



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 131 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-9
AND AMENDMENT NO. 113 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-17
DUKE POWER COMPANY
MCGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-369 AND 50-370

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated May 9, 1988, as supplemented August 1, 1988, and January 5, 1989, the Duke Power Company (the licensee or DPC) submitted a request for changes to the McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes involve a few editorial corrections as well as changes to the reactor coolant system (RCS) surveillance frequency that stemmed from DPC's investigation into an incident at McGuire Unit 2 involving a gradual decrease in indicated Delta-T. Subsequently on October 8, 1991, DPC withdrew its amendment request to TS 4.2.3.5 regarding the RCS flow surveillance. The August 1, 1988, and January 5, 1989, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

2.0 EVALUATION

The proposed changes to Notes 1 and 2 of TS Table 2.2-1 cause Delta-T to be expressed as a ratio of the calibration Delta-T value rather than the absolute Delta-T value. This rearrangement of the expressions in Notes 1 and 2 does not change the quantities calculated, but instead adjusts the indicated value, and, therefore, is acceptable.

The requested change to Table 3.3-1 is of an editorial nature and is, therefore, acceptable.

The change to Table 4.3-1 to add Note 15, in conjunction with the withdrawal of the change to TS 4.2.3.5, provides clarification as to when Delta-T channels require calibration. Since TS 4.2.3.5 requires the precision level balance on an 18 month basis, Delta-T channels and RCS loop Delta-T values will also be determined on this same 18 month basis consistent with TS 4.2.3.5. Since this change is clarifying in nature and does not represent a technical change it is acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the North 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 (53 FR 30129). 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 Contributors: L. Lois, SRXB/DST
T. Reed, PD II-3/DRP-I/II

Date: May 7, 1992