UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

JCM

RECEIVED

June 1, 1972

JUN 6 AM 11

Docket No. 50-219

COMM.
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
REACTOR SAFEGUARDS

Dr. Chester P. Siess
Chairman, Advisory Committee
on Reactor Safeguards
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Dr. Siess:

Sixteen (16) copies of the following are transmitted for the Committee's information:

Letter from Jersey Central Power & Light Company dated May 26, 1972, transmitting the following: (1) Amendment No. 69 to the Oyster Creek Station Facility Description and Safety Analysis Report, and (2) Change Request No. 12 to the Oyster Creek Technical Specifications.

Sincerely,

Donald J. Skovholt

Donald J. Skovholt
Assistant Director
for Operating Reactors
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosures:
As stated above

3/27/50

[redacted]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 155 CATEGORY B

Oyster Creek June 30, 1972

WRS & ACRS Containment Spray Out of Service

Jersey Central Power & Light Company letter dated May 17, 1972 formally submits the request contained in their TWX of the same date (see Supplement No. 154, page 60). AEC letter dated May 18, 1972 approves the request.

No ACRS action is recommended.

The enclosed material should be retained and the TWX dated May 17, 1972 may be discarded.

(JCM)

WRS & ACRS Core Physics Calculations

Jersey Central Power & Light Company letter dated May 26, 1972 forwards Amendment No. 69 to the FSAR answering questions contained in AEC letter dated April 25, 1972 (see Supplement No. 153, page 48). In addition, Proposed Change No. 12 to the Tech Specs is submitted to make plant safety system operation consistent with the analyses of Amendment No. 69.

A review of the previously submitted transient analysis was done in support of the request for the Cycle 2 core reload. This consisted of a review of the parameter changes for the reload core and a comparison of these parameters with those used in previous analysis. The original conservatisms in the earlier transient analyses were sufficient to cover the minor changes attributed to the reload core. During this review for the Cycle 2 reload at Oyster Creek, it became apparent that a significant change in the shape of the scram reactivity insertion curve is required in order to ensure conservatism throughout core life. However, since the reanalysis of the transients considering this new scram reactivity insertion curve was not completed, and since operation without consideration of this change would not result in exceeding safety limits even if a transient did occur, the review of the transients for the reload did not include this change. As stated in the submittal, the comparison between Cycle 2 core dynamic characteristics and the characteristics of the core used in the Amendment 65 transient analysis resulted in no significant changes. The requested back-up information is included in this submission.

[redacted]

OFFICE ▶	ACRS				
SURNAME ▶	JCM:bjw				
DATE ▶	6/30/72				

[redacted]

SUPPLEMENT NO. 155 CATEGORY B

Oyster Creek Continued

The principal changes in the Tech Specs involve the lowering of the pressure setpoint on the electromatic relief valves to 1070 psig and the slightly improved control rod scram times to 90% in 5 sec. This is needed to be consistent with the new assumptions used in the transient reanalyses and is discussed in detail in Amendment 69 to the Oyster Creek FDSAR. The setpoints for the High Reactor Pressure Scram and the High Reactor Pressure initiation of the Isolation Condenser are also being changed to 1060 psig.

No ACRS action is recommended.

The enclosed amendment should be incorporated into your copy of the FSAR and the proposed change to the Tech Specs retained pending Regulatory Staff action.

(JCM)

OFFICE ▶						
SURNAME ▶						
DATE ▶		[redacted]				