



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 32 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-12

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY

I. INTRODUCTION

By letter dated July 24, 1984, South Carolina Electric and Gas Company (SCE&G) requested a change to Technical Specification Table 3.3-7, "Seismic Monitoring Instrumentation," and Technical Specification Table 4.3-4, "Seismic Monitoring Instrumentation Requirements" to allow an installed triaxial peak accelerograph to be moved to an accumulator safety injection line from the pressurizer surge line. A typographical error would also be corrected in Technical Specification Table 3.3-7.

II. EVALUATION

The relocation of the accelerograph is necessary because the present instrument location causes the accelerograph to engrave the vibratory motion of the surge line on its record plates continuously. Therefore, the instrument is rendered inoperable for recording future earthquakes.

The accumulator safety injection line is Class 1 piping located inside the containment building. The instrument is to be located at a seismically analyzed point away from a restraint. This point produces relatively large accelerations under Operating Basis Earthquake conditions and should not be subject to vibratory motion during normal plant operation. Therefore, this location would be capable of providing accurate and useful recorded information in the event of seismic activity. The staff has reviewed the relocation of the accelerometer and the typographical error and finds that these changes are acceptable.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation of a 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 Sec 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.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (49 FR 38409) on September 28, 1984, and consulted with the state of South Carolina. No public comments were received, and the state of South Carolina did not have any comments.

We have 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.

Principal Contributors: Jon B. Hopkins, Licensing Branch No. 4, DL

Dated: November 8, 1984