



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 139 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-35  
AND AMENDMENT NO. 133 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-52

DUKE POWER COMPANY, ET AL.

CATAWBA NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-413 AND 50-414

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 31, 1994, Duke Power Company, et al. (the licensee), submitted a request for changes to the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes would remove the steam generator power operated relief valve (PORV) stroke times from TS Tables 3.6-2a and 3.6-2b.

2.0 EVALUATION

The proposed changes would revise the lists of containment isolation valves by changing the maximum opening time limitation from "<5" seconds to "NA" for the valves SV-19, SV-13, SV-7, and SV-1.

The licensee's technical justification for the changes is based on the following: (a) the valves' protective action functions are initiated by signals other than containment isolation signals, as identified in Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) Table 3.104, Note 8, and (b) credit for the operation of these valves is not taken in the dose analyses.

The function of the above valves is to prevent lifting of the safety valves during mild pressure transients, assist reseating actuated safety valves, provide a means for plant cooldown when the steam dump system is not operable, and to provide a safety-grade means of achieving reactor coolant system (RCS) cooldown to decay heat removal (ND) system initiation temperature in compliance with Branch Technical Position (BTP) RSB 5-1.

Since the steam and feedwater isolation functions are safety-related functions for which the protective actions must be completed within an assumed time period, it is appropriate that the TS include operability criteria which ensure that the protective actions can be accomplished within time limits assumed in the FSAR analyses. Such assurance is provided elsewhere in the TS in Table 3.3-5 "Engineered Safety Features Response Times" which specifies, for both feedwater and steamline isolation features, maximum protective action time limits that identify the maximum acceptable total time allotted for an entire protective action, encompassing the time from which a monitored parameter exceeds its setpoint, to the time at which the actuated valve is closed (Reference TS Section 1.13 "Definition of Engineered Safety Features

Response Time"). Since the requirements established by TS Table 3.3-5 ensure the timely actuation of the valves listed above, and the subject valves serve no other safety function, deletion of the closure time specification from TS isolation valve Tables 3.6-2a and 3.6-2b is acceptable.

Based on the results of the staff's review, it is concluded that the proposed TS changes are acceptable.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the South Carolina State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. The State official had no comments.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change requirements 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 amendments involve 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 amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (60 FR 3715, dated February 15, 1995). Accordingly, the amendments meet 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 amendments.

### 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 amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: R. E. Martin

Date: December 18, 1995