means to control RPV pressure provides a higher capacity system than the previous use of only RCIC. This increased flexibility assures successful completion of this evolution for a wider variety of RPV pressure and power situations. Direction to scram if RPV pressure cannot be controlled is conservative and provides direction that will insure that the evolution is thoroughly controlled. Since this direction is consistent with currently approved methods used at the station and does not adversely impact other systems or functions, it does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCGP 1-3, UNIT HOT STANDBY TO POWER OPERATION

DESCRIPTION:

1. a. Prerequisite added to require Chemistry Department to sample and analyze reactor water chemistry per approved procedure, QCP 200-S1.
- b. Precautions and steps added to state the requirement for maintaining Reactor water dissolved oxygen concentration <300 ppb when water temperature is >284°F OR to stop the reactor startup.
2. Incorporates a Limitation and Action for use of the Turbine Vacuum Breaker if turbine vibration reaches 12 mils or a step increase or rapid rise in vibration occurs. Limits decrease in backpressure to 5 inches Hg.
3. a. During shell warming, first stage pressure is limited to less than 85 psig vs 70 psig to prevent rolling the Turbine off Turning Gear.
- b. To terminate shell warming, Differential Expansion Rotor Long must be >.145 in. vs .150 in.
- c. At the discretion of the S.E. the Generator may be synchronized if vibrations are greater than 5 mils to allow rotor heating to reduce vibration readings.
4. A Caution is added prior to steps placing Hydrogen Addition into operation, which alerts Operating management to consider delaying operation of Hydrogen Addition to accommodate personnel performing inspection, etc. in areas where radiation dose rates will increase.
5. A step is added to monitor for MFLPD > FRP, and notification of a QNE if that condition occurs.
6. Incorporates Tech Spec requirements for HPCI/RCIC testing at 325 psig and 920 psig during startup. THIS CHANGE PREVIOUSLY EVALUATED IN SE-91-219 (FOR HPCT) AND SE-91-220 (FOR RCIC).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.

- Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:
 - a. Prior to commencing a reactor startup, reactor water samples will be drawn and analyzed. Checks will be performed prior to startup and during startup to verify that the dissolved oxygen concentration is acceptable. Monitoring of reactor water chemistry will reduce equipment failures and decrease the possibility of an accident or malfunction. This type of guidance does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - b. This change incorporates direction on turbine operation. Standard operating practices used to maintain the turbine/generator in good operating condition over a long period of time does not impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - c. This change incorporates direction on turbine operation. Standard operating practices used to maintain the turbine/generator in good operating condition over a long period of time does not impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - d. During reactor startup, work and inspections may be continuing in areas that will be subjected to higher radiation dose rates when Hydrogen Injection is initiated. This change alerts the crew to this fact so that personnel exposure can be considered prior to initiating Hydrogen Injection. Making a crew aware of a personnel hazard cannot impact systems or functions so as to create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.

- e. Currently approved operating guidance at QCNPS enforces this Tech Spec requirement. Tech Spec required that MFLPD remain less than or equal to FRP or that corrective action be initiated. This restriction is imposed to protect the fuel cladding. This procedure change states that requirement as something to monitor as reactor power is increased. Implementing this change will serve to help protect fuel cladding integrity and does not create the possibility of an accident of malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - f. SE-91-219 and SE 91-220.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

QCGP 2-1, NORMAL UNIT SHUTDOWN

DESCRIPTION:

Main Generator load is reduced to 30 MWe vs 10 MWe prior to tripping Turbine/Generator. Steps included to verify auto start of Stator Cooling Pumps when Generator 86 relay is reset. Turbine Bearing Lift Pumps are started when Turbine speed decreased to 900-1000 rpm vs 800 rpm. Offgas charcoal adsorbers are bypassed and air sparged when RPV pressure is <900 psig.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the types of setpoints changed are within the constraints of Tech Specs or are related to long term maintenance of the turbine/generator. These have no direct connection to accidents or malfunctions described in the UFSAR and due to their nature do not create the possibility of accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

REACTOR SCRAM - QCGP 2-3

DESCRIPTION:

1. If any control rods failed to insert to position 00, direction is given to bypass the RWM, close the CRD Charging Water Header stop valve and manually insert them.
2. Previous direction was to maintain RPV level between 20 and 40 inches, this has been revised to 8 to 48 inches.
3. This change adds verification steps for a turbine trip.
4. This change adds individual steps which direct how to transfer auxiliary power if it did not automatically transfer.
5. This change expands the scope of the scram procedure so that it includes direction for placing the plant in a cold shutdown condition.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:
 - a. This change directs operator action in response to an accident or system malfunction. The CRD system is designed for the pressure expected in the drive water header and since a scram signal has already occurred, the need to immediately recharge the accumulators does not exist. Due to these factors, this change does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - b. This change uses the scram setpoint as the low end of the band and the high level trip setpoint as the high end of the band. Operation anywhere within these points is allowable and does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - c. This change is a verification of an expected automatic action. Since the automatic action is evaluated to be acceptable, verification of that action cannot create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - d. This change is a verification of an expected automatic action. Since the automatic action is evaluated to be acceptable, verification of that action cannot create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.
 - e. SE-91-567.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALT.

DESCRIPTION:

Connect the Unit 2 Recombiner Temperature Recorder (2-5440-3) point number 5 to TE 2-5441-287B instead of TE 2-5441-28B.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None:

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the spare thermal couple functions in the same manner as the primary thermal couple, the possibility of a malfunction remains unchanged. This change is the intended function of the spare thermal couple and allows the recombiner temperature to be verified on the base-line plot.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the base-line plot of recombiner outlet temperature vs. reactor power for the 2B recombiner will not be changed. The spare thermal couple is a designed backup in case the primary thermal couple fails. The spare will be verified locally as operating correctly before it is connected to the temperature recorder.

DESCRIPTION:

Connect an alternate recorder to inputs 4 and 5 on TR 2-5440-3. This will provide a redundant temperature indication for the recombiner.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the malfunction of TR 2-5440-3 was not addressed in the UFSAR. The change is intended to add another location to read recombiner temperature at points 4 and 5.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the base-line plot of recombiner outlet temperature vs reactor power for the 2B recombiner will not be changed. The alternate recorder will provide a secondary means of verifying the recombiner temperature for points 4 and 5.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURES #7251

DESCRIPTION:

These procedures result in rearranging the 250 VDC normal distribution system on a temporary basis.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 14.3
MSL Break Outside Containment	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2
Loss of Offsite Power	UFSAR SECTION: 14.1.2

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because all actions prescribed in this procedure are written to ensure that applicable Technical Specification requirements are met. None of the actions described in the procedure will increase the probability of an accident. By ensuring all LCO requirements are met any reduction in equipment availability is within the boundaries approved by the NRC via the Technical Specifications.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the above limits are unchanged. Both 125 VDC battery systems will be operable and the other 250 VDC battery will be operable. If the three day LCO expires, Unit 2 will be shutdown.

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure revision will allow visitors to go to the same assembly area as their escort. Currently the visitor goes to the lunchroom.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure has no impact on systems or functions that could create the possibility of an accident or malfunction. It only directs visitors to go to their escort's assembly area.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

LOADING EVALUATION 91-021

DESCRIPTION:

Place up to 25 lead blankets on scaffolding in the U-2-A RHR room.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the scaffold and the floor have been evaluated and will support the 1000 lbs of lead blankets. The blankets will be wrapped around the scaffold bar in such a manner that if the scaffolding falls, the lead blankets will fall to the floor and not on the 2-4862A-1"L. It is a straight drop from the scaffold to the floor, and no equipment will be impacted by the falling lead blankets. A sketch of blanket placement appears in the loading evaluation #91-021.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The MDC involves installing corrosion coupon holders in the 1/2 DCCW line downstream of the heat exchanger. This equipment is being installed in response to NRC Generic Letter 89-13.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA (DGCW Pump Autostart) UFSAR SECTION: 14 Safety Analysis

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the work is being done following standard approval welding procedures. This prevents unapproved welding methods during installation. The approved procedures are used to prevent damage to the piping, to keep the DG operable.

Hot tap methods are being used to drill through the valve. System pressure will be contained against the machine's packing. A drain line is also provided to prevent leakage during the work. This prevents water from spraying on any equipment in the DG room and possibly affecting equipment. In case the piece of pipe is not held by the hot tap machine's drill bit, the piece will be discharged to the river, since it is downstream of the DCCW pumps and heat exchangers. Since the installation is downstream of the pump and heat exchanger, the drilled piece of pipe will not cause malfunction of that equipment, ultimately keeping the DG operable.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

The MDC involves installing corrosion coupons in the 2A and 2B RHRSW lines downstream of each heat exchanger. This MDC is in response to NRC Generic Letter 89-13.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA UFSAR SECTION: 14 Safety Analysis

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the work is to be completed following station-approved welding procedures, which will prevent unapproved welds during installation. These procedures are used to prevent damage to the piping, thus keeping the RHR system operable. Hot tap methods are being used to drill through the piping. System pressure will be contained against the machine's packing. A drain line is provided to prevent leakage during the work. This prevents water from spraying on any equipment in the room. The installation is rated for 500 psi, which is greater than RHRSW system pressure. In case the piece of pipe is not held by the hot tap machine's drill bit, the piece will be discharged to the river, since the installation is downstream of the RHR pumps and heat exchangers. Because of this, the piece will not cause a malfunction of that equipment, ultimately keeping the RHR system operable.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

PROCEDURE QCAP 2200-5

DESCRIPTION:

This is a new procedure which describes actions to be taken for planning and performance of critical tasks. Critical tasks are those identified by plant management as requiring special attention because of their potential for affecting plant safety.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because implementation of this procedure will have no adverse impact on systems or functions. Implementation of the procedure will cause increased planning and discussion of critical tasks, thus reducing the chance of having any adverse effect on plant safety during the execution of the task. Any task that has an adverse impact on systems or functions will have its own specific safety evaluation.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION

DESCRIPTION:

Connect the recombiner thermocouples to an alternate recorder so that the normal temperature can be prepared.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the temporary recorder will function in the same manner as the existing recorder and its failure will not affect any UFSAR accident analyses. The temporary replacement of this recorder does not reduce the redundancy of the existing recorder.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the base-line of recombiner outlet temperature vs. reactor power for either unit two recombiner will not be changed. This temporary recorder will function in the same manner as the existing recorder, such that, this Tech Spec will still be met. The temporary recorder will be secured, such that during a seismic event, no safety related equipment will be affected.

DESCRIPTION:

Add additional clarifying information on operation of the compressor, initial SW valve lineup, and terminals to which the multimeters will be connected.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure change adds clarifying information and does not alter the function or operation of the "A" train. Since the function and operation of the "B" train will not be altered, there is no possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than those described in the UFSAR happening.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

NEW PROCEDURE, QOA 6900 BLOCK

DESCRIPTION:

Add procedures: "Loss of 250 VDC battery chargers concurrent with a design basis accident." In this situation, the procedure will direct the operator to shed the following non-safety related loads at different intervals after the loss of the chargers: Turbine Emergency Bearing Oil Pump (EBOP), Recirculation MG Set Coastdown Lube Pumps, and Emergency Hydrogen Seal Oil Pump (ESOP).

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the situation in which this procedure would be used is during a DBA. The equipment addressed above is not required to mitigate the consequences of any DBA that may be occurring at the time. Therefore, no additional accident situation would arise which might prevent the recovery from the situation already at hand. The removal of the non-safety related loads from the battery will increase the performance of the 250 VDC battery system during recovery from the accident.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #7269

DESCRIPTION:

Alternative method to withdraw control rod J-2 by only sending a withdraw signal to the HCU. This is accomplished by disconnecting the insert directional control valve.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the ability of the control rod drive to scram will not be affected in any way. The possibility of the withdraw directional control valves to malfunction is not changed and that malfunction (described in FSAR Section 10.5) is bounded by the more severe rod drop accident (described in FSAR Section 6.5.3).
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #7272

DESCRIPTION:

This will provide an alternative method to assist in the withdrawal of control rod J-2 by venting the underpiston area.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the ability of the control rod drive to scram will remain unaffected. This change could not increase the withdrawal speed above the rod drop accident speeds.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION 91-1-135

DESCRIPTION:

Install a recorder on the Service Water Radiation Monitor (SWRM) to monitor HI voltage, Low voltage, Main detector, background detector, and recorder signals for troubleshooting.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the recorder points do not change the operation or alter the performance of the SWRM. The UI SWRM is inoperable. The Chemistry Department is presently taking 1 per 12 hr. grab samples as required by T.S. Table 3.2-5.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because the margin of safety is not reduced due to the fact the monitor is inop. and chemistry is taking its 1 per 12 hr. grab samples.

TEMPORARY PROCEDURE

DESCRIPTION:

This temporary procedure will conduct a test of secondary containment/capability.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Refueling	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.2
LOCA	UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.4
Instrument Line Break	UFSAR SECTION: 5.3.4.1

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the SBT, reactor building ventilation systems will not be placed in a configuration different from those evaluated in the FSAR. The systems impacted by this procedure are SBT, reactor building ventilation, fire protection, and secondary containment. SBT will be auto-started, reactor building ventilation will be isolated and restarted. The procedure utilized the outside fire main and its internal piping for an induced leak. Also, a leak will be induced via the drywell-torus purge fans filter housing. During both evolutions personnel will be stationed to correct the induced leak if needed. By inducing a leak of a known magnitude an operating margin for secondary containment will be established.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because a leak will be induced during this procedure to determine the margin above Technical Specification limit.

LOADING EVALUATION #91-024

DESCRIPTION:

Rad protection would like to place up to 10 layers of lead blankets on 595' elevation and 623' elevation in the reactor building.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the loading of the lead blankets will not exceed the design criteria of the floor and supporting structure.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION 91-2-55 & NWR Q96851

DESCRIPTION:

Install four 0-1200 psig pressure transducers on existing pressure taps off of main steam line low pressure switches, PS-2-261-30A,B,C&D, sensing lines. The pressure transducers will then be connected to a high speed strip chart recorder.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

Mainsteam Line Break Outside of Drywell UFSAR SECTION: 14.2.3

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

A failure of one of the pressure transducers would depressurize the associated main steam line low pressure switch which would insert a 1/2 Group I Isolation signal. A failure is assumed to be the transducer falling off the test tap allowing a steam path to atmosphere. The test tap is only 3/4" in diameter, a steam leak of this size is considered negligible and could be isolated if necessary by closing the associated isolation valve.

The setpoints of the main steam line low pressure switches are also remaining unchanged with the installation of this temporary alteration. The transducers are being installed on existing test taps, and thus, will not interrupt the flow path to the main steam line low pressure switches. The weight of the transducers is also considered negligible. Therefore, the four main steam line low pressure switches will still function as designed after installation of this temporary alteration.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

Replace existing thermal overload heater C087A in MCC 28-1A-1, Cubicle D2 with thermal overload heater C118A, for MOV 2-1601-57.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LJCA

UFSAR SECTION: Section 5

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because changing the existing thermal overload heater to the properly sized heater does not adversely affect systems it interacts with based on the following:

Changing a thermal overload heater does not affect the stroke time of a valve. The stroke time of the 2-1601-57 valve is determined by the valve size, the motor size, and limit switch settings. The thermal overload only provides protection to the motor.

With the properly sized thermal overload heater, the 2-1601-57 valve will fully close as required by Tech Specs on a Group II isolation because the thermal overload will not prematurely trip the MOV on overcurrent.

Changing the thermal overload heater to the proper size as determined by NED Guideline ENC-QE-59 exhibit G, setpoint charge #132 will not affect loading on MCC 28-1A-1 because the thermal overload is not an electrical load, it is a protective device used only to protect the motor from overcurrent.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, is not reduced because changing the thermal overload to the proper size will ensure that the valve will go fully closed as required by Tech Specs on a Group II isolation. Changing the thermal overload will not affect the stroke time of the valve and has no loading effect on the MCC it is powered from.

PROCEDURE: TRANSFER AND DEWATERING OF WASTE
DEMINERALIZER SPENT RESIN TANK

DESCRIPTION:

This procedure provides the steps necessary to transfer the waste demineralizer spent resin tank to a high integrity container or liner and dewater with Chem-Nuclear Rapid Dewatering System-1000.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because this procedure only provides an alternate method of processing Radwaste resins from the Waste Demineralizer Spent Resin tank. The station process control program currently describes the vendor system being used and has previously been on-site reviewed. This procedure utilizes system piping that is currently in use to process other waste streams and should not create any possibility of accident and malfunction.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SPECIAL TEST 2-101

DESCRIPTION:

Perform special test on the 2A RHR heat exchanger to measure thermal performance.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because the special test does not change the operation or control of the RHR system. The test operates the RHR system in the torus cooling mode per approved station procedures.

Temperature data will be collected during torus cooling to measure heat transfer rate. A temporary temperature recorder is used to improve temperature reading accuracy. No change to the RHR system will be performed. Test controls data collection. The RHR system would automatically realign in the event of a LPCI initiation. Failure of the temperature indication would not degrade RHR system operation.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

TEMPORARY ALTERATION #91-2-57

DESCRIPTION:

Connect the alternate battery at cubicle B04 of 125 VDC Bus 2A. A jumper will be connected to B04 from compartment C03 of 125 VDC battery Bus 2.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

LOCA w/Loop UFSAR SECTION: Section 14, Section 8

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

The temporary battery rack and associated cable conduits will be seismically supported. The Unit 2 permanent battery instrumentation will be used to monitor the temporary battery. The instrumentation is located in the control room. Instrumentation will include undervoltage detection, battery voltage, and ground detection which will monitor the temporary battery in the same manner as that of the permanently installed battery. Both the main and reserve feeds to the 125 VDC system will be unaffected by the installation of the temporary battery. The temporary battery will use the same type of charger as the permanent battery without a load increase, thus, there is not an increase in hydrogen generation. Since the temporary battery will be located in a larger open area of the mezzanine level of the turbine building, the small amount of hydrogen generated by charging the temporary battery will not be able to build up to the extent that it would pose a threat to any surrounding equipment or systems.

Furthermore, a probabilistic analysis shows that the installation of the temporary battery does not expose the station to an unacceptable tornado missile risk, and no design provisions are needed to protect the temporary battery.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

A temporary distribution "A" frame will be connected to an electrical distribution box in the S.E. corner of the 2nd floor of the reactor building, near the hatchway. The distribution box is fed from a 480 V transformer (located outside, near the 1/2 trackway). This 480 V transformer is fed from a 13.8 KV spray canal transformer through feeder #4. The temporary "A" Frame will provide a feed for chemical decon. equipment and equipment used in the drywell during the Q3R11 outage.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no safety related equipment will be affected. If the loads at the "A" frame cause the fusible links to be interrupted, there might be a loss of power to the substation building and to the old addition of the new service building.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

DESCRIPTION:

A temporary distribution "A" frame will be connected to an electrical distribution box at the S.E. corner of the U-2 turbine. The distribution box is fed from the unstacking transformer, which in turn is fed from a 13.8 KV spray canal transformer through feeder #4. The temporary "A" frame will provide a feed for work on the turbine floor during the Q2R11 outage.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because no safety related equipment would be affected. If the loads at the "A" frame cause the fusible lines at the 13.3 KV switchyard to be interrupted, there could be a loss of power to the substation and old addition of the new service building.
3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

SE-91-602

SPECIAL TEST 2-104, TURBINE TRIP MAIN STEAM LINE LOW PRESSURE TEST
AND TEMPORARY PROCEDURE #7313 for QCGP 2-1

DESCRIPTION:

Install chart recorder test leads across contacts on relays 595-103 A-D and 595-106 A-D to monitor when the relays drop out. Install a 1 ohm resistor in series with throttle pressure indicator 2-3040-10. Then install chart recorder test leads across this resistor. Install chart recorder test leads across an existing resistor in series w/reactor pressure indicator 2-040-25B. Also, trip the main turbine from approx. 200 MWe.

SAFETY EVALUATION SUMMARY:

1. The change described above has been analyzed to determine each accident or anticipated transient described in the UFSAR where any of the following is true:
 - The change alters the initial conditions used in the UFSAR analysis.
 - The changed structure, system or component is explicitly or implicitly assumed to function during or after the accident.
 - Operation or failure of the changed structure, system, or component could lead to the accident.

The accidents which meet these criteria are listed below:

None

For each of these accidents, it has been determined that the change described above will not increase the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of the accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR is not created because:

Installation of the chart recorders does not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a type different from those evaluated in the UFSAR.

If the chart recorders short to ground, the in-line 5 amp fuses would blow (performing their design function) and de-energize the associated 595-103 and 106 relays. The correct combination and number of blown fuses would cause a Group I isolation and subsequent reactor scram due to MSIV closure. This is considered a conservative failure and one which is already analyzed in Section 11.2.3 of the UFSAR.

If the chart recorders internally short out, the Control Room Annunciators for Main Steam Line Low Pressure and Group I isolation would falsely alarm. This is not considered a safety concern because other Control Room instrumentation such as MSIV position indication, main steam line flow indication, and reactor pressure indication, exist so that the Nuclear Station Operators can validate the annunciator alarm.

A turbine trip from approximately 200 MWe is well within the analysis of a turbine trip from FULL power with a failure of the relief valves and turbine bypass system, as discussed in Section 4.4.3 of the UFSAR. Even if a Group I isolation occurred upon the turbine trip, we would still be within the analysis of a Main Steam Isolation Valve Closure from full power discussed in Section 11.2.3 of the UFSAR.

3. The margin of safety, is not defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, therefore, the safety margin is not reduced.

Minor Design Change MC-4-0-90-098

Power Feed Tie-In to New Mixed Waste Storage Facility

Description

This minor design change involves the sizing and installation of a new breaker in compartment 3A of MCC 4-1 in the Wastewater Treatment Facility. The purpose of this breaker protects the main feed supplying power to the new Mixed Waste Storage Building which will be located south of the Wastewater Treatment Facility.

Evaluation

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this minor design change affects non-safety related components and will not prevent any safety related components from performing their design functions.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the breaker to be installed in MCC4-1 is non-safety related and is in the non-safety-related 13.8 KV system. The new breaker has been sized to provide overload and short circuit current protection for the new feed from the Wastewater Treatment Facility.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the components involved in this change are not specifically identified as the basis for any technical specifications, so safety is not affected.

Minor Design Change P04-1-90-175

1A Reactor Feed Pump Lube Oil Piping Flanges

Description:

Install flange bolt disc springs, "Live-Load Flanges", for the 1A Reactor Feed Pump Lube Oil Piping Flanges. This piping has a history of leakage at the flanges. The flange bolt disc spring consist of two belleville washers in parallel placed under the nut of each flange bolt.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this change will increase the reliability of the feed pump lube oil system by minimizing oil leakage.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this change will increase reliability. The worst case scenario would be loss of feedwater which has been previously analyzed. Further the feed pump lube oil system is not mentioned in the FSAR or Technical Specifications.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this change is intended to improve reliability and thus does not reduce safety. Further, the feed pump lube oil system is not mentioned in the Technical Specifications.

Minor Design Change P04-1-90-165

1A Moisture Separator Drain Tank (MSDT)
to "D" Feedwater Heater Instrumentation Air Lines

Description:

Install pressure taps on existing instrumentation air lines to accommodate data collection during MSDT/heater study. (i.e. between MSDT level controllers, level switches and heater level control valves. Lines are tubing and swaglock.)

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the MSDT's level control valves' instrumentation is not addressed in the FSAR, and its design function is not affected by the taps or data collection.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the installation of the pressure taps does not alter system design, or system function.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because MSDT's are not addressed specifically in Technical Specifications and the addition of instrument taps will not change the designed function or operation of instrumentation, nor reduce the margin of safety.

Modification P04-0-90-053

SBGTS Fan Flow Control Valves

Description:

Replacement of existing 1/2-7510 A&B valves with a valve that has been evaluated to meet or exceed the requirement of the existing valves as far as form, fit, function and qualification. Remove pressure switches 1/2-7541-32A & B and associated solenoid valve as the design of the new valve no longer requires them to assure a fail open design. Revise support 2-7508-R192 to account for loading from new valve.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this change replaces a valve in the SBGTS with a valve that has been evaluated to be equal or superior in form, fit, function and qualification to the original component. Replacement of a component with a qualified equivalent does not change the function, performance or interface of the SBGTS. The SBGTS is not identified as having the possibility to be an accident initiator in the SAR as it has not direct or indirect interface with reactivity control, heat removal or makeup capability, or part of the primary pressure or containment boundary.

The consequences of an accident in the SAR is not increased because this change replaces a component with a equally qualified component. This change does not alter any of the process parameter of the SBGTS on which the LOCA and Refueling accident consequences were based.

The probability of occurrence of a malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the replacement of this component with a component which is evaluated to be equivalent or better than the original in regard to form, fit, function or qualification will not increase the probability of that component failing. No new failure modes or system interactions are identified that increase the probability of malfunction of other important to safety equipment.

The consequences of malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the SAR is not increased because the function and performance of the SBGTS after replacement with the qualified valve is unchanged from that as previously analyzed in the FSAR. The SBGTS will function to limit the consequences (dose to public) of any equipment malfunction as previously designed.

Modification P04-0-90-053 CONT

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this system is designed for accident mitigation and does not directly or indirectly interface with reactivity control or core cooling or makeup capabilities and as such cannot be involved as an accident initiator. The system does interface with the containment boundary, but the replacement of this valve does not change the systems function or performance nor does it create a new failure mode which can impact that boundary.

The possibility of a malfunction of a different type than previously evaluated in the SAR is not created because the replacement valve is equivalent or better than the valve it replaces. The valve has no new failure modes which could impact the SBGTS, and in fact is more direct acting in moving to its failure position. This valve has no new direct or indirect interactions with other plant systems which could result in their malfunction.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this change to replace a component with an equally qualified component does not change the functional performance requirements of the SBGTS from its current design basis, and therefore does not impact any margins of safety for this system as defined by the Technical Specification.

Minor Design Change MC4-1-90-136

Unit 1 Reserve Auxiliary Transformer #12

Description:

Connect undervoltage relay 27 contacts to give "RESERVE AUX TRANS 12 TROUBLE" ALARM 901-8 C2 when there is a loss of control voltage per QOA 6100-9.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the MDC is limited to internal panel wiring which will utilize contacts from a non-safety related relay to provide input to the non-safety related annunciator system.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because no changes will be made which impact other failure modes or their effects because the change utilizes contacts from a non-safety related relay to provide input to the non-safety related annunciator system.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because no technical specifications were found to be applicable for the Reserve Auxiliary XFMR and annunciators since these are non-safety related systems

Minor Design Change P04-1-90-169

Pipe Support and 6" Section of Pipe

Description:

This Minor Design Change replaced the two damaged sections of pipe in line 1-1086-6"-DX and pipe support M-994D-58 in response to discrepancy reports DR-04-90-3891 and DR-04-90-3927.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this minor design change consists of pipe replacement and repair of an existing support. The design meets all requirements of FSAR/UFSAR. This like-for-like repair does not alter the existing routing or support configuration of the system.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the safety-related supports are seismically designed and the piping is also seismically qualified. Existing configuration of the system remains unchanged and, therefore, accidents or malfunctions of a different type are not created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because by repairing the damaged support and replacing the damaged sections of line 1-1086-6"-DX the possibility of this line failing is reduced. Therefore, the margin of safety will increase.

Primary Containment Inboard Isolation Valve

Description:

This minor plant change involved the replacement of actuator parts internal to the limitorque operator on the reactor water clean up (RWCU) system inboard primary containment isolation valve. Specifically, the motor pinion and worm shaft gear will be replaced in the limitorque operator on RWCU system valve MO1-1201-2. This change out will reduce the valve stroke time by approximately two seconds.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this minor plant change does not alter the design, function, or method in which the RWCU system operates as defined in the FSAR/UFSAR section 10.3. In addition, the primary containment system (Section 5.2) and the primary containment isolation system (Section 7.7.2) remain unchanged. Therefore, the probability or the consequences of an accident or malfunction are not increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the change will reduce the stroke time of RWCU inboard primary containment isolation valve (MO1-1201-2) by approximately two seconds. No change has been made which affects any of the bounding conditions of the FSAR/UFSAR accident analysis. All bounding conditions remain the same, no new accidents or malfunctions are introduced by this change.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this change to the limitorque operator on the MO1-1201-2 valve does not adversely affect any set points, operational limits, or special conditions that prescribe the margin of safety. The change does not alter any system or component as described in the technical specifications. This motor gear set replacement will insure that the technical specification for valve closure time of less than or equal to 30 seconds is not violated. The margin of safety is not reduced.

Minor Design Change P04-1-90-172

"B" Drywell Radiation Monitor

Description:

This Minor Design Change added a new magnetically shielded junction box near drywell penetration X-1073 to hold a spool of electrical cable for the ion chamber detector, RE-1-2418B. In addition, a grounded, braided, shielding sleeve was installed over the signal and high voltage cables between ISB-35 and RM-1-2413B located in 901-56.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the minor change adds components to improve shielding of the detector signal cable from nearby high voltage sources of electromagnetic radiation. The new components do not impair the radiation monitors in performing its safety related function of measuring drywell radiation levels and initiating a Group 2 Isolation.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this minor design change does not create any new failure modes or interfaces that have not been evaluated for the design change. The new components do not create the potential for new failures that are not bounded by the FSAR analysis.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the installation shall be performed in accordance with Limiting Conditions of Operation contained in Technical Specifications 3.2/4.2, 3.7/4.7, and 3.12/4.12. The modified equipment will be more resistant to electromagnetic noise that can cause spurious operation.

Minor Design Change P04-1-90-125

Strip Chart Recorders

Description:

Replace the existing obsolete GEMAC and other strip chart recorders on the 901-5 panel with YOKOGAWA UR100T recorders. Also, the total steam flow indication is relocated from the 1-0640-28 recorder to the third pin of the 1-0640-26 recorder.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the recorders provide indication, trending, and alarms for several parameters important for both normal and abnormal operation of the plant. These new recorders have been evaluated to be equal to or better than the original recorders in service.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because there will be no change to the system configuration. Also the new recorders have been evaluated to be equal to or better than the recorders already in service, therefore the new recorders cannot cause an accident of a different type than was previously evaluated in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the margin of safety, as defined in the Technical Specifications, is not adversely affected. The recorders are being replaced to provide new recorders that are of a standard configuration, that are not obsolete, and that can be better maintained with an available supply of spare parts. This should increase the recorder reliability by improving the ability to maintain the recorders.

Minor Design Change M04-1-90-144

Sample Probe on Condensate Pump Discharger Header

Description:

Existing probe location is inadequate, since it will not work when hydrogen injection is in operation. The sample probe was relocated to correct the H₂ intake problem by placing the probe out of the high point where any noncondensable gasses have collected.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the sample probe relocation does not alter the description of the system in the FSAR, therefore, the current analysis remains unaffected.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the function of the sample probe is the same as before and will not introduce a different type of accident not previously analyzed.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the condensate system is reliability/non-safety related and Technical Specifications do not list any requirements for the system operation.

Minor Design Change MC-4-1-90-142

Extraction Steam turbine Nozzles

Description:

Repair of extraction steam turbine nozzles was require due to erosion/corrosion damage.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new nozzle configuration will not affect the function of safety related equipment.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the repair will not affect any accident initiating event or cause a malfunction related to safety.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the repair is not discussed in the Technical Specifications.

Minor Design Change PC4-1-90-176

Generator Backup SI Fault Detector Relay

Description:

Modify Main Generator Backup SI Fault Detector Relay to externally add two indicators and one capacitor and internally add three resistors to prevent false trips per SOAD report ER-6-85.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because minor design change adds a filter circuit to the back up generator fault detector relay. The filtering circuit is being added to prevent false trips of the relay. The filtering circuit will be added to the relay when the unit is shutdown. The change will not effect equipment important to safety as evaluated in FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because filtering circuit has no effect on the relay's original function, it only prevents false trips of the relay.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this level of component is not defined in any Technical Specification.

Minor Design Change MC4-1-89-018

Extraction Steam Non-Return Check Valves

Description:

Replacement of the cotter pin with a stainless steel pin, and the addition of an anti-rotation pin on the extraction steam non-return check valves per vendor recommendation.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the changes described above improve valve reliability, reducing chance of accident.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the valve function is not altered so its characteristics do not change.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because valve operation is not discussed in Technical Specification. Also valve reliability is increased.

Minor Design Change MC-4-1-90-19

Pipe Penetration Seal Details

Description:

This change replaced the Unit One Reactor Building Secondary Containment pipe penetration ventilation seals for the main steam lines 1-3001A, B, C, D and feedwater lines 1-3204A & B (MK-188, 189, 190, 191, 83 and 84). The current seals were identified as being a source of leakage during the Secondary Containment Capability Test QTS 160-5.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new design will not change from that which has already been analyzed in section five.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the new design will have the same function as the old design so an accident or malfunction of a different type will not be created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the new design will have the same requirements as the original design.

Minor Design Change MC4-1-90-059

Turbine Fast Acting Solenoid Valves

Description:

This Minor Design Change involved the replacement of the main turbine fast acting solenoid valves (FSAV's). The valves are part of the turbine EHC subsystem and provide turbine protection against a load reject condition. The FSAV's had integral limit switches that detect FSAV actuation and provided an anticipatory RPS scram of the reactor. The new FSAV's have pressure ports for separate pressure switches that detect decreasing fluid pressure required for fast Turbine Control Valve (TCV) closure. A setpoint for calibration of these new RPS pressure switches was included in the approval letter. The new configuration is based on General Electric recommendations contained in TIL number 848.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the load reject and the FSAV actuation is described in UFSAR sections 3.2.5.4.1, 7 (pages 107-113), and 11.2.3. The revised configuration is primarily intended to improve the turbine protection, because the failures at Quad Cities have generally been a failure of the valves to function and not a failure of the limit switch to detect the TCV fast closure. The new configuration will have the necessary calibration, response time, and reliability to provide the same (or an improved) level of protection for the turbine and reactor, as the original equipment.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the FSAV's interface with the RPS, turbine control (EHC), and the Instrument Bus systems. These interactions have been evaluated and considered in the design and testing requirements of this Minor Design Change. The only new failure modes are: 1) failure of the tubing connecting each FSAV to each new pressure switch, and 2) failure of any of the new pressure switches to function. Failure of the tubing will result in a trip of the affected load reject channel(s), because of the declining hydraulic pressure sensed by the switch. The potential for failure of the pressure switches is minimized by the require monthly functional testing, calibration requirements, and quality requirements specified for the switches and their installation.

Minor Design Change MC4-1-90-059 CONTD

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because changes to the Technical Specifications and their bases are required as the result of this Minor Design Change. The margin of safety, as defined in the bases for Technical Specification 3.1 and 4.1, is not reduced. The calibration schedule for the new switches shall be added to Table 4.1-2. The reliability of the new assemblies is improved over the existing ones based on industry experience and the design requirements. The new configuration using pressure switches is similar to the EHC Low Pressure and other RPS inputs. After installation, the sensors shall be tested for response time and calibration. The new FASV's shall also be tested to verify their ability to cause a fast closure of the TCV's.

Minor Design Change MC-4-1-89-002

EHC Oil Skid

Description:

This Minor Design Change seal welds the seams of the EHC reservoir tank to reduce the leakage of EHC fluid. This fluid has caused damage to the electrical cables in the tunnel below.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this Minor Design Change will lower the possibility of cable failures due to EHC oil leakage.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the possibility of cable failure is reduced to this Minor Design Change because the oil will be contained within the oil skid.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this is a non-safety related Minor Design Change. The system is not referenced in the Technical Specifics therefore, the margin of safety is not reduced.

Minor Design Change MC-4-1-90-055

Feedwater Heater Extraction Steam Nozzle

Description:

Feedwater Heater Extraction Steam Nozzle was damaged by Erosion/corrosion. Repair consisted of welding a carbon steel clamshell to the outer surface of the nozzle.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new nozzle configuration will not change the original design parameters of the heaters.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the nozzle repair will not affect any accident or accident initiating event described in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the feedwater nozzle is not addressed in the Technical Specifications.

Minor Design Change P04-2-90-178

Pipe Supports for HPCI Condensate Drain Lines

Description:

This Minor Design Change provides improved pipe support for the Unit 2 high Pressure Coolant Injection (HPCI) condensate drain lines located in the Unit 2 HPCI corner room of the Reactor Building. The previous pipe support configuration had pipe and support stresses that exceed UFSAR and code allowables. The following lines are affected: 2-2321-1"-B (HPCI drain line) and 2-2322-1"B (trap bypass line). The changes included removing 3 supports, modifying 1 existing support, and adding 2 new supports.

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the lines and new pipe support configurations have been analyzed for all applicable loads. The new configuration upgrades the piping system to reduce pipe and support stresses to the UFSAR limits. This shall make the HPCI system less vulnerable to failure, including seismic events.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the interaction of the new supports is limited to other HPCI system components. There is no identified failure modes or interactions that could cause an accident more severe than a steam lines break in the HPCI room (i.e., Group 5 containment isolation in section 7.7.2.2) or the loss of the HPCI system (reference UFSAR section 6.2.6.1). Therefore, the potential failures are bounded by the analysis in the FSAR/UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because while the current piping meets operability criteria submitted and accepted by the NRC in the past, the re-supporting of the HPCI drain lines to FSAR/UFSAR stress allowables restores the margin of safety described in the Technical Specification 5.6.

Computer Uninterruptible Power Supply (U.P.S.)

Description:

Installation of uninterruptible Power Supply including batteries for Station Process Computers and Peripherals.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because neither computer operation nor computer power supply availability are evaluated in the FSAR. Neither is required for the operation of plant safety systems.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the Uninterruptible Power Supply System will be an independent system with the exception of electrical ties to the station 480 Vac. These ties are protected by load breakers and are not from safety related busses.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because computer availability is not a basis for any Technical Specification safety margins. However, the addition of the computer Uninterruptible Power Supply System will increase the availability of the station computer system. This modification will also remove existing computer load from the ESS Buss, thereby increasing its availability by reducing its duty cycle.

Modification M4-1/2-78-26

Plant Process Computer

Description:

Remove the feed to the plant process computer from the 120/240 VAC essential service system bus and provide it with its own power supply, a static uninterruptible power supply (inverter/rectifier).

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the computer does not perform a safety related function.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because no failure in the new power supply will degrade the operation of any safety related equipment. If it is connected to a Class 1E bus, appropriate isolation devices (circuit breakers) will be installed.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the only method for converting 480 VAC or 250 VDC to 120/240 VAC is being changed, and the ESS bus currently receives all its power from Class 1E busses, the power requirements for the Class 1E busses will not be increased.

Modification M4-1(2)-84-21A & B

Steam Leak Detection Temperature Switches

Description:

This modification calls for a design change to the Area Steam Leak Detection/Isolation System to eliminate spurious isolations which have been occurring due to minute steam leaks. At present, the system is comprised of 16 temperature switches in 4 groups of 4 per system. Each group is configured to form a (one-out-of-two taken twice) logic & any one the 4 groups are capable of isolating the system. This modification will reduce the number of temperature switches from 16 to 4. The (one-out-of-two taken twice) logic will be maintained along with divisional separation requirements. The systems isolation response time will be maintained through a reduction in the temperature switch setpoint.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the reduction from 16 temperature switches to 4 will not degrade the integrity of the steam leak detection/isolation system. The system will still be totally automatic along with the capabilities for manual initiation. The (one-out-of-two taken twice) logic and divisional power sources is still maintained along with other steam leak detection devices. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction previously evaluated has not been increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this modification does not interact nor interface with other primary containment isolation systems. No single failure within the system can create a malfunction to prevent system isolation from occurring, or to cause spurious isolations. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type other than previously evaluated has not been created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the new steam leak detection/isolation logic continues to satisfy the requirements for primary containment isolation as listed on Table 3.2.1 in the Technical Specification and the associated basis.

Modification 1(2)-87-71

Main Steam Line Low Pressure Switches

Description:

This modification consists of the addition of vibration isolator assemblies to the main steam line low pressure switches (1(2)-261-30A, B, C, D) located on Turbine Building Instrument Rack #2251-1 and 2252-1.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because FSAR does not specifically address the Main Steam Low Pressure Switches. However, this modification does not change either the switch function or performance requirements.

The postulated event of a Pressure Regulator failure as described in the FSAR is still addressed by Main Steam Line Low Pressure Switches. If the Regulator were to fail causing a sudden pressure decrease, the switches would still be capable of providing a Group I isolation if reactor pressure decreases to 850 psig.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the FSAR does not specifically address the Main Steam Low Pressure Switches. However, since this modification does not change either the switch function or performance requirements, the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated is not created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this modification does not change switch performance requirements and therefore does not affect the margin of safety used for the basis of any Technical Specification. The margin of safety therefore is not reduced. The limiting safety system settings are not changed as a result of this modification and the low pressure isolations of the main steam lines at 850 PSIG minimum will still protect against rapid reactor depressurization (Thermal Hydraulic Safety Limit) and the resulting rapid cooldown of the vessel.

Modification M04-1(2)-89-117

Drywell Floor Drain and Equipment Drain Sump Pumps

Description:

Drywell floor drain and equipment drain sump pumps were replaced with new submersible sump pumps. The function of the sump pumps remains the same.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this modification replaces existing sump pumps with a new pump design, however, all functions of the pumps will remain the same.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than previously evaluated in the FSAR is not created because the function of the pumps remain the same.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the margin of safety as defined in the basis of Technical Specifications is not reduced since the function of the new sump pumps remains the same as the old sump pumps.

Modification M04-1-88-052A and B

RCIC Pump Discharge Check Valve

Description:

Install new RCIC pump discharge check valve, 1-1301-50, and remove the air operator, control switch, indicating lights and associated conduit.

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because operation of the new check valve is identical to that of the existing check valve, therefore, the probability of an occurrence or consequence of an accident is not increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because no new possibility for an accident or malfunction is created. The air operator for the valve is to be removed, however, testing of the valve will still be accomplished by manual initiation and injection of RCIC which is currently performed once per cycle. There are no other testing requirements for this valve.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this modification will not affect RCIC system operation, therefore, the margin of safety is not reduced.

Modification M-4-2-84-361

Fire Suppression and Detection

Description:

The Fire Protection Systems Upgrades Modifications (M04-1-84-036, M04-2-84-036, M04-0-84-014 and M04-0-84-016) provided additional fire suppression and detection systems to comply with 10CFR50 Appendix R requirements and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code commitments from Appendix A to Branch Technical Position APCS 9.5.1. This work was divided into 12 phases with this work designated as partial modification M04-2-84-361 of Phase 10B - Provide electronic supervision for existing 10CFR50 Appendix R Suppression systems. The particular system for which this partial modification provides supervision is the Unit 2 Diesel Generator room door monitors. This partial modification relocates the electrical supervision for the Unit 2 Diesel Generator room doors D-120, D-120A, and D-128 from the security computer to the XL3 System.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because fire suppression and detection is not classified as Safety Related in the FSAR. Seismic installation of equipment ensures adequate operation of existing safety equipment and safety related equipment in the immediate area of installation.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the installation does not interfere with any existing safety systems.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because suppression and detection is not Safety Related. The reliability of the Fire Protection system is increased by providing this additional suppression and detection.

Modification M-4-1-84-36H

Suppression and Detection

Description:

The Fire Protection Systems Upgrades Modifications (M04-1-84-036, M04-2-84-036, M04-0-84-014 and M04-0-84-016) provided additional fire suppression and detection systems to comply with 10CFR50 Appendix R requirements and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) code commitments from Appendix A to Branch Technical Position APCS 9.5.1. This work was divided into 12 phases with this work designated as partial modification M04-0-84-16E of Phase 10B - Provide electronic supervision for existing 10CFR50 Appendix R Suppression systems. The particular system for which this partial modification provides supervision is the Unit 1 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System. Output identifying any alarm or trouble conditions in the Unit 1 Cable Tunnel will be routed to the Control Room Fire protection typer via the XL3 computer.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because fire suppression and detection is not classified as Safety Related in the FSAR. Seismic installation of equipment ensures adequate operation of existing safety equipment and safety related equipment in the immediate area of installation.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the installation does not interfere with any existing safety systems.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because suppression and detection is not Safety Related. The reliability of the Fire Protection system is increased by providing this additional suppression and detection.

Modification M-4-2-84-36H

Suppression and Detection

Description:

The Fire Protection Systems Upgrades Modifications (M04-1-84-036, M04-2-84-036, M04-0-84-014 and M04-0-84-016) provided additional fire suppression and detection systems to comply with 10CFR50 Appendix R requirements and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) code commitments from Appendix A to Branch Technical Position APCS 9.5.1. This work was divided into 12 phases with this work designated as partial modification M04-2-84-36H of Phase 10B - Provide electronic supervision for existing 10CFR50 Appendix R Suppression systems. The particular system for which this partial modification provides supervision is the Unit 2 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System. Output identifying any alarm or trouble conditions in the Unit 2 Cable Tunnel Wetpipe System will be routed to the Control Room fire protection typer via the XL3 computer.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because fire suppression and detection is not classified as Safety Related in the FSAR. Seismic installation of equipment ensures adequate operation of existing safety equipment and safety related equipment in the immediate area of installation.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the installation does not interfere with any existing safety systems.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because suppression and detection is not Safety Related. The reliability of the Fire Protection system is increased by providing this additional suppression and detection.

Modification M-4-1/2-80-2

Technical Support Center

Description:

This modification is required to provide all necessary interface for the new technical support center. The reason for this modification is to comply with the requirements as set forth in NUREG-0578 Section 2.2.2.b to provide engineering data to the Technical Support Center (TSC). To supply the data required, a PRIME computer system will be added to the present Honeywell computer. Digital and analog inputs to the computer will be hardwired from the required instruments and valves as outlined in the Bechtel Monitored parameters list Rev. 3, dated June 24, 1980.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the addition of this modification does not change any evaluation made in the final safety analysis report.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the interface necessary for TSC, will be by design isolated from any inplant equipment necessary for safe plant operation.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the margin of safety would indirectly be increased with the addition of the equipment required to support the TSC, by giving a wider range of support in the event of an accident.

Modification M-4-0-84-16D

Suppression and Detection.

Description:

The Fire Protection Systems Upgrades Modifications (M04-1-84-036, M04-2-84-036, M04-0-84-014 and M04-0-84-016) provided additional fire suppression and detection systems to comply with 10CFR50 Appendix R requirements and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) code commitments from Appendix A to Branch Technical Position APCS 9.5.1. This work was divided into 12 phases with this work designated as partial modification M04-0-84-16D of Phase 10B - Provide electronic supervision for existing 10CFR50 Appendix R Suppression systems. The particular system for which this partial modification provides supervision is the Turbine Building Resin Storage Area Wetpipe System. Output identifying any alarm or trouble conditions in the Resin Storage Area Wetpipe System will be route to the Control Room fire protection typer via the XL3 routed to the Control Room fire protection typer via the XL3 computer.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because fire suppression and detection is not classified as Safety Related in the FSAR. Seismic installation of equipment ensures adequate operation of existing safety equipment and safety related equipment in the immediate area of installation.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the installation doe snot interfere with any existing safety systems.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because suppression and detection is not Safety Related. The reliability of the Fire Protection system is increased by providing this additional suppression and detection.

Minor Design Change P04-2-91-011

Containment Atmosphere Monitor System

Description:

This minor design change was initiated to replace the current heat trace circuit (37) of the 2B Containment Air Monitor (CAM). The current circuit is unable to supply the heat necessary to warm the 2B CAM pipe to 280 degrees Fahrenheit (F). The contents of the pipe are gasses from the drywell which, in an accident, must be heated sufficiently to remove all moisture from the incoming sample. This is done because the CAM pump can only pump dry gasses. The present heat trace circuit output has degraded to as low as 190 degrees F. By replacing the heat trace circuit, the system will be restored to its original design basis.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the containment atmosphere monitor is not discussed in connection with the design basis accidents or single failure events as given in Chapter 14 of FSAR/UFSAR. The heat trace replacement restores the redundancy of the system and moves in a more conservative direction. Therefore, probability of accidents or malfunction is not increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the heat trace replacement restores the redundancy of the containment atmosphere monitor system. The replacement is apart for part replacement and does not alter the design or function of the system. Therefore, the possibility for accident or malfunction is not created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the replacement of the heat trace will restore the redundancy of the containment atmosphere monitor system. Currently the B loop is inoperable. Therefore, the system moves in a more conservative direction.

Minor Design Change MC-4-1-89-001

124 VDC and 250 VDC Reactor Building Bus and Feed

Description:

The minor design change is for the replacement of Westinghouse model case circuit breaker in the 250 volt DC and 125 volt DC distribution systems, with a new model Westinghouse molded case circuit breaker. The replacement breakers are recommended by the Nuclear Engineering Department in the letter from J. S. Abel to R. L. Bax, dated August 24, 1989. The mounting configuration for the molded case circuit breakers were altered to seismically mount the new molded case circuit breakers.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this minor design change does not alter the design, function, or method in which the 250 volt DC and 125 volt DC systems operate, as defined in the UFSAR section 8.2.3.2.1 and 8.2.3.2.2 respectively. The minor change is required for the replacement of non traceable molded case circuit breakers. This change does not directly or indirectly impact operation of any of the plant's systems.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this minor design change involves replacing existing non traceable molded case circuit breakers with a new model molded case circuit breaker that is traceable to the original equipment manufacturer. No change has been made which affects any of the bounding conditions of the FSAR accident analysis. All bounding conditions remain the same, no new accidents or malfunctions are introduced by this minor design change. The potential for an accident remains unchanged.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this minor change to the mounting configuration does not affect any set points, operational limits, or special conditions that prescribe the margin of safety. The minor design change does not impact any system or component as described in the technical specifications. Therefore, the margin of safety has not been reduced.

Procedure QOS 1000-3

Monthly LPCI Motor Operated Valve Test

Description:

Procedure format change from QOS 1000-3 to QCOS 1000-3.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the LPCI mode of RHR will still function as stated in the FSAR. The new QCOS verifies monthly valve operability and does not change the reliability or the function of any LPCI component which would increase the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because QCOS 1000-3 now incorporates QOS 1000-3 and does not change the configuration of any valves, instruments, or control that could put the LPCI mode of RHR in an unanalyzed condition not previously addressed in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the Technical Specification requirements for valve operability are still being satisfied by the new QCOS 1000-3 and the LPCI mode of RHR System operability is maintained to verify the margin of safety is not reduced.

Procedure QCOS 1000-3

Monthly LPCI Motor Operated Valve Test

Description:

Procedure format change from QOS 1000-3 to QCOS 1000-3.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the LPCI mode of RHR will still function as stated in the FSAR. The new QCOS verifies monthly valve operability and does not change the reliability or the function of any LPCI component which would increase the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because QOS 1000-3 is now incorporated into QCOS 1000-3 and does not change the configuration of any valves, instruments, or control that could put the LPCI mode of RHR in an unanalyzed condition not previously addressed in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the Technical Specification requirements for valve operability are still being satisfied by the new QCOS 1000-3 and the LPCI mode of RHR System operability is maintained to verify the margin of safety is not reduced.

Minor Design Change MC4-1-90-120

Torus Water Temperature - Chart Recorder and Signal Conditioning

Description:

This Minor Design Change replaces the chart recorders for torus water temperature located in the 901-36 and the 901-4 Control Room panels. In addition, signal conditioning electronics is replaced in the 2201-70A and 2201-70B panels in the Auxiliary electric Room. The recorders are being replaced due to obsolescence of the existing equipment and as part of a Control Room upgrade to standard recorder models. The signal conditioning equipment is being replaced to provide a linear output signal for digital displays and linear scales on the chart recorders.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this change is to the indication of torus water temperature, only. There is no automatic control function associated with these instruments. Since the new equipment is procured to the same quality and qualification requirements as the original equipment, there will be no reduction in the ability of this equipment to perform this function. The probability or consequences of an accident analyzed in the FSAR/UFSAR has not, therefore, been increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this change replaces components within the existing torus water temperature monitoring system. All previous design features such as the number of sensors, redundancy, circuit power sources and fault protection, circuit separation into divisions, seismic qualification, etc. have been maintained. Therefore, this design does not create any new failure modes that would cause an accident of a different type than analyzed in the FSAR/UFSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the components added by this Minor Design change have been evaluated and found to be at least as accurate and reliable as the replaced components. The new equipment is fully compatible with existing equipment. All new equipment is procured and installed seismic Class 1E. All new Safety Related components are procured Safety Related, 10CFR21 applicable, from suppliers with a 10CFR50, Appendix B quality assurance program. Therefore, the margin of safety as described in the Technical Specifications has not been reduced.

Procedure QOS 1000-1

Quarterly LPCI Mode Flow Rate Test

Description:

Procedure format change from QOS 1000-1 to QCOS 1000-1

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the LPCI mode of RHR will still function as stated in the FSAR. This new QCOS verified quarterly flow rate requirements are met and does not change the reliability or the function of any LPCI component which would increase the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because QCOS 1000-1 now incorporates QOS 1000-1 and does not change the configuration of any valves, instruments, or controls that could put the LPCI mode of RHR system in an unanalyzed condition not previously addressed in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the Technical Specification requirements for LPCI flowrate are still being satisfied by the new QCOS 100-1 and the LPCI mode of RHR system operability is maintained to verify the margin of safety is not reduced.

Procedure QCOS 1000-1

Quarterly LPCI Mode Flow Rate Test

Description:

Procedure format change from QOS 1000-1 to QCOS 1000-1

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the LPCI mode of RHR will still function as stated in the FSAR. This new QCOS verified quarterly flow rate requirements are met and does not change the reliability or the function of any LPCI component which would increase the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because QOS 1000-1 is now fully incorporated into QCOS 1000-1 and does not change the configuration of any valves, instruments, or controls that could put the LPCI mode of RHR system in an unanalyzed condition not previously addressed in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the Technical Specification requirements for LPCI flowrate are still being satisfied by the new QCOS 100-1 and the LPCI mode of RHR system operability is maintained to verify the margin of safety is not reduced.

MODIFICATION NO. P04-1-90-153

Description:

This Minor Design Change is to fabricate an opening in the 901-4 panel for the new Reactor Water Cleanup (RWCU) filter demineralizer inlet dissolved oxygen chart recorder, 1-1241-29. Other instrumentation and control switches are presently located at the planned location for the new recorder and is not well grouped by system function. This Minor Design Change relocates the existing equipment, cuts an opening for the new recorder, and installs a blank plate in the panel until the new recorder can be installed.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this change does not make any accident analyzed in the FSAR more likely or more severe. All current indications and controls remain unchanged, except for the relocation of the 901-4 panel. The new configuration has been evaluated for Human Factors issues and found to be acceptable.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because there are not any new system interactions or failure modes created by the Minor Design Change. All relocated equipment is being tested after the installation to verify that there are not unintended plant changes that could increase the likelihood of any accident not analyzed (or bounded by accidents) in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because there are no functional changes to any system as the result of the Minor Design Change. The relocation of equipment on the 901-4 panel does not reduce the capability of the operator to detect, respond to, or mitigate any accidents. The changes do not alter the plant normal operating conditions or in any way reduce the margin of safety as defined in the Technical Specification bases.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE MC4-1-90-123

Description:

This Minor Design Change replaces the existing GEMAC and Tractor Westronics strip chart recorders on the 901-5 panel with Yokogawa uR100T recorders. In addition to installing the new chart recorders, the tube strip support in the 901-5 panel supporting recorder 1-0640-27 is removed. The recorder is seismically qualified without this support installed under modification MO4-1-88-101D. For the new neutron monitoring recorders only, toggle switches have been installed near each recorder for selecting a high or low chart speed.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new equipment meets or exceeds all performance requirements for the equipment. The equipment replaced by this Minor Design Change is discussed in the following sections of the UFSAR: 7.4.3, 7.4.5.2, 7.4.5.3, 7.5.3, 7.5.4, and 7.5.6. The new equipment meets or exceeds all performance requirements for the equipment. The design basis of all affected systems as defined in the UFSAR is not adversely impacted.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because there were no new failure modes or system interactions identified that would increase the potential of a new type of accident. The new equipment is a component replacement. The instrument loops are not significantly impacted by the change.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the new recorders are procured Safety Related and Seismic Class 1E. The procurement has been from a 10CFR50, Appendix B manufacturer. It is anticipated that these recorders will provide a high degree of reliability and performance.

Minor Design Change MC4-1-90-109

MSIV Actuators

Description:

This Minor Design Change replaced the 8 MSIV tandem pneumatic/hydraulic cylinders and the solenoid operated, control valve manifolds. The replacement Ralph A. Hillier Model Number SA-A104 actuators and control assemblies were supplied by General Electric Company and have Class 1E components that are environmentally qualified (EQ) to the requirements of 10CFR50.49 NAMCO quick disconnect connectors/cables are added for ease of maintenance. The packing leakoff line on the 1D MSIV was removed and capped for the installation of "live load" packing. Seismic and EQ qualification of all components has been performed by General Electric and NAMCO Controls. The installation was qualified by Sargent and Lundy.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new actuators are fully qualified to the requirements of the original equipment. Seismic and EQ qualification has been performed by General Electric Company. The removal of the MSIV leakoff line and installation of "live load" packing on the "1D" valve has reduced the potential for a small leak inside containment.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because there are no new failure modes or new system interactions created by this Minor Design Change. The actuators have been designed to be nearly identical in configuration to the original actuators so as to maintain the current seismic qualification.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because all critical design features of the MSIV actuators is either unchanged or improved by the Minor Design Change. The testing for this Minor Design Change verifies that all features described in the Technical Specifications, the bases, and the FSAR/UFSAR are tested following the installation of the change.

Description:

Added references to new BWR water chemistry control. Auto-start of motor suction pump in control room instead of locally. Provide more information on turbine warming. Allows recirc pump controllers be left in manual.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because these changes do not affect the reactor or any of its safety systems. The analysis in the FSAR are based on full power operation and do not specify controller positions.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the changes do not effect the accident precursors in accidents described in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because Tech Spec limits are not affected by any of these changes.

Description:

Added the pulling of the shorting links to the SRM's when the reactor vessel head is detensioned or not in place to the procedures prerequisites.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because there are no accidents previously evaluated in the FSAR for when the reactor vessel head is detensioned or not in place which would be effected by or takes SRM response into account. Also the removal of the shorting links does not increase the severity of the failure rate of any equipment since removing the links only effects the RPS response to the SRM's.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the SRM shorting links are only removed when the reactor vessel head is detensioned or not in place. In all other conditions the shorting links are in place returning the SRMs to their condition of operation previously evaluated in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the removal of the shoring links will cause the reactor to scram earlier than evaluated in Technical Specifications. This therefore, gives an increase in the margin of safety should the reactor go critical with a rapid period during the shutdown margin demonstration.

SAFETY EVALUATION #90-885
QCOS 1000-1, Quarterly LPCI Mode Flow Rate Test

Description:

Procedure format change from QOS to QCOS. QOS 1000-1 to QCOS 1000-1.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the LPCI mode of RHR will still function as stated in the FSAR. This new QCOS verifies quarterly flow rate requirements are met and does not change the reliability or the function of any LPCI component which would increase the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because QCOS 1000-1 now incorporates QOS 1000-1 and does not change the configuration of any valves, instruments, or controls that could put the LPCI mode of RHR system in an unanalyzed condition not previously addressed in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the Technical Specification requirements for LPCI flowrate are still being satisfied by the new QCOS 1000-1 and the LPCI mode of RHR system operability is maintained.

SAFETY EVALUATION 90-887
QCOS 1000-3, REVISION 8

Description:

Procedure format changes from QOS to QCOS. QOS 1000-3 to QCOS 1000-3.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the LPCI mode of RHR will still function as stated in the FSAR. The new QCOS verifies monthly valve operability and does not change the reliability or the function of any LPCI component.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because QCOS 1000-3 now incorporates QOS 1000-3 and does not change the configuration of any valves, instruments, or controls that could put the LPCI Mode of RHR in an unanalyzed condition.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the requirements for valve operability are still being satisfied by the new QCOS 1000-3 and the LPCI mode of RHR System operability is maintained.

MODIFICATION M4-1-88-09

Description:

Modification M4-1-88-009 involved the replacement and relocation of the two closed-end-of-travel (closed position) limit switches on each of the twelve torus-to-drywell vacuum breaker valves. The modification was implemented due to a history of problems adjusting these limit switches.

Previously the limit switches were located near the pivot point for the disk arm of the vacuum breaker, requiring an adjustment tolerance of 1/60th of an inch. By relocating the limit switches to the lower portion of the vacuum breaker bolt ring, the required adjustment tolerance changed to 1/16th of an inch, as actual disk displacement is now being measured.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this modification does not add any additional equipment or systems. It only involves replacing and relocating an existing limit switch to new location to improve performance and decrease maintenance.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this modification does not add any additional equipment or systems. It only involves replacing and relocating an existing limit switch to new location to improve performance and decrease maintenance.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the purpose of the modification is to make switches with Technical Specification limits easier to maintain within specified limits per Technical Specifications 3.7.A.4 (4.7.A.4) on vacuum breaker position indication.

SAFETY EVALUATION #90-739
REPLACF HPCI DELUGE SYSTEM SPOT TYPE DETECTORS WITH LINE TYPE DETECTION

Description:

Replace existing spot type (Fenwal) heat detectors from the HPCI Deluge System with a line type (Protectowire) heat detector system. The new system will improve the reliability of the HPCI detection system and allow the suppression system to remain as it currently exists.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new linear detection system is a more reliable heat detection system and is less subject to damage than the existing detectors. The linear heat detectors will actuate the fire deluge sprinkler system at a designed temperature that will not vary due to damage from maintenance activities.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the new detection system will perform the same function as the existing detection system. The linear detection will increase the reliability of the HPCI fire deluge system actuation without changing the intent of the original fire detection system.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is actually increased by replacing the detection system with a more reliable and durable system.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE 4-1-90-034

GE CR2820 Time Delay Relay Replacement

Description:

This minor design change replaces a TDOD relay located in compartment D2 of Bus 19. The relay is part of the circuitry to transfer the power feed to MCC18/19-5 from Bus 19 to Bus 18. This transfer of power will occur when there is a loss of offsite power and the Unit One Emergency Diesel Generator fails to restore power to Bus 19.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the change is to increase reliability of the affected circuitry. The function of the affected circuitry is not changed by this minor design change.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the function of the affected circuitry is not changed by this minor design change. A class 1E safety related relay of high quality is used for the change. The relay has no known failure modes that were not present with the original relay.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the reliability of the auxiliary power system described in section 3.9 of the Technical Specifications has been improved by the installation of a more reliable TDOD relay.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE MC4-1-90-110
SYSTEM 0030 - TURBINE BUILDING

Description:

Install permanent rigging points (CEA PLATES) for 5000-6000 lb loads for maintenance work on 1C Reactor Feed Pump Gear Unit.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because installation of rigging points in concrete overhead RFP permits loading within code allowable stresses consistent with the FSAR, and Temp. Loading.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because installation of approved rigging points by engineering eliminates using questionable geometries on structures when rigging.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this change is not addressed in Tech Specs. Plates installed permanently, present an insignificant seismic load.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE MCR 4-0-90-029 (REV 1)
PLANT HEATING BOILERS
SENSING LINE FREEZING PROBLEM

Description:

When plant heating boiler burner air intake ductwork was installed per Modification M4-0-89-019, pressure impulse sensing lines on each boiler were so close to the duct that they became susceptible to freezing such that both boilers tripped in December 1989. Rerouted impulse lines around ductwork.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because plant heating boiler performance is not discussed in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because plant heating boiler trip is not to be evaluated as an accident and is not considered in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this is not addressed in the Technical Specifications.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE MC 4-2-90-137
UNIT 2 DIESEL GENERATOR FUSE HOLDER REPLACEMENT

Description:

This minor design change replaces the fuse holders for fuses F23 and F24 in the local control panel for the Unit 2 Emergency Diesel Generator. The old fuse holders had worn and no longer held the fuses tightly. The new fuse holders are of a bakelite material, replacing the old ceramic material fuse holders, which are no longer available.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the probability of the Unit 2 Emergency Diesel Generator not functioning properly has not increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this change is limited to the fuse holders internal to the Unit 2 Emergency Diesel Generator control panel.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the new fuse holders are of a similar quality as the original and have been dedicated safety-related per procedures.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE
MC-4-2-90-164

Description:

This Minor Design Change replaced the existing Condensate Reject Flow transmitter GE Model number 50-553112BKZZ3, EPN 2-3341-28, with a new Rosemount transmitter Model number 1151DP4B22. The GE transmitter had a history of oscillating over its entire range. The Instrument Maintenance Department installed the Rosemount transmitter. The Rosemount transmitter was mounted in the same location as the GE transmitter but has a different bolting pattern requiring bolt holes to be drilled into the existing mounting plate.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this change does not change the function of any component or system.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the function is unchanged.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the condensate reject function is not described in the Technical Specifications.

SE 90-775
MINOR DESIGN CHANGE MC-4-0-90-138
RE-ROUTE CABLE BETWEEN SECURITY DIESEL GENERATOR BUILDING AND THE TSC

Description:

Re-route cable between the security diesel generator building and TSC MCC 9908-3. Cable carries both the main and backup power to the TSC.,

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the design function of this cable (supplying the main and backup power to the TSC) is not affected by changing its location.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this cable is non-safety related and its relocation will have no affect on any safety related components.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this cable (or power supply) is not discussed as the basis for any Technical Specifications, so safety is not affected.

SE 90-739
MINOR DESIGN CHANGE NO. MC-4-1(2)-90-57
HPCI DELUGE SYSTEM HEAT DETECTORS

Description:

Replace existing spot type (fenwal) heat detectors from the HPCI Deluge System with a line type (Protectowire) heat detector system. The new system will improve the reliability of the HPCI detection system and allow the suppression system to remain as it currently exists.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new linear detection system is a more reliable heat detection system and is less subject to damage than the existing detectors. The Linear heat detectors will actuate the fire deluge sprinkler system at a designed temperature that will not vary due to damage from maintenance activities.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the new detection system will perform the same function as the existing detection system. The Linear detection will increase the reliability of the HPCI fire deluge system actuation without changing the intent of the original fire detection system.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced, it is increased by replacing the detection system with a more reliable and durable system.

SE 90-733
MINOR DESIGN CHANGE NO. MC-4-1-89-003
"D" FEEDWATER HEATER EXTRACTION STEAM DRAIN LINES

Description:

Replace "1D1" and 1D3" Extraction Steam piping. This is required due to erosion/corrosion damage found during Ultrasonic examinations. Replacement material chromemoly has better erosion/corrosion resistant properties than carbon steel.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because chrome-moly has better erosion/corrosion resistance.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because failure of these drain lines are already bounded by the condenser loss of vacuum analysis.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the extraction steam drain lines are not described in the Technical Specifications.

SE 90-658
MODIFICATION NO, MC 4-1-90-117
RECIRCULATION PUMP

Description:

The pipe nipples are shortened on a spare part to be used on the "A" or "B" recirculation pump. The seal holder on the pump has 3 taps for drain and vent lines socket welded to its flange. These taps are shortened on the spare part from 2" long to 1 1/4" long. A new weld is made from the pipe nipple to an existing threaded union. The change is to make the spare part configuration like what is installed in the plant.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because change the change to the spare part doesn't change the configuration of the plant.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the catastrophic failure of the component is bounded by current LOCA and small line break analysis. There is no other identified failure mode.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the change satisfies all specification on code requirements.

Description:

Feedwater Heater Extraction Steam Nozzle was damaged by Erosion/Corrosion. Repair consisted of welding a carbon steel clamshell to the outer surface of the nozzle.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new nozzle configuration will not change the original design parameters of the heaters.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the nozzle repair will not affect any accident.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the feedwater nozzle is not addressed in the Technical Specifications.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE NO. 1(2)-90-010

Description:

External spring pack tubing and/or spring pack modifications are being installed on limitorque MOVs to prevent hydraulic lock by providing a grease relief path. Work to be performed per vendor recommended upgrade.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because these upgrades improve component reliability.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because these upgrades do not change component function.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because valve reliability is increased. MOV operation is not discussed in Technical Specifications.

SE 90-528
MINOR DESIGN CHANGE NO. 04-0-90-050

Description:

Security system multiplexer air conditioners are now powered from wall outlets. This change will install duplex receptacles inside the cabinets to power the air conditioners. These receptacles are hardwired to nearby regular lighting cabinets.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because moving the outlet to the inside of the cabinet increase the reliability of the air conditioner from inadvertent disconnection.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the location of the outlet is the only change in this MDC and not its configuration.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because relocating the outlets to inside the multiplexer cabinets does not reduce the margin of safety.

Description:

Security lighting is relocated to allow construction of the new service building and the fire protection ring header relocation modification. Security lighting on the existing service building and along the Station's paved access road (South Portion) will be mounted on poles under the change.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because altering the physical location of the security lighting does not affect in any way the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because moving the security lights does not create any new or different risk as described in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the security lights will be relocated in close proximity.

SE 90-440
MINOR DESIGN CHANGE NO. MC 4-1-90-037
SERVICE AIR COMPRESSOR INTAKE PIPING

Description:

The turbine oil reservoir exhaust vent is located directly above the existing service air intake filter. During normal operating conditions oil fumes are drawn into the service air flow. Since oil fumes in the service air flow are considered undesirable, the station has decided to relocate the service air intake.

Four additional supports and piping will be required to locate the filter further west. The existing smaller capacity dual filters will be replaced with a single larger capacity filter. A "Start Up Strainer" will be installed at the intake of the compressors. The purpose of the strainer is to protect the compressor from rust, scale, and other debris which can not be removed during installation.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this change does not directly or indirectly affect any safety related systems.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this change involves only piping, the integrity of the piping system and effect of the building have been evaluated.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this change does not affect any margin of safety.

SE 90-498
MINOR DESIGN CHANGE MCR-4-1(2)-90-60

Description:

Replace cribhouse temperature indication transducer and power supply (manufacturers upgrade).

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the cribhouse temperature indication transducer and power supply are not discussed in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the minor design change is an upgrade of the manufacturers components.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the cribhouse temperature indication transducer and power supply are not discussed in the Technical Specifications.

SE 90-499
MCR 4-1(2)-90-60
TEMPERATURE TRANSDUCER

Description:

Replace U1 reactor feed pump ventilation exhaust air temperature transducer and power supply with manufacturers upgrade

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the reactor feed pump ventilation exhaust air temperature transducer and power supply are not discussed in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the minor design change is an upgrade of the manufacturers components.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the reactor feed pump ventilation exhaust air temperature transducer and power supply are not discussed in Technical Specifications.

Description:

Minor Design Change modified pipe support shown on drawing M-9910-66 to allow maintenance to the AO-1601-23 valve. The valve could not be removed from the pipe for maintenance, because the pipe support blocks access to the flange bolts.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this change will not change or affect seismic analysis, therefore the probability of an accident is not increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this change will not affect the structural integrity of pipe support, valve, line, or other pipe supports downstream or upstream on line.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this work is not covered in the Technical Specifications.

Description:

Design, fabricate, and install control blade storage racks to sit in the contaminated equipment storage pit area of the U-1 and U-2 fuel pools. The racks are made of aluminum and be free-standing so they will not be attached to the pool liner.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because seismic calculations have shown that the design basis earthquake will cause no damage to the pool liner and the racks will not tip provided they are symmetrically loaded. Procedure changes are in progress to enforce the symmetrical loading of the racks.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because installation of the new racks is covered by the bounding analysis of a dropped fuel cask as described in FSAR Section 10.1.2. No other new types of accidents have been created by this Minor Design Change.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the installation and use of the new control blade storage racks does not affect the Technical Specification criticality requirement for the spent fuel pool. The specified margin of safety $K_{eff} \leq 0.95$, is not reduced by this Minor Design Change.

Description:

Replaced existing Sodium Bromide tank level indicator with a King Gage Liquiseal gauging system similar to the level indicators on the hypochlorite and silt dispersant tanks.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the operation of this level indicator does not affect the equipment evaluated in the FSAR, and its passive function is not altered.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the design function and operation of the level indicator is not affected by this minor design change.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this instrument is not addressed in the Technical Specifications, nor does it affect equipment that is.

MINOR DESIGN CHANGE M-4-2-81-C22

Description:

The modification consists of installing additional hold down clamps for the 2-3208 A,B, C feedwater check valve seats. These were installed in six and twelve o'clock positions. The modification was initiated due to fatigue breaks in the two existing hold down clamp assemblies in the three and nine o'clock positions. These breaks occurred at Dresden due to flow induced turbulence around section of the seat assembly/valve body interface.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the operational function of the valves is not changed. The installation of the ring clamps add reliability to the valves.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created nor increased.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because check valves are not addressed in Technical Specifications, but the margin of safety would be increased by the installation of hold down clamps. As the valve is considered to be more reliable. The operational function of the valve is not changed.

M4-1(2)-83-43
FEEDWATER CHECK VALVES

Description:

The modification consists of the permanent addition of "O"-Rings to the bottom seat ring of valves 2-3208 A,B and 2-220-59B. The "O"-Rings are being added to help prevent backflow leakage between the valve seat ring and the valve body.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the Dupont "O"-Rings are non-safety related and not a limiting factor for the actuation of equipment.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this modification is guarding against valve leakage by reducing Seat Ring leakage, which does not affect the operation of equipment.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because Technical Specifications do not address the addition of "O"-Rings in the seat ring, therefore, the margin of safety is not reduced.

Description:

Revise control logic of RHR Swing MCC to ensure that auto transfer properly occurs from the Diesel Generator #1 to the alternate source whenever defined abnormal fluctuations in voltage or frequency exist.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because reliability of the power source to the injection valves of the LPCI mode of the RHR system will be enhanced.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because there is no new failure mechanism created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the Technical Specification bases for the LPCI mode of the RHR system.(3.5) and Aux. (3.9) systems are not changed by the design covered by this modification which enhances availability of the emergency power to the valves of the LPCI mode of the RHR system. The margin of safety remains unchanged.

Description:

Installed permanent local isolated pressure indicators to the ECCS room coolers. Replaced discharge check valve valves on the ECCS room coolers, and installed isolation valve downstream of the HPCI room cooler flow elements.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because installation of valves and instrumentation is to be performed during the QIR11 outage.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because installation does not create new ways for ECCS room coolers to become inoperable. Installation will be done during the QIR11 refuel outage while equipment is out of service.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the same margins apply. During installation when a given cooler or exchanger is declared inoperative, the Technical Specification requirements and limited condition of operation still apply.

Description:

The purpose of this modification was to enhance the existing security system by adding a motion detector cable alarm system to the camera towers TV (3/4, 11/13, 12, 14), blue building roof, and lift pump station roof. This modification was to be installed and operable prior to the Regulatory Effectiveness Review (RER) of 11-13-89. The system consists of three parts. 1) A main alarm to detect motion, 2) a tamper alarm to detect unauthorized contact with system hardware, and 3) a tamper alarm for the main control panel.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this addition is an enhancement to the existing security system. No additional interactions with other systems is created.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this system is not required or involved in any accident calculated in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this system is not addressed in the Technical Specification.

Description:

The modification replaced the 1/2 instrument air compressor and filter/dryer with more efficient equipment. This modification provides additional instrument air capacity during abnormal operating conditions or when instrument air system equipment is taken out of service for maintenance.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the instrument air system is not required for the design function of any safety system.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the instrument air system is not required for the design function of any safety system. However, since instrument air quality affects the function of control equipment and instrumentation, this modification can reduce the possibility of challenging safety systems.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the instrument air system is not required for the design function of any safety system.

Description:

This modification suppresses recirculation water oxygen by means of adding hydrogen to the feedwater thus mitigating the effects of Intergranular Stress Corrosion Cracking (IGSCC). Hydrogen is added by injection into the condensate system. To ensure that all excess hydrogen is safely recombined in the recombiners, oxygen is injected into the off-gas system. Oxygen concentration in the off-gas flow is monitored. System control is from a self-contained panel to be added in the main control room, or from local control panels.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because a licensing document for this modification was prepared and sent to the NRC for review, and was subsequently approved via a January 19, 1989 SER. The additional delay introduced into the main steam isolation sequence, due to the Main Steam Line Radiation Monitor (MSLRM) setpoint increase from 7 to 15 times normal full power background without hydrogen addition will result in a small increase in the consequences of the CRDA.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the storage areas have been analyzed to be located at a sufficient distance to mitigate the effects of a hydrogen fireball or explosion, and to prevent hydrogen or oxygen rich air from entering any safety-related air pathways into the station. Excess flow check valves are located at the hydrogen and oxygen storage areas, and at the Turbine Building entrance point for hydrogen to prevent large hydrogen or oxygen releases due to a pipe break. Also, hydrogen area monitors are interfaced with a hydrogen supply isolation valve which will terminate hydrogen flow into each unit's Turbine Building if there is a high area hydrogen concentration for that unit. In addition to these safety features, normal Hydrogen Water Chemistry System shutdown is performed by closure of the active train's flow control valve and each hydrogen injection solenoid isolation valve, which are located just prior to the injection point to the condensate pump discharge piping. An electronic interlock between the Hydrogen Injection Solenoid Isolation Valve and its corresponding condensate pump motor also prevents inadvertent hydrogen injection into a non-operating condensate pump. These features should prevent spurious hydrogen addition into the condensate system.

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification is reduced because:

The MSLRM setpoint is defined in the Technical Specifications bases for the Reactor Protection System (Sec. 7.1) and the Protective Instrumentation (Sec. 7.2) as seven times normal full power background. This modification will increase the MSLRM setpoint to fifteen times normal full power background. This change does not reduce the margin of safety for the Reactor Protection System, however, it does promote an increase in the radiological consequences for the CRDA. This is because the primary purpose of the MSLRM is to mitigate the radiological consequences of a CRDA once the fuel damage has occurred and not to minimize the fuel damage from the CRDA. Therefore, a licensing document for this modification was prepared and sent to the NRC for approval. The NRC has approved the MSLRM setpoint increase to 15 times normal full power background without hydrogen addition via a January 19, 1989 SER. This SER has accepted the required Tech. Spec. changes and their insignificant effect on the total activity release and resulting dose to the public.

Modification M4-1(2)-88-057

Turbine Building Floor Drains

Description:

This modification installed a floor drain under the Feedwater Regulating Valves (FRV) on the mezzanine level of the Turbine Building. The drain was installed in conjunction with water barriers to isolate and drain water that may result from the spillage of water in the area. The drain was core bored and counter sunk into the floor between the two feedwater lines and field routed in the feed pump room to an existing drain.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this modification will actually decrease the possibility of damage of surrounding equipment (especially electrical) in the event of water spillage in the area.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this modification will actually decrease the malfunction of equipment by removing any water which could damage equipment.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because removal of any water in the area thru the drain will actually increase safety to the equipment in the area.

Modification M4-1-88-43B

125 VDC Battery

Description:

This modification replaced the NCT-1344 125 VDC battery with a NCX-21 125 VDC battery. In order to perform the modification without a dual unit outage, a NCX-21 125 VDC alternate battery was installed in the same battery room. The alternate battery was connected to power the unit while the permanent battery is being installed.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the new permanent battery will handle the same load as the old battery. The permanent battery is designed to carry the normal DC loads required for safe shutdown on one unit and operations required to limit the consequences of a design basis event on the other unit for a period of four hours following loss of all AC sources. This design is identical to that of the old battery. As stated in the UFSAR Section 12.1.1, the portions of Class II structures which house Class I components have been designed to provide protection for the Class I components in the same manner as Class I structure. The permanent battery is housed within a concrete structure in the turbine building (Class II).

The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction as analyzed in the FSAR/UFSAR is not increased.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the new permanent battery rack and associated cable conduits are seismically supported. Both the main and reserve feeds to the same 125 VDC system will be unaffected by the replacement of the permanent battery. The new permanent battery will use the same charger as the old battery without a load increase. Even though the permanent battery will be located in the same battery room as the alternate battery, the latter and other batteries will be in a float mode when the permanent battery is being charged. Thus, there will be no increase in hydrogen generation at any time in the battery room.

Although the new battery has a higher capacity rating, its associated switchgear, cabling, and breaker coordination have been evaluated, and are found to be adequate to mitigate an accident involving the battery.

Thus the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the FSAR/UFSAR is not created.

Modification M4-1-88-43B CONT'D

3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the surveillance applied to the old permanent battery will be equally applied to the new battery. The type of surveillances described in the Technical Specifications has been demonstrated over the years to provide indication of a cell becoming irregular or unserviceable long before it becomes a failure. The new permanent battery can supply the same load as the old battery. The new permanent 125 VDC battery is designed to carry the normal DC loads plus all DC loads required for safe shutdown on one unit and operations required to limit the consequences of a design basis event on the other unit for a period of four hours following loss of all AC sources.

Therefore the margin of safety defined in Section 3.9/4.9/B of the Technical Specifications will not be reduced.

Modification M4-1(2)-88-046

Service Air Drops and Hose Reels

Description:

The Service Air System provides compressed air and breathing air to support maintenance activities. During outages delays are incurred due to lack of available service air connections, in addition, time is required to handle and decontaminate hoses used to provide temporary service air supplies. To facilitate maintenance and to reduce the risk of contamination the station installed additional service air drops complete with permanent hose reels. The service air drops were added to high maintenance activity areas, and were designed to withstand seismic events.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the service air system is non safety related and has no effect on safety related systems.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because to assure structural integrity the new piping system will be installed per approved procedures and the design will be seismically evaluated.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because service air is not included in any Technical Specifications.

Modification M4-1-87-51C

Annunciator System

(Service Panel Ringback Installation)

Description:

This partial modification adds visual and audible ringback to the annunciator systems of the control room service panels 901-53, 54, 55, 56 and 912-2, 7, 8. The existing annunciator systems at the panels has been replaced or upgraded.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the annunciator system is not discussed in the accident analysis section of the FSAR. This system is not required for accident mitigation. Since the annunciator system is electrically isolated from the safety related systems, the failure of the non-safety related annunciator system will not affect the operation of any of the plant's safety-related systems.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because no change has been made which affects any of the bounding conditions of the FSAR accident analysis. All bounding conditions remain the same, no new accidents are introduced by this modification.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because when applicable, the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) 3.12.F and the Surveillance Requirements (SR) 4.12F for the Fire Protection System's fire barriers will be adhered to for the installation of cables. No other LCOs, SRs or their basis will be affected by the installation, operation or failure of the modified annunciator system.

Modification M4-0-89-123

1/2-20114-1"-LX Line

Description:

Valve AO-1/2-2001-218A(B) leaked excessively. Line 1/2-20114-1"-LX has been capped to prevent further leakage.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because present modes of handling sludge are still contained within piping and vessels as described in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because although processing methods differ slightly, both products suitable for burial. All process streams are controlled within plant systems until the resins are ready for shipment.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because current handling of solid resin waste (using dewatering) is an approved method per our Process Control Program (PCP) per Technical Specification 3.8.E.1.

Modification M-4-1-88-080

Dryer Separator Pit Seal Gate

Description:

This modification consists of the addition of a seal gate installed between the existing reactor cavity bulkhead and dryer separator pit. The new seal gate is equipped with dual inflatable seals and is used during refueling outages.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this modification has no effect on equipment important to safety. The dryer separator pit is non-safety related, seismic. Seismic properties of the dryer separator pit are not compromised by this modification.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this modification improves the integrity of the dryer separator pit and actually reduces the possibility for accidents due to water damage, and leakage.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the equipment affected by this modification is not significant to any margin of safety as defined in the Technical Specifications.

Description:

The modification involved tapping into the existing 8" diameter fire protection line near the construction office/training building at the plant entrance. Installing an 8" diameter branch connection at this point and a position indicating isolation valve. Also part of this modification is capping the existing 4" diameter branch line and reconnecting it downstream of the isolation valve.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the modified piping is analyzed, constructed and supported to meet the requirements of the FSAR. Furthermore no new systems are being added or modified so the occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the FSAR is not increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this modification does not affect any of the bounding conditions in the FSAR accident analysis. Because all bounding conditions remain the same no new accidents are introduced by this modification.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this modification does not reduce any of the existing margins of safety identified in the technical specifications. Since the intended function of the modified system is not changed and the modified portion is designed to the same or better standards as the existing system the margin of safety is not reduced.

Modification M4-1(2)-87-003-B

Reactor Building Sample Panels

Description:

The modification replaced the existing sample panels in the Reactor Building at Quad Cities Units 1 & 2 with new sample panels which have improved operational features and a modular design.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this modification consists of installing non-safety related, seismic and non-seismic mounted equipment. The modification will not affect any design basis accident or single failure event scenarios previously analyzed in the FSAR or USAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because failure modes and effects analysis demonstrates no new accidents or malfunctions are created by this modification. Seismic mounting of the panels will assure adjacent safety related equipment is protected from damage during a seismic event.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this modification presents no changes to the Technical Specifications Basis. All conditions applicable to this modification have been previously addressed in the basis for the existing equipment to be replaced. The margin of safety is not reduced.

CRD Return Line

Description:

The CRD return line was removed to mitigate IGSCC. This partial modification involved removal of piping and supports inside the drywell, cutting and capping piping outside the drywell, and installation of caps on the RPV nozzle safe-end and drywell penetration X-36.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the CRD return line being removed reduces the potential for IGSCC, thereby decreasing the probability of a line break.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because there is no new interfaces with safety-related equipment, systems, or structures or new systems subject to failure or malfunction have been introduced. The drywell capping detail is evaluated and qualified using the loading utilized at other areas of the containment where steel is not backed by concrete.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because The CRD return line is not discussed in any technical specification and was not included in the original plant safe shutdown analysis. Removal does not reduce any margins of safety or limiting condition of operation. Primary containment integrity will be maintained by the installation of a new cap which will be qualified using the FSAR-specified design criteria.

Temporary Make-Up Demineralizer Piping

Description:

Installation of a supply and discharge to connect the temporary Make-Up Demineralizer trailer to the Well Water System and the existing Make-Up Demineralizer while bypassing the resin tanks. This involves installation of approximately 200 feet of pipe and 20 pipe supports.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this modification changes the flowpath of well water to a temporary trailer which performs the same function as the resin tanks. Since the original conditions and assumptions made in the FSAR have not been changed the probability of occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the FSAR is not increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this modification does not change the original assumptions made in the FSAR and would not fall outside any single failure event or DBA which has already been analyzed.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the Make-Up Demineralizer system does not interact with any systems described in the Technical Specifications.

Crib House Sump Discharge Flange

Description:

Addition of a flange with an isolation valve and a check valve to the discharge piping of one of the Crib House Dewatering Sump pumps, so a temporary pump can be attached during maintenance activities.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the addition of a flange on the discharge of the crib house sump does not change the design function or impact any equipment evaluated in the FSAR.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the addition of a flange on the discharge of the crib house sump does not change the design function or impact equipment evaluated in the FSAR, thus not impacting the possibility of an accident or malfunction evaluated in the FSAR.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the addition of a flange on the discharge of the crib house dewatering sump does not change the design function or impact equipment in Technical Specifications, thus not affecting the margin of safety.

Flow Transmitter, Controller & Square Root Extractor

Description:

Replacement of the existing RCIC flow controllers on the 901(2)-4 panels with new Yokogawa programmable controllers. In addition, the existing square root extractor was deleted. However, its function was retained by replacing the existing flow transmitter with a Rosemount transmitter that includes an integral square root function. A jumper in the RCIC governor signal converter was rewired to allow it to accept a 4-20 ma input.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the replacement of the RCIC flow controller and transmitter does not affect any safety-related functions since it is not classified as a safety-related system. Therefore, the probability of occurrence of a DBA or SFE has not increased.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because all new components will be seismically mounted, with the new controller being seismically qualified. This will mitigate any component failures that could affect the operation of nearby safety-related equipment. No new accidents or malfunctions not previously analyzed in the FSAR are introduced by this partial modification.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the replacement of the RCIC flow controller and transmitter does not have any impact on the existing basis of the Quad Cities Technical Specifications since the RCIC system is not a safety-related system.

Modification M4-2-88-023B

'A' and "B" Low Pressure Turbine Rotors

Description:

Replace the original General Electric (G.E.) "A" and "B" Low pressure rotors with Brown Boveri Co. (BBC) low pressure welded rotors. Adjust the alignment of the generator and high pressure turbine as necessary. This replacement was necessary due to wheel cracks found in the original GE rotor.

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because in Section 11 of the FSAR, the postulated accident associated with the turbine rotors is that caused by the rotor breaking apart and producing missiles which could damage safety-related equipment. The FSAR states that even if missiles were generated, the plant could still be shutdown safely since redundant safety-related equipment would be unaffected.

An analysis conducted by Brown Boveri Co. has shown that the probability of turbine missiles being produced by the BBC rotor meets the NRC guidelines in Section 2.2.3 of the Standard Review Plan (NUREG-0800) and Regulatory Guide 1.115. Furthermore, BBC welded low pressure rotors have never experienced stress corrosion cracking which is believed to be the dominant failure mechanism for turbine rotors.

Since the steam path through the BBC rotor is identical to the GE rotor, the Turbine-Generator System will be unaffected by operating with three BBC rotors.

Therefore, the probability for an accident or malfunction as previously evaluated in the FSAR is not increased.

2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the failure mechanism of the Turbine-Generator System is not being changed. Therefore, the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the FSAR is not created.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because the probability of a failure of the Turbine-Generator system is not increased by this modification. Since the Turbine-Generator system's reliability does not form the basis for any Technical Specification, the margin of safety is not reduced.

Minor Design Change No. P04-1-90-168

Model 973 Crane Tilting Disk Check Valves

Description:

Replace the existing "Old Style" disk/seat ring assemblies with new assemblies incorporating a more positive retention of the pivot pin. This change addresses the non-safety related valves.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the integrity of the valves is being increased with this recommendation. The valves function and failure mode remain unchanged.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the valve function is unchanged with this minor change. The possibility of an accident or malfunction is being decreased with this positive pivot pin retention method.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this change will improve the integrity of the valve, all safety margins will not be reduced.

Minor Design Change MC4-1-89-001

125 VDC and 250 VDC Reactor Building Bus and Feed

Description:

The minor design change is for the replacement of Westinghouse molded case circuit breakers in the 250 volt DC and 125 volt DC distribution systems, with a new model Westinghouse molded case circuit breaker. The replacement breakers are recommended by the Nuclear Engineering Department in the letter from J. S. Abel to R. L. Bax, dated August 24, 1989. The mounting configuration for the molded case circuit breakers were altered to seismically mount the new molded case circuit breakers.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because this minor design change does not alter the design, function, or method in which the 250 volt DC and 125 volt DC systems operate, as defined in the UFSAR sections 8.2.3.2.1 and 8.2.3.2.2 respectively. The minor change is required for the replacement of non traceable molded case circuit breakers. This change does not directly or indirectly impact operation of any of the plant's systems.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because this minor design change involves replacing existing non traceable molded case circuit breakers with a new model molded case circuit breaker that is traceable to the original equipment manufacturer. No change has been made which affects any of the bounding conditions of the FSAR accident analysis. All bounding conditions remain the same, no new accidents or malfunctions are introduced by this minor design change. The potential for an accident remains unchanged.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this minor change to the mounting configuration does not affect any set points, operational limits, or special conditions that prescribe the margin of safety. The minor design change does not impact any system or component as described in the technical specifications. Therefore, the margin of safety has not been reduced.

Minor Design Change No. P04-1-90-168

Model 973 Crane Tilting Disk check Valves

Description:

Replace the existing "Old Style" disk/seat ring assemblies with new assemblies incorporating a more positive retention of the pivot pin. This change addresses the non-safety related valves.

Evaluation:

1. The probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not increased because the integrity of the valves is being increased with this recommendation. The valves function and failure mode remain unchanged.
2. The possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report is not created because the valve function is unchanged with this minor change. The possibility of an accident or malfunction is being decreased with this positive pivot pin retention method.
3. The margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification is not reduced because this change will improve the integrity of the valve, all safety margins will not be reduced.