

August 23, 1983

Note to R. Hernon

SUBJECT: CRYSTAL RIVER - MANUAL TESTING FREQUENCY (OELD # 836 449)

The description of the amendment in the first paragraph of the SER and the description of the amendment to be put in the monthly notice should sound a little like the notice of proposed action published in connection with this amendment on July 25. I am attaching a xeroxed copy of the page from the Federal Register. Please have the description of the amendment in the as-issued package look somewhat closer to the description of the amendment as it was put out in the as-proposed package on July 25. If you and Mr. Karman can agree by phone on the language of the change, the package does not need to come back to ELD. However, immediately before the amendment is issued, check to see whether any petitions or comments were received. If so, come back to ELD before the amendment is issued. Do not issue before August 24, 1983.

*amb*  
for Joe Scinto

Attachment

cc w/attachment:  
M. Karman

8502090226 840518  
PDR FOIA  
ADAT084-166 PDR

14

of this policy guidance to dilute the engineering and accident assessment expertise on shift, but only to incorporate these qualifications in a member of the operating crew. In addition, total shift manning will need to be sufficient to provide staffing to handle emergency preparedness as discussed in Supplement 1 to NUREG-0737 (December 1982), "Requirements for Emergency Response Capability" (Generic Letter 82-33).

Licensees may apply for modification to their Technical Specifications or Safety Analysis Reports to eliminate the STA position, if they commit to providing a required Senior Operator on shift with the qualifications described in Alternative 2 above. Acceptance of such modifications will be subject to NRC finding that the proposal meets the intent of this policy statement. Special attention will be given to multi-unit sites with common control rooms and dual licensed senior operators with regard to the total number of licensed staff.

#### Invitation To Comment

Commissioner Roberts would like to receive public comments on the need for some form of "or equivalent" provision in the Policy Statement and the standards to be met in establishing equivalency.

Dated at Washington, DC, on this 19th day of July 1983.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Chilk,  
Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 83-20028 Filed 7-22-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-02

[Docket No. 50-302]

Florida Power Corp., et al.;  
Consideration of Issuance of  
Amendment to Facility Operating  
License and Proposed No Significant  
Hazards Consideration Determination  
and Opportunity for Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-72, issued to Florida Power Corporation, City of Alachua, City of Bushnell, City of Gainesville, City of Kissimmee, City of Leesburg, City of New Smyrna Beach and Utilities Commission, City of New Smyrna Beach, City of Ocala, Orlando Utilities Commission and City of Orlando, Sebring Utilities Commission, Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc., and the City of Tallahassee (the licensees), for operation of the Crystal River Unit No. 3 Nuclear Generating Plant (the

facility) located in Citrus County, Florida.

The proposed amendment would change the Crystal River Unit 3 Technical Specifications to increase the time interval between certain functional tests of engineered safeguards logic circuits on an interim basis until appropriate control circuit modifications can be made at Crystal River Unit 3. Specifically, the frequency of the channel functional test of the manual actuation portion of the engineered safeguards system would be changed from monthly to once each 18 months during plant shutdown. In addition, the scope of channel functional testing of several automatic actuation logic circuits would be revised to prevent undesirable operation of certain components during plant power operation. Alternate tests of these circuits would be specified which would accomplish the intended purpose of the testing but would result in eliminating undesirable consequences of performing the testing. The request for this change was made by the licensees' application for amendment dated January 14, 1983, and supplemented on January 20, 1983, July 6, 1983 and July 14, 1983.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment is not likely to (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of these standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of guidance regarding actions not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is a change which either may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of a previously analyzed accident or may reduce in some way a safety margin, but where the results of the change are clearly within all acceptable criteria with respect to the system or component specified in the Standard Review Plan. In this case, the licensees have requested approval to change the

frequency of certain channel functional tests involving manual and automatic actuation of logic circuits of the engineered safeguards including high pressure injection, low pressure injection, reactor building cooling and reactor building isolation. Although the actuation circuit design allows testing of individual initiation signals, the system design does not permit on line testing in many cases without actuating the system and imposing potential adverse consequences on the reactor systems. Consideration of this amendment request required an assessment of the potential adverse effects of performing these tests on a less frequent basis as compared to performing the testing as currently specified. The revised test frequencies approved by this amendment are based on the provisions for testing permitted by Section D.4 of Regulatory Guide 1.22 where actuated equipment is not tested during reactor operation and will be consistent with test frequencies included in Standard Technical Specifications. Specifically, Position D.4 of Regulatory Guide 1.22 excludes the requirement to test actuated equipment during reactor operation where such action could adversely affect safety or operability of the plant, the probability of protection system failure is acceptably low without such testing, and it can be routinely tested when the reactor is shutdown. The NRC staff requested the licensee to indicate what experience they have had on failure of these types from tests that had been conducted since the plant went into commercial operation in early 1977. Based on a review of the testing and maintenance history of these systems, no failures were identified to have occurred in the logic matrix relay contacts or associated wiring. Therefore, the staff concludes that the provisions of Section D.4 of Regulatory Guide 1.22 are met with the licensees proposed interim surveillance test program. The staff has required testing of all channels in the automatic logic circuits by the licensee before restart from the current refueling outage.

Interim relief for testing of these items was given in License Amendment No. 61 dated January 24, 1983 for the period January 24, 1983 through the end of Fuel Cycle 4 (March 1983). The licensees have committed to a long-range program to install circuit modifications where possible, to enable complete testing during power operation. Therefore, the Commission proposes to determine that the amendment will involve no significant hazards considerations.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed