



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 77 TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-16
GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION AND
JERSEY CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION
DOCKET NO. 50-219

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 28, 1984, and supplemented September 7, 1984, GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPU) (the licensee) requested an amendment to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16 for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. This amendment would authorize removal of the weight limitation of the spent fuel shipping cask in Section 5.3.1.E of the Technical Specifications (TS).

A Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing related to the requested action was published in the Federal Register on September 28, 1984 (49 FR 38400). No request for hearing or public comments were received.

On October 14, 1983, a U.S. District Court, Western District of New York, issued a Partial Settlement Agreement and Order which requires GPU to return 224 spent fuel assemblies from the Nuclear Service Center in West Valley, New York to Oyster Creek. Accordingly, in preparation for receiving these fuel assemblies GPU is contracting for the use of two TN-9 spent fuel shipping casks each having a full load weight of 40.5 tons. The use of these casks would reduce the number of shipments from West Valley to 32 instead of the 114 required if the NLI 1/2 cask were utilized.

2.0 DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

The staff has reviewed the existing Oyster Creek TS, Section 5.3.1.E, as well as the proposed change. The staff has also examined the applicability of the staff's previous findings regarding handling of the spent fuel cask as stated in the Safety Evaluation (SE) dated March 30, 1977 for Amendment 22 to the Oyster Creek License.

8410310232 841029
PDR ADDOCK 05000219
PDR

In the March 30, 1977 SE the staff imposed a 30-ton limitation on cask handling and stated that "movement of the 100-ton fuel cask assumed in the cask drop analyses will not be permitted until the details of the means used to limit the height to which the cask can be raised over the operating deck have been submitted by the licensee and approved by the NRC staff." Although the original analysis for the cask drop protection system had been performed by GPU using a 100-ton cask, this analysis was found acceptable by the staff only with the above condition satisfied as discussed in the March 30, 1977 SE. The licensee has proposed to use a TN-9 spent fuel shipping cask having a full load weight of 40.5 tons. The licensee has provided details of the means for limiting the height to which the cask can be raised. The design consists of redundant limit switches which will be provided to ensure that the cask will not be raised more than 6 inches above the operating deck. In addition, a "GO, NO-GO" gauge will be used to ensure the cask is at the correct height prior to movement. Specific procedures will be developed prior to use of the TN-9 cask.

The proposed change is in accordance with the criteria of SRP Section 9.1.5 and therefore, the staff concludes that the proposed change to Section 5.3.1.E of the TS is acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR Section 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner; and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

5.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This evaluation was prepared by A. Singh.

Dated: October 29, 1984