



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 105 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-72
FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION, ET AL.
CRYSTAL RIVER UNIT NO. 3 NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT
DOCKET NO. 50-302

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 17, 1987, Florida Power Corporation (the licensee) proposed certain changes to the Crystal River Unit 3 Technical Specifications (TSs) concerning the containment air lock surveillance requirements (TS 4.6.1.3). These proposed changes update the plant Technical Specifications to reflect the exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J, paragraph III.D.1(b)(ii), which the staff granted the licensee on December 9, 1986. The exemption provided the licensee relief from the requirements to conduct a full pressure air lock leakage test by permitting substitution of an air lock seal test when the reactor is in cold shutdown (Mode 5) or refueling (Mode 6), and when no maintenance has been performed that could affect air lock sealing capabilities. A full pressure air lock leakage test will be performed at least once per 6 months and prior to establishing containment integrity following any maintenance that affects the air lock sealing capability.

In response to discussions with the staff (as discussed below), the licensee submitted a revised change to TS 4.6.1.3 by letter dated March 9, 1988. This letter did not alter, in any way, the staff's initial determination of no significant hazards considerations.

EVALUATION

In the February 17, 1987 letter, the licensee proposed to update the TS for containment air lock surveillance testing by requiring the performance of an air lock seal test in Modes 5 and 6 if the air lock doors had been opened. If the doors had not been opened, the licensee stated that the performance of the 6-month full pressure test was sufficient to demonstrate the overall sealing capabilities of the air lock. In addition, to ensure that air lock leakage continues to be within specified limits, an air lock leakage test at full pressure will be performed prior to establishing primary containment integrity whenever maintenance has been performed on the doors.

However, the TS surveillance requirements as represented in the licensee's February 17, 1987 letter did not specify that a seal leakage test will be performed on each door prior to ascending to Mode 4 when no maintenance has been performed. Appendix J of 10 CFR 50, paragraph III.D.2.(b)(ii) explicitly states that "air locks opened during periods when containment integrity is not required by the plant's technical specifications shall be tested at the end of such periods at not less than Pa." The exemption granted by the staff did not address this point, and the staff maintained that performance of a seal test before ascending to Mode 4 was required even when no maintenance was done that could affect the sealing capability. This issue was discussed with the licensee and they subsequently committed to add a paragraph to the TS incorporating this requirement, which was submitted by letter dated March 9, 1988.

The staff also raised the concern that paragraph "a" in the TS was not very clear. We requested that the licensee add a statement identifying that the seal leakage test be done after they have assured that the pressure has stabilized. The licensee agreed to add a clarifying sentence to that effect.

Based on the above, the staff concludes that the proposed TS is in conformance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix J and the approved exemption, and will adequately ensure containment air lock leak tightness. The staff therefore finds the proposed changes acceptable.

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 or changes to a surveillance requirement. We have 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 no 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

We have 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.

Dated: April 13, 1988

Principal Contributor:

A. Gill