



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-38

LOUISIANA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3

DOCKET NO. 50-382

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application dated March 31, 1988, Louisiana Power and Light Company (LP&L or the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (Appendix A to Facility Operating License No. NPF-38) for Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3. The proposed changes would replace the 31 day Channel Functional Test and 92 day Channel Calibration of the Hydrogen Analyzer with a 31 day channel calibration. The June 2, 1988 letter reinstated the sample gas concentration and no change is currently proposed on gas concentration.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee has replaced the hydrogen analyzers at Waterford, Unit 3 in order to resolve long standing problems with moisture in the sample lines. The new analyzers are qualified to IEEE 323-1974 and IEEE 344-1975. The system is Class 1E and system components are seismically qualified and designed to operate within the environmental conditions expected following a large break loss of coolant accident.

The manufacturer of the new system, however, has recommended a 31 day Channel Calibration which would encompass the current requirement for a 31 day Channel Functional Test and 92 day Calibration. The licensee is not proposing changes to the sample gas concentration to accomplish the calibration. On the basis that the only change proposed is the more restrictive 31 day Channel Calibration and no other change is proposed, we find the change is acceptable.

3.0 CONTACT WITH STATE OFFICIAL

The NRC staff has advised the Administrator, Nuclear Energy Division, Office of Environmental Affairs, State of Louisiana of the proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration. No comments were received.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION:

The amendment relates to changes in installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has 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, the 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.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Based upon its evaluation of the proposed changes to the Waterford 3 Technical Specifications, the staff has concluded that: there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public. The staff, therefore, concludes that the proposed changes are acceptable, and are hereby incorporated into the Waterford 3 Technical Specifications.

Dated: August 17, 1988

Principal Contributor: D. Wigginton