



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NOS. 89 AND 94 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. DPR-24 AND DPR-27

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-266 AND 50-301

Introduction

By letter dated May 2, 1984, Wisconsin Electric Power Company (licensee) requested license amendments for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 which would revise the surveillance requirements for the prestressed containment tendons. The purpose of the proposed amendments was to improve the containment tendon surveillance program. The staff reviewed the licensee's request and, in a letter dated July 24, 1984, requested that the licensee address staff concerns regarding the proposed amendments. The licensee responded to the staff's concerns by letter dated September 5, 1984.

Evaluation

The proposed Technical Specifications revise the surveillance requirements and limiting conditions for operation for containment prestressed tendons to more nearly conform to the Standard Technical Specifications.

The differences between the existing tendon surveillance specification and that proposed by the licensee can be summarized as follows:

1. TENDON SELECTION

EXISTING: The selection of tendons at the required periodic surveillance intervals has been the same (identical) tendons, three from each group, selected at the first tendon inspection.

PROPOSED: Eleven tendons (five hoop, three vertical and three dome) are inspected. One tendon from each group is to be kept unchanged and the others are selected randomly but should be representative.

2. FREQUENCY AND METHOD OF SURVEILLANCE

EXISTING: Both units are to be inspected visually and physically for the intervals of one year, three years, and every five years thereafter dating from the initial structural integrity tests.

PROPOSED: Visual inspection is required on both units, but physical inspection alternates each five years between the two units.

3. PROCEDURE OF PHYSICAL INSPECTION

EXISTING: There is no detailed procedure to conduct the inspection if the lift-off force is less than the predicted value.

PROPOSED: Additional lift-off testing and action to be taken for various levels of tendon lift-off forces are prescribed.

4. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

EXISTING: There are no specific acceptance criteria for most of the critical surveillance elements.

PROPOSED: For most of the critical surveillance the acceptance criteria are indicated.

5. LIMITING CONDITION FOR PLANT OPERATION

EXISTING: There is no limiting condition for plant operation if degraded tendons are detected.

PROPOSED: Before initiation of reactor shutdown, allowable times of 72 hours and 15 days are specified for corrective actions depending on the severity of the abnormal degradation of the containment integrity.

The staff has reviewed and evaluated the changes as summarized above. The changes to the technical specifications are mainly in conformance with the provisions in Regulatory Guide 1.35 (Proposed Revision 3) and in Regulatory Guide 1.35.1 (Proposed). The net effect of the proposed changes will improve the tendon surveillance program over that currently in place. Based on the above, the staff finds that the proposed changes are acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments involve a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The 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 these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, these 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 these amendments.

CONCLUSION

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

Date: March 7, 1985

Principal Contributor:

C. P. Tan
T. G. Colburn