



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NOS. 88 AND 93 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

In a letter dated June 8, 1984, Wisconsin Electric Power Company proposed changes to Technical Specification 15.3.10, Control Rod and Power Distribution Limits, for Point Beach Units 1 and 2. The proposed changes revise the definition of "fully withdrawn" for the control rods as equal to or greater than 225 steps and the corresponding Figure 15.3.10-1. In a letter dated August 22, 1984, the licensee provided more detailed results of an analysis supporting the proposed changes.

EVALUATION

To minimize localized control rod cluster assembly (RCCA) wear at the top of the controls, the proposed Technical Specification changes will allow operation with the RCCAs inserted three steps into the reactor from their normal withdrawn position of 228 steps. At 225 steps withdrawn, the RCCSSs are only 0.3 inches into the active fuel region. Because of the low rod worth in the top region of core, the resultant power distribution perturbations are calculated to be less than 1%, and can be accommodated with available margin. Similarly, the effect on shutdown margin is minimal ( $0.02\% \Delta \rho$ ), and can be accommodated by available excess shutdown margin ( $> 0.75\% \Delta \rho$ ).

The impact on other key safety parameters was found to be negligible in the licensee's analysis. Because the proposed change will insert the RCCAs so little into the active fuel region, we would expect essentially negligible effects of the proposed change as reported in the licensee's evaluation. We therefore find the proposed change 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 amendment will not be inimical to common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: March 7, 1985

Principal Contributor:

M. Dunenfeld  
T. Colburn