



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 179 AND 160 TO FACILITY OPERATING

LICENSE NOS. DPR-70 AND DPR-75

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

SALEM NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 11, 1994, as supplemented December 13, 1994, and September 6, 1995, the Public Service Electric & Gas Company (the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Technical Specifications (TSs). The requested changes would make two changes concerning pressurizer heaters in TS 3/4.4.4. The first change would add the phrase "capable of being powered from an emergency power supply" to the Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO). The second change would alter the frequency of surveillance requirement 4.4.4.2 from 92 days to every refueling outage. The December 13, 1994, September 6, 1995, and December 28, 1995, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

2.0 EVALUATION

Currently, ACTION 3.4.4.a states that operation may continue for only 72 hours with an inoperable emergency power supply, but the requirement that the pressurizer heater group be capable of being powered from an emergency power supply is not in the LCO. The first proposed change adds this requirement to the LCO and is consistent with NUREG-1431, "Standard Technical Specifications Westinghouse Plants," and is therefore acceptable.

The second proposed changes alters the frequency of surveillance requirement 4.4.4.2 which requires that the capacity of the pressurizer heater groups be verified at least once per 92 days. This requirement is discussed in Section 6.6 of NUREG-1366, "Improvements to Technical Specifications Surveillance Requirements." NUREG-1366 states that most pressurizer heaters are in constant use and, therefore, operators should be aware of problems that may arise with the heaters. Furthermore, NUREG-1366 states that pressurizer

heaters are fairly reliable. The NUREG concludes that 92-day testing appears to be too frequent and recommends that the test be done once each refueling interval.

Generic Letter (GL) 93-05, "Line-Item Technical Specifications Improvements to Reduce Surveillance Requirements for Testing During Power Operation," enclosed guidance to assist licensees in preparing a license amendment request to implement the recommendations in NUREG-1366. Item 6.6 of GL 93-05 recommended that plants without dedicated safety-related heaters should test the capacity of the pressurizer heaters once each refueling interval.

The licensee stated that its pressurizer heaters are in constant use, are reliable, and are of the identical design to those described in NUREG-1366. The licensee, in its letter of September 6, 1995, provided information to support its statement that the pressurizer heaters are reliable.

Therefore, since the proposed change is consistent with NUREG-1366 and GL 93-05, and since the Salem pressurizer heaters are identical to those discussed in the NUREG and the GL and are reliable, the NRC staff finds the change to require testing at each refueling outage, rather than every 92 days, to be acceptable.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the New Jersey State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendments. By letter dated November 21, 1994, the State submitted four comments. Three of the comments were editorial in nature and were corrected by the licensee's letter dated December 13, 1994. The other comment stated that no basis was provided to support the statement that the pressurizer heaters were reliable. The licensee provided the supporting basis regarding pressurizer heater reliability in its letter of September 6, 1995.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments change a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes surveillance requirements. 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 (59 FR 60386). 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: L. Olshan

Date: January 24, 1996