

INDEX

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF PAGES</u>
Average Daily Unit Power Level	1
Operating Data Report	2
Refueling Information	1
Monthly Operating Summary	1
Summary of Changes, Tests, and Experiments.	6

AVERAGE DAILY UNIT POWER LEVEL

DOCKET NO. 50-354
 UNIT Hope Creek
 DATE 12/15/92
 COMPLETED BY V. Zabielski
 TELEPHONE (609) 339-3506

VZ

MONTH November 1992

DAY AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL
(MWe-Net)

1. 0
 2. 0
 3. 0
 4. 0
 5. 0
 6. 0
 7. 0
 8. 0
 9. 0
 10. 100
 11. 287
 12. 485
 13. 928
 14. 1089
 15. 1062
 16. 1072

DAY AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL
(MWe-Net)

17. 1069
 18. 1069
 19. 1068
 20. 1066
 21. 1063
 22. 1034
 23. 1043
 24. 1051
 25. 1063
 26. 1059
 27. 1062
 28. 1068
 29. 1059
 30. 1073
 31. N/A

OPERATING DATA REPORT

DOCKET NO. 50-354
 UNIT Hope Creek
 DATE 12/15/92
 COMPLETED BY V. Zabielski
 TELEPHONE (609) 339-3506

VZ

OPERATING STATUS

1. Reporting Period November 1992 Gross Hours in Report Period 720
2. Currently Authorized Power Level (Mwt) 3293
 Max. Depend. Capacity (MWe-Net) 1031
 Design Electrical Rating (MWe-Net) 1067

3. Power Level to which restricted (if any) (MWe-Net) None

4. Reasons for restriction (if any)

	<u>This Month</u>	<u>Yr To Date</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>
5. No. of hours reactor was critical	<u>584.0</u>	<u>6388.5</u>	<u>43,549.8</u>
6. Reactor reserve shutdown hours	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
7. Hours generator on line	<u>497.8</u>	<u>6239.8</u>	<u>42,814.3</u>
8. Unit reserve shutdown hours	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
9. Gross thermal energy generated (MWH)	<u>1,485,775</u>	<u>19,994,138</u>	<u>135,991,281</u>
10. Gross electrical energy generated (MWH)	<u>498,850</u>	<u>6,644,440</u>	<u>44,996,934</u>
11. Net electrical energy generated	<u>472,323</u>	<u>6,332,581</u>	<u>42,984,130</u>
12. Reactor service factor	<u>81.1</u>	<u>79.5</u>	<u>83.5</u>
13. Reactor availability factor	<u>81.1</u>	<u>79.5</u>	<u>83.5</u>
14. Unit service factor	<u>69.1</u>	<u>77.6</u>	<u>82.1</u>
15. Unit availability factor	<u>69.1</u>	<u>77.6</u>	<u>82.1</u>
16. Unit capacity factor (using MDC)	<u>63.6</u>	<u>76.4</u>	<u>79.9</u>
17. Unit capacity factor (Using Design MWe)	<u>61.5</u>	<u>73.8</u>	<u>77.4</u>
18. Unit forced outage rate	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>4.7</u>
19. Shutdowns scheduled over next 6 months (type, date, & duration): None			
20. If shutdown at end of report period, estimated date of start-up: N/A			

OPERATING DATA REPORT
UNIT SHUTDOWNS AND POWER REDUCTIONS

DOCKET NO. 50-354
 UNIT Hope Creek
 DATE 12/15/92
 COMPLETED BY V. Zabielski
 TELEPHONE (609) 339-3506

MONTH November 1992

NC.	DATE	TYPE F=FORCED S=SCHEDULED	DURATION (HOURS)	REASON (1)	METHOD OF SHUTTING DOWN THE REACTOR OR REDUCING POWER (2)	CORRECTIVE ACTION/COMMENTS
9	11/1	S	222.2	C	4	Continuation of 4th Refueling Outage

Summary

REFUELING INFORMATION

DOCKET NO. 50-354
 UNIT Hope Creek
 DATE 12/15/92
 COMPLETED BY S. Hollingsworth
 TELEPHONE (609) 339-1051

MONTH November 1992

1. Refueling information has changed from last month:
 Yes No
2. Scheduled date for next refueling: 3/5/94
3. Scheduled date for restart following refueling: 4/23/94
4. A. Will Technical Specification changes or other license amendments be required?
 Yes No
- B. Has the Safety Evaluation covering the COLR been reviewed by the Station Operating Review Committee?
 Yes No
 If no, when is it scheduled? 2/18/94
5. Scheduled date(s) for submitting proposed licensing action: N/A
6. Important licensing considerations associated with refueling:
 - Highly likely that will use same or similar fresh fuel as current cycle: no new considerations.
7. Number of Fuel Assemblies:

A. Incore	764
B. In Spent Fuel Storage (prior to refueling)	1008
C. In Spent Fuel Storage (after refueling)	<u>1232 to 1264</u>
8. Present licensed spent fuel storage capacity: 4006
 Future spent fuel storage capacity: 4006
9. Date of last refueling that can be discharged to spent fuel pool assuming the present licensed capacity: 11/4/ 2010
 (EOC16)
 (does not allow for full-core offload)
 (this item not expected to be updated before January 1993)

HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

MONTHLY OPERATING SUMMARY

NOVEMBER 1992

The 4th Refueling Outage began on September 12 and continued throughout the month of October. On November 6, the reactor was taken critical. On November 10 at 1334, the unit was put on line, ending the refueling outage. The unit operated for the remainder of the month without experiencing any shutdowns or reportable power reductions. As of November 30, the plant had been on line for 20 consecutive days.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES, TESTS, AND EXPERIMENTS
FOR THE HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

NOVEMBER 1992

The following items have been evaluated to determine:

1. If the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the safety analysis report may be increased; or
2. If a possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the safety analysis report may be created; or
3. If the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any technical specification is reduced.

The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations showed that these items did not create a new safety hazard to the plant nor did they affect the safe shutdown of the reactor. These items did not change the plant effluent releases and did not alter the existing environmental impact. The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations determined that no unreviewed safety or environmental questions are involved.

TMRDescription of Safety Evaluation

92-027

This TMR installed electrical jumpers across the #2 Feedwater Heater High High Level Trip Switches. These switches cause spurious high level trip signals during low power levels. The jumpers were removed after the level signals stabilized.

The Feedwater system is not safety related and is not required to be operable following a LOCA, other than for containment isolation. Failure of the Feedwater system does not compromise any safety related system or components. This TMR has no impact on the containment isolation function of the Feedwater system. Therefore, this TMR does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

92-029

This TMR installed instrumentation on four Reactor Vessel Level Reference Leg Condensate Chambers to provide temperature monitoring. This TMR was initiated in response to NRC Generic Letter 92-04, concerning possible non-condensable gas accumulation with the transmitter reference legs. The objective of the TMR is to measure the external surface temperatures of the top and bottom walls of the condensate chambers.

An insulation pad was used to prevent heat transfer between the two thermocouples. It was also determined that this TMR has no impact on loading. The addition of external thermocouples does not have any affect on the internal operation of the condensate chambers. Therefore, this TMR does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

92-030

This TMR removed the overload heaters from the breakers for the Reactor Water Cleanup Discharge to Condenser Valve and the Reactor Water Cleanup Discharge to Equipment Drain Valve. Removing the overload heaters from the breakers will prevent the valves from inadvertently opening during an Appendix R fire.

Disabling these valves, along with the overhead annunciator, does not prevent their associated systems from performing their designed functions. Also, the UFSAR discusses the Appendix R requirement that the valves be disabled. Therefore, this TMR does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

DR

Description of Deficiency Report

HMT 92-216

This DR addresses the "use-as-is" disposition of an elbow on a drain line back to the 'C' Condenser. Portions of the elbow have a wall thickness of less than the allowable thickness plus a conservative safety factor.

There are no equipment or components important to safety located in the area that could be affected by a failure of the line. The High Pressure Coolant Injection and Reactor Core Isolation Cooling Drain Pots that this line serves isolate on an initiation signal. The failure of this elbow will not prevent the High Pressure Coolant Injection and Reactor Core Isolation Cooling Systems from operating. Therefore, the "use-as-is" disposition of this DR does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

Procedure
Revision

Description of Safety Evaluation

HC.OP-IS.KL-0101(Q)
Rev. 7

These procedure revisions change the position of the isolation valves for the Suppression Chamber/Vacuum Breaker Gas Supply Line from open to closed when the gas line is not being used to test the vacuum breakers. This change will help to eliminate the possibility of water intrusion into Primary Containment Instrument Gas affecting the vacuum breakers.

HC.OP-IS.KL-0102(Q)
Rev. 7

The realignment of these valves does not in any way affect the operation of the system or its response to accident conditions. Control of these valves is still available from the Control Room. The closed position is conservative because that is the accident position for these valves. Therefore, these procedure revisions did not involve Unreviewed Safety Questions.

NC.NA-AP.ZZ-0048(Q)
Rev. 1

This procedure revision affects the administrative controls for the portion of the performance monitoring program that relates to component monitoring. This revision was initiated in response to the 1991 INPO assessment of Salem Nuclear Generating Station.

This procedure revision enhances the process and does not change the intent of the administrative controls for performance monitoring as described in the UFSAR. Therefore, this procedure revision does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

UFSAR Section

12.3

Description of Safety Evaluation

The symbol used to designate resin fill cover plates on a Shielding and Radiation Zoning drawing is similar to the symbol used to designate Area Radiation Monitor locations on Shielding and Radiation Zoning drawings. This UFSAR Change Notice deletes the Area Radiation Monitor location symbols from figures and revises to identify reference instrument location drawings.

No changes were made to Radiation Monitoring System equipment. The change does not affect the operation of the Radiation Monitoring System. Therefore, this change does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.