



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO.87 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-24
AND AMENDMENT NO.92 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. 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 December 10, 1981, Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27. The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) for Point Beach Units 1 and 2 concerned changes to Section 15.3.7. These changes added limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements following previously approved modifications of the vital instrument power supplies which corrected an unacceptable arrangement of the 120V AC instrument bus supply system, discovered during the safety evaluation of plant changes resulting from IE Bulletin 79-06A (Post TMI Related Issues). Subsequently, Amendment Nos. 84 and 88 were issued by the Commission on April 30, 1984, to become effective upon completion of equipment installation but not later than December 31, 1984. At that time the modifications were scheduled to be completed by October 31, 1984.

In a letter dated June 26, 1984, the licensee stated that, even though there were unexpected delays in the delivery of Auxiliary Safety Instrument Panels (ASIPs) and air handling units for the new battery and equipment rooms, they expected to meet the scheduled completion date and that implementing procedures and training was expected to be completed by January 1, 1985.

In a letter dated June 29, 1984, in response to the staffs request for further reasons for the delays, the licensee submitted a detailed account of what had occurred to delay the receipt of the ASIPs and the air handling equipment and their efforts to expedite the delivery of equipment and its installation. The licensee requested an extension of the installation completion date to not later than December 31, 1984.

On September 25, 1984, the licensee stated that because of further installation delays they expected to complete the construction of the instrument bus upgrade by November 30, 1984, and since they did not know where they would be in the testing and checkout of the system on December 31, 1984, when Amendments 84 and 88 were to become effective, they requested a delay in the effective date of the amendments to March 1, 1985. This extension was to assure adequate time to operate the new system with a simulated load prior to sequentially switching in actual plant instrumentation channels.

8501140156 841227
PDR ADOCK 05000266
PDR
P

EVALUATION

During a site inspection on November 29-30, 1984, and December 5-7, 1984, the staff reviewed purchasing, receipt and installation records to confirm that the delays in purchase and installation warranted the extension of the effective date of the amendments. After review of the records and observation of the as-built equipment installation, the staff concludes that reasonable efforts were made to meet the October 31, 1984, installation date and that the installation is now essentially complete. Additionally, the licensee will have all the required TMI instrumentation energized from a reliable source of power by December 31, 1984. Further, the staff concludes that a reasonable period of time for checkout and systematic startup of the new system is warranted and the short extension of time will not increase the safety risks since the facilities have been operating satisfactorily for 14 years without these modifications. The staff also concludes that the effective date of March 1, 1984, is a reasonable period of time to complete the checks and tests providing that no adverse conditions of critical equipment are detected during startup.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20, and/or a change to the surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the amendment involves 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 not significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets 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 this amendment.

CONCLUSION

The staff has further 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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTORS

R. Mendez and K. R. Ridgway

Dated: December 27, 1984