

DEC 19 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Gus C. Lainas, Assistant Director
for Operating Reactors, DL

FROM: Dennis M. Crutchfield, Assistant Director
for Safety Assessment, DL

SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION OF QUAD CITIES
UNITS 1 AND 2 NUREG-0737 TECHNICAL
SPECIFICATIONS (GENERIC LETTER 83-36)

ORAB has reviewed the submittal from the Commonwealth Edison Company in response to Generic Letter 83-36. Enclosure 1 contains our evaluation of the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2. Enclosure 2 contains our SALP input per the guidance contained in Office Letter No. 44. The licensee has proposed acceptable TSs for the following items:

1. Post-Accident Sampling (II.B.3)
2. Sampling and Analysis of Plant Effluents (II.F.1.2)
3. Containment High-Range Radiation Monitor (II.F.1.3)
4. Containment Pressure Monitor (II.F.1.4)
5. Containment Water Level Monitor (II.F.1.5)
6. Containment Hydrogen Monitor (II.F.1.6)

No TSs changes are required for Item II.B.1 - RCS vents. The TSs for Item II.F.1.1 - Noble Gas Effluent Monitors are covered by amendment for REIS. As agreed by the Project Manager, the TSs for Item III.D.3.4. - Control Room Habitability, will be reviewed by DSI under a separate TAC.

The enclosed Safety Evaluation completes our review for TAC numbers 54561 and 54562 on Quad Cities Units 1 and 2. When the Project Manager issues the license amendments for these TSs for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2, the above two TACs and MPA B-83 should be closed.

If you have any questions, please contact Chandu Patel of my staff.

Original Signed By:

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Assistant Director
for Safety Assessment, DL

Enclosures:

1. Safety Evaluation Report
2. SALP Input

cc w/enclosures:
D. Vassallo
R. Bevan

DISTRIBUTION
Central File
~~ORAB Rdg~~
GHolahan
JHannon
CPatel

CPP
ORAB:DL
CPatel:dm
12/17/84

H
ORAB:DL
JHannon
12/17/84

for
C:ORAB:DL
GHolahan
12/17/84

AD
G.D. DCrutchfield
12/19/84

*Previously
Processed
w/ Incorrect
Encl.*

8412310398 XA

ENCLOSURE 1

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. AND TO

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

QUAD CITIES UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-254 AND 50-265

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In November 1980, the staff issued NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," which included all TMI Action Plan items approved by the Commission for implementation at nuclear power reactors. NUREG-0737 identifies those items for which Technical Specifications are required. A number of items which require Technical Specifications (TSs) were scheduled for implementation after December 31, 1981. The staff provided guidance on the scope of Technical Specifications for all of these items in Generic Letter 83-36. Generic Letter 83-36 was issued to all Boiling Water Reactor (BWR) licensees on November 1, 1983. In this Generic Letter, the staff requested licensees to:

1. review their facility's Technical Specifications to determine if they were consistent with the guidance provided in the Generic Letter, and
2. submit an application for a license amendment where deviations or absence of Technical Specifications were found.

By letter dated September 26, 1984, Commonwealth Edison Company (the licensee) responded to Generic Letter 83-36 by submitting Technical Specification change request for Quad Cities Units 1 and 2. This evaluation covers the following TMI Action Plan items:

1. Post-Accident Sampling System (II.B.3)
2. Sampling and Analysis of Plant Effluents (II.F.1.2)
3. Containment High-Range Radiation Monitor (II.F.1.3)
4. Containment Pressure Monitor (II.F.1.4)
5. Containment Water Level Monitor (II.F.1.5)
6. Containment Hydrogen Monitor (II.F.1.6)

EVALUATION

1. Post-Accident Sampling (II.B.3)

The guidance provided by Generic Letter 83-36 requested that an administrative program should be established, implemented and maintained to ensure that the licensee has the capability to obtain and analyze reactor coolant and containment atmosphere samples under accident conditions. The Post-Accident Sampling System is not required to be operable at all times. Administrative procedures are to be established for returning inoperable instruments to operable status as soon as practicable.

The licensee has provided a proposed revision to the TS which is consistent with the guidelines provided in our Generic Letter 83-36. We conclude that the licensee has an acceptable TS for the Post-Accident Sampling System.

2. Sampling and Analysis of Plant Effluents (II.F.1.2)

The guidance provided by Generic Letter 83-36 requested that an administrative program should be established, implemented and maintained to ensure the capability to collect and analyze or measure representative samples of radioactive iodines and particulates in plant gaseous effluents during and following an accident. The licensee has proposed TSs that are consistent with our guidance. We conclude that the TSs for sampling and analysis of plant effluents are acceptable.

3. Drywell High-Range Radiation Monitor (II.F.1.3)

The licensee has installed two drywell radiation monitors in both Quad Cities Units that are consistent with the guidance of TMI Action Plan Item II.F.1.3. Generic Letter 83-36 provided guidance for limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for these monitors. The licensee proposed TSs that are consistent with the guidance provided in our Generic Letter 83-36. Therefore, we conclude that the proposed TSs for Item II.F.1.3 are acceptable.

4. Drywell Pressure Monitor (II.F.1.4)

Both Quad Cities Units have been provided with two wide range channels for monitoring drywell pressure following an accident. The licensee has proposed TSs that are consistent with the guidelines contained in Generic Letter 83-36. Therefore, we conclude that the proposed TSs for drywell pressure monitors are acceptable.

5. Torus Water Level Monitor (II.F.1.5)

The torus water level monitors at both Quad Cities Units provide the capability required by TMI Action Plan Item II.F.1.5. The TSs for both units contain limiting conditions of operation and surveillance requirements that are consistent with the guidance contained in Generic Letter 83-36. Therefore, we conclude that the proposed TSs for torus water level monitors are acceptable.

6. Drywell Hydrogen Monitor (II.F.1.6)

The licensee installed drywell hydrogen monitors that provide the capability required by TMI Action Plan Item II.F.1.6. The proposed Technical Specifications contain appropriate limiting conditions of operation and surveillance for these monitors. We conclude that the proposed TSs are acceptable as they meet the intent of the guidance contained in Generic Letter 83-36.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

These amendments involve a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area. The staff has determined that these amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts 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. 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, safety and interest 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.

ENCLOSURE 2

SALP INPUT FOR QUAD CITIES UNITS 1 AND 2

Our review involved the evaluation of the licensee's response to Generic Letter 83-36. Management involvement in assuring the quality of the response was above average. The licensee discussed each item in sufficient detail for performing the evaluation. The licensee has followed our guidelines provided in Generic Letter 83-36. No further communication with the licensee was necessary. Other criteria considered in SALP are not applicable to the scope of our review.

Overall performance of the licensee for responding to Generic Letter 83-36 is considered to be above average.