



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 112 AND 115 TO  
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. DPR-24 AND DPR-27

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY  
POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2  
DOCKET NOS. 50-266 AND 50-301

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In a letter dated January 8, 1987, Wisconsin Electric Power Company (the licensee) submitted an application for amendments of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, licenses. The licensee's January 8, 1987 application was supplemented by letters dated June 8 and October 16, 1987. The purpose of the amendments was to make a number of changes to the Technical Specifications including:

1. changing the number of channels indicated in Technical Specification Table 15.3.5-5, Item 10, "Containment Hydrogen Monitors", from four to two;
2. modify Technical Specification Table 15.3.5-2, "Instrument Operation Conditions for Reactor Trip," to accurately indicate the number of channels required for a reactor trip;
3. changing the term "zero power physics testing" to "low power physics testing" in a footnote to Technical Specification Table 15.3.5-2.

2.0 EVALUATION

Technical Specification Table 15.3.5-5, Item 10, "Containment Hydrogen Monitors," currently specifies that each Point Beach unit has four containment hydrogen monitor channels, one of which must be operable. In its amendment request, the licensee proposed that Table 15.3.5-5, Item 10, be revised to specify that each Point Beach unit has two containment hydrogen monitor channels, one of which must be operable.

On November 1, 1983, the NRC issued Generic Letter 83-17, "NUREG-0737 Technical Specifications," which provided guidance on the Technical Specifications required for TMI items scheduled for implementation after December 31, 1981. The Generic Letter listed the acceptable number of independent containment hydrogen monitor channels as two. In response to this Generic Letter, the licensee submitted an amendment application (dated December 16, 1983)

listing the "No. of Channels" for containment hydrogen monitors as four, and "Minimum Operable Channels" as one. Four channels were installed to permit two channels to be removed from service for calibration during operation. This change was approved by the staff in a letter dated July 18, 1985. Subsequently, the licensee has determined that the monitors could be calibrated onsite during annual refueling outages. Accordingly, the licensee has requested that the "No. of Channels," be reduced to two. This does not change the number of channels required to be operable.

The staff has reviewed this request and notes that with the revision of the "No. of Channels" from two to four, the licensee still meets the guidance contained in Generic Letter 83-37. The two "extra" monitors will be used as redundant hydrogen monitoring channels. Furthermore, in its October 16, 1987 letter, the licensee affirmed that the two channels required to be operable will be powered from independent power sources. The licensee also proposed an additional Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) Statement for the case in which only one monitor, of the two required, is operable. This LCO would require that the plant restore an inoperable monitor with an independent power supply to an operable status within 30 days, or be in hot shutdown within the next 6 hours. The proposed change is acceptable.

The licensee also proposed to revise Technical Specification Table 15.3.5-2, "Instrument Operation Conditions for Reactor Trip," Item 10, to correctly indicate the number of channels required for a trip. Specifically, the following changes would be made:

1. Under Column 2, "No. of Channels to Trip," change "2/loop (any loop)" to "2/loop (both loops)" for 10-50% F.P.;
2. Under Column 3, "Min. Operable Channels," "2" would be changed to "2/loop" for >50% F.P. (full power) and "1" would be changed to "1/loop" for 10-50% F.P.;
3. Under Column 4, "Minimum Degree of Redundancy," change "1" to "1/loop" for >50% F.P. and 10-50% F.P.

The Point Beach plants are two-loop Westinghouse plants. Each loop is monitored by three channels of instrumentation to detect low flow conditions. The plants were designed, and are operated so that the reactor will trip when either: (1) low flow is detected by two channels in one loop, either loop, when power is greater than 50%, or (2) low flow is detected by two channels in each loop when power is between 10 and 50%. Although this design is acceptable, Technical Specification Table 15.3.5-2, Item 10, does not accurately describe these conditions.

The changes proposed by the licensee and discussed above accurately describe these conditions. Change No. 1 removes the ambiguity regarding the number of channels, per loop, required for reactor trip at between 10 and 50% of reactor power. Change 2 removes the ambiguity regarding the minimum number of channels, per loop, required for various reactor power ranges. Change 3 removes the ambiguity regarding the minimum degree of redundancy, per loop, for various reactor power changes. These changes are acceptable.

The licensee proposed changing the term "zero power physics testing" to "low power physics testing" in a footnote to Technical Specification Table 15.3.5-2. The purpose of this change is to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications relative to power limitations during physics testing. The term "zero power" would be replaced with the better-established and understood "low power" term which is defined in Technical Specification 15.1.n. This change is acceptable.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments involve a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 or change an inspection or surveillance requirement. The staff has determined that the amendments involve 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 no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously published a proposed finding that these amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, these amendments meet 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 these amendments.

#### CONCLUSION

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

Principal Contributor: D. Wagner

Dated: March 2, 1988