



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 54 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-9
AND AMENDMENT NO. 35 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-17
DUKE POWER COMPANY
McGUIRE NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

INTRODUCTION

On February 21, 1985, the NRC staff issued its Safety Evaluation Report (SER) on the Westinghouse Technical Specification Optimization Program for increased surveillance intervals and out-of-service times for testing and maintenance of the Reactor Trip System (RTS). The Optimization Program proposal was set forth in WCAP-10271, "Evaluation of Surveillance Frequencies and Out-of-Service Times for Reactor Protection Instrumentation System," and Supplement 1 thereto.

By letter dated July 22, 1985, Duke Power Company (the licensee) proposed several changes to the McGuire Technical Specifications based on the Optimization Program. One of these proposed changes, which sought to allow RTS analog channel testing in a bypassed condition instead of a tripped condition, was withdrawn by a subsequent letter from the licensee, dated September 11, 1985. The remaining proposed changes have been evaluated by the NRC staff. Those which we find acceptable are the subject of this evaluation report and are included in these amendments.

EVALUATION

These amendments increase, from one to six hours, the time during which an inoperable RTS analog channel may be maintained in an untripped condition (See Table 3.3-1, Action Statements 2a and 6a in the revised Technical Specifications). The time an inoperable RTS analog channel may be bypassed to allow testing of another channel in the same function is increased from two to four hours (See Table 3.3-1, Action Statements 2b and 6b in the revised Technical Specifications). A cautionary note is added to the action statements referencing the more stringent requirements for Engineering Safety Feature Actuation System (ESFAS) channels for RTS analog channels common to ESFAS (See Table 3.3-1, Functional Units 9, 10, and 13 and Note ***). We find these changes to be consistent with those which we reviewed and accepted for the Optimization Program proposal. Therefore, the staff finds these changes acceptable on the bases set forth in the staff's February 21, 1985, SER.

The amendments delete Action Statement 7 and substitute a reference to Action Statement 6 for those reactor trip channels which referenced Action Statement 7 (See Table 3.3-1, Functional Units 11, 12 and 16a in the revised Technical Specifications). This change, is discussed in Supplement 1 to WCAP-10271, and results from the similarity and the intent of Action Statements 6 and 7. Further, the staff in a July 24, 1985, letter from Harold R. Denton to L. B. Butterfield identified this to be a specific acceptable revision in the model technical specifications provided to the Westinghouse Owners Group (WOG). On this basis, the staff finds this change acceptable as proposed by the licensee.

The amendments revise Bases Sections 3/4.3.1 and 3/4.3.2 to include a discussion of WCAP-10271. We find the revised Bases, as proposed in the licensee's letter of September 11, 1985, to be equivalent to those in the "WOG Guidance for Preparation of Submittals Requesting Revisions to RPS Technical Specifications," Revision 1, dated September 3, 1985, and that the revised Bases encompass the specific comments in the staff's July 24, 1985, letter. Therefore, the revised Bases are acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendments involve a change in use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and a change in 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 exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration, and there have been no public comments on such findings. 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.

CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (50 FR 51622) on December 18, 1985, and consulted with the state of North Carolina. No public comments were received, and the state of North Carolina did not have any comments.

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

Principal Contributors: Darl S. Hood, PWR#4
Fred Burrows, EICSB
Richard Emch, TOSB

Dated: April 4, 1986

DATED: April 7, 1986

AMENDMENT NO.54 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-9 - McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1
AMENDMENT NO.35 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NPF-17 - McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 2

DISTRIBUTION:

~~Docket File 50-369/370~~

- NRC PDR
- Local PDR
- PRC System
- NSIC
- PWR#4 R/F
- BYoungblood R/F
- MDuncan
- DHood
- HThompson
- OELD
- JPartlow
- BGrimes
- EJordan
- LHarmon
- WJones
- TBarnhart (8)
- ACRS (10)
- OPA
- LFMB
- VBenaroya
- FBurrows, EICSB
- REmch