



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NOS. 88 AND 61 TO FACILITY OPERATING
LICENSE NOS. DPR-70 AND DPR-75
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY
DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY
SALEM GENERATING STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-272 AND 50-311

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated May 3, 1988, Public Service Electric & Gas Company requested an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-70 and DPR-75 for the Salem Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The proposed amendments would change Technical Specification (T/S) 4.8.2.5.2.e to remove the requirement to perform both a battery service test and a battery performance discharge test during certain plant shutdowns. Under the existing battery surveillance, the licensee is required to perform:

- 1) The battery service test (T/S 4.8.2.5.2.d), which demonstrates if the battery will meet the design requirements (battery duty cycle) of the DC system. This test is performed as part of the preoperational and periodic DC system tests every 18 months during refueling, or whenever there is any DC system change.
- 2) The battery performance discharge test (T/S 4.8.2.5.2.e), which determines if the battery is still within acceptable limits relative to its original design capacity. This test is performed as a part of the battery acceptance test every 60 months (approx. every third outage).

According to the above requirements, these tests have to be performed consecutively every 60 months. The licensee contends that the battery performance discharge test demonstrates whether the battery is within acceptable limits relative to its original design capacity as well as the original design requirements. Since the battery performance discharge test (60 month test) encompasses the battery service test, the licensee has concluded that a separate service test is not required at the interval when the discharge test is performed and has revised the Technical Specifications to that end. In addition, the service test adds an extra week to the outage schedule.

2.0 EVALUATION AND SUMMARY

The staff has reviewed the information and concurs with the licensee that the proposed change is acceptable and that it has no impact on the operability of the batteries. In fact, the subject change is consistent with the existing standard T/S provision "once per 60 month interval, this performance discharge test may be performed in lieu of the battery service test." Therefore, the staff concludes that the proposed T/S 4.8.2.5.2.e is acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments involve a change to a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes to the surveillance requirements. 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 issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the 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 the amendments.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (53 FR 28294) on July 27, 1988 and consulted with the State of New Jersey. No public comments were received and the State of New Jersey did not have any comments.

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 nor to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: D. Fischer

Dated: August 29, 1988