GPU Nuclear

GPU Nuclear
100 Interpace Parkway
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054
201 263-6500
TELEX 136-482
Writer's Direct Dial Number:

April 14, 1986

Director
Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Sir:

Subject: Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Docket No. 50-219
Technical Specification Change Request No. 143

Pursuant to 10CFR50.90, GPU Nuclear Corporation, operator of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16, requests a change to Appendix A of that license.

The subject Technical Specification Change Request would revise the excess flow check valve surveillance requirements of Section 4.5.0. This change will facilitate plant operation by removing technically unnecessary requirements and adding a new surveillance requirement for instrument line excess flow check valves.

This change request has been reviewed and approved by the Plant Review Group (PRG) and has received an Independent Safety Review (ISR) in accordance with Section 6.5 of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Technical Specifications.

We request that the license amendment be issued by August 1, 1986. We further request that the effective date for implementation be 60 days after approval and issuance of the license amendment in order to revise and approve the affected surveillance procedures. This desired schedule will allow the proposed changes to be implemented in time for operation in Cycle 11.

A001 1/1 w/check $300.00 # 206224

Pursuant to 10CFR50.91(b)(1), a copy of this change request has been sent to the State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. In addition, pursuant to 10CFR170.12, a check for $300.00 is attached to cover the fee required for review of this application for license amendment and Technical Specification Change Request No. 144 which will be submitted in the near future.

Very truly yours,

Peter B. Fiedler
Vice President and Director
Oyster Creek

PBF:gpa
2791f
Attachment

cc: Dr. Thomas E. Murley, Administrator
Region I
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mr. Jack N. Donohew, Jr., Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
7920 Norfolk Avenue
Phillips Building, Mail Stop #314
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

NRC Resident Inspector
Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Forked River, N. J. 08731

GPU NUCLEAR CORPORATION
OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

Provisional Operating
License No. DPR-16

Technical Specification
Change Request No. 143
Docket No. 50-219

Applicant submits by this Technical Specification Change Request No. 143 to the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Technical Specifications, changes to Section 4.5.0.

By _____
Peter B. Fiedler
Vice President & Director
Oyster Creek

Sworn and Subscribed to before me this 14th day of April 1986.

Diana A. Maldet
A Notary Public of N. J.
DIANA A. MALDET
A Notary Public of New Jersey
My Commission Expires June 5, 1986

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the matter of)
GPU Nuclear Corporation)

Docket No. 50-219

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of Technical Specification Change Request No. 143 for Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Technical Specifications filed with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission on April 14, 1986 has this day of April 14, 1986, been served on the Mayor of Lacey Township, Ocean County, New Jersey by deposit in the United States mail, addressed as follows:

The Honorable, Christopher Connor
Mayor of Lacey Township
818 West Lacey Road
Forked River, N. J. 08731

By _____
Peter B. Fiedler
Vice President & Director
Oyster Creek

GPU Nuclear

GPU Nuclear
100 Interpace Parkway
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054
201 263-6500
TELEX 136-482
Writer's Direct Dial Number

April 14, 1986

The Honorable Christopher Connor
Mayor of Lacey Township
818 West Lacey Road
Forked River, New Jersey 08731

Dear Mayor Connor:

Enclosed herewith is one copy of Technical Specification Change Request No. 143 for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Operating License.

This document was filed with the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission on April 14, 1986 .

Very truly yours,

Peter B. Fiedler
Vice President & Director
Oyster Creek

OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION
Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16
Docket No. 50-219
Technical Specification Change Request No. 143

Applicant hereby requests the Commission to change Appendix A to the above captioned license as follows, and, pursuant to 10CFR50.91, an analysis concerning significant hazards considerations is provided:

1. Section to be changed

   4.5.0

2. Extent of change

   Change section 4.5.0 to revise the surveillance requirements for excess flow check valves in instrument lines penetrating containment as below:

   Delete: Venting an instrument or instrument line.
   Isolating an instrument.

   Add: Venting an unisolated instrument or instrument line.
   Installation of a new instrument or instrument line.

3. Change requested

   Replace page 4.5-6 of Section 4.5.0 with attached changed page 4.5-6.

4. Discussion

   The proposed change to Technical Specifications will modify Section 4.5 Paragraph 'O' surveillance requirements for excess flow check valves (EFCV) in instrument lines penetrating containment.

   The purpose of this change request is to revise the open position verification requirements for the EFCVs after an instrument or instrument line is tested, calibrated or vented.

   The following changes are proposed to the conditions for excess flow check valve open position verification.

   Delete Venting an instrument or instrument line.
   Isolating an instrument.

   Add Venting an unisolated instrument or instrument line.
   Installation of a new instrument or instrument line.

The procedures employed in isolating an instrument for testing or calibration does not produce flow disturbances. The instrument is first isolated by closing the isolation valves and returned to service still filled with process fluid before the isolation valves are cracked open.

Similarly, venting an isolated instrument or instrument line does not create a significant flow disturbance as the valves are slightly cracked open to vent air and then closed.

It is proven by surveillance and established by design that it requires approximately 2 gpm flow to close an EFCV. It is concluded that isolating and subsequently unisolating an instrument or instrument line and venting an isolated instrument or instrument line will not cause enough flow to close the EFCV.

The once per cycle requirement for an isolation test (EFCV functional test) is also performed, which includes a subsequent open position verification test and is adequate to ensure correct positioning and valve operability.

Considering the above, the surveillance requirements for EFCV open position verification is not required each time an instrument or instrument line is isolated. This change will reduce surveillance time, improve plant availability and reduce radiation exposure to personnel.

Venting an unisolated instrument or instrument line may create a flow disturbance. Putting a new instrument or instrument line in service may also create a flow disturbance since, initially, the inlet line will not be filled with process fluid. Therefore, the excess flow check valve will require open position verification for these conditions and these conditions will be added to the Technical Specifications.

This change will not affect the safety of the plant, since no system design, configuration or hardware change will be made. This change will not increase the potential for radioactive discharge to the atmosphere, since closing of the EFCV in case of high flow (approximately 2gpm) will prevent discharge of fluid.

5. Determination

We have determined that this change request involves no significant hazards considerations in that operation of the Oyster Creek plant in accordance with the proposed amendment will not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated as surveillance experience and practice indicates sufficient flow cannot be achieved, by isolating an instrument/instrument line or venting an isolated instrument/instrument line, to close an EFCV; or

2. Create the probability of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated since this request involves no system design, configuration or hardware change; or

3. Involve a significant reduction in margin of safety because remaining surveillance requirements are adequate to ensure EFCV operability and correct positioning.

In addition, the proposed change remains compatible with, and in some respects more restrictive than, the BWR Standard Technical Specifications, NUREG 0123, Revision 3.