



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 157

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-16

GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION AND
JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-219

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 24, 1991, the NRC denied a request by the licensee, GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPUN), that would have obviated the requirement to have a Technical Specification (TS) consistent with NUREG-0123, Revision 4. The applicable TS required a preplanned alternate method of monitoring the containment radiation if both containment high range area radiation monitors are inoperable for more than 7 days.

GPUN responded in a letter dated October 23, 1991, with Technical Specification Change Request (TSCR) No. 204 which proposed to have available a preplanned alternate method consistent with NUREG-0123, Revision 4. Additionally, the licensee submitted a revised BASES section in a letter dated December 20, 1991, which superseded the one in their October 23, 1991 letter. The TSCR complies with the NRC approved Amendment No. 116 to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16 for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station. The licensee's request will modify TS Section 3.13 Item G, Containment High-Range Radiation Monitor and its associated BASES section by declaring the post accident sampling system (PASS) as the preplanned alternate for measuring the containment radiation in the event the containment high-range area radiation monitors are out of service for more than 7 days.

2.0 EVALUATION

The change requested by GPUN would add a statement to TS Section 3.13 Item G, Containment High-Range Radiation Monitor, which requires, with the number of operable monitors less than 1 for more than 7 days, the availability of a "preplanned alternate method capable of being implemented to provide an estimate of the radioactive material in containment under accident conditions."

The licensee's proposed use of the PASS as the preplanned alternate monitoring method is considered technically acceptable. The PASS is required by TS 6.17 to have the capability to obtain and analyze containment atmosphere samples

(as well as from other key systems) under accident conditions. It includes requirements for: procedures for sampling and analysis; training of personnel in sampling and analysis; and provisions for verifying operability of the systems. This system is considered adequate to provide information on containment radiation levels in lieu of the containment high-range area radiation monitors for use in assessing the magnitude of an accident and for use in determining offsite protective action recommendations.

A review of NUREG-1435, Volume 1, Status of Safety Issues at Licensed Power Plants, documents that the licensee has implemented the requirements of NUREG-0737, Item II.B.3, Post Accident Sampling Capability.

Based on the above, the staff finds that, consistent with NUREG-0123, Revision 4, the licensee has proposed an adequate preplanned alternate method of monitoring the containment radiation if both containment high-range area radiation monitors are inoperable for more than 7 days. Consequently, the staff recommends that TSCR No. 204 be approved.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

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

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The NRC staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (57 FR 4487). Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: S. Klementowicz

Date: March 9, 1992