



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 29 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-47

GULF STATES UTILITIES COMPANY

RIVER BEND STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-458

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 5, 1988, Gulf States Utilities Company (GSU) (the licensee) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-47 for the River Bend Station, Unit 1. The proposed amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TSs) to revise the definition of core alteration to exclude the normal movement (including replacement) of local power range monitors (LPRMs) from this definition.

2.0 EVALUATION

Technical Specification Definition 1.7, CORE ALTERATION, currently does not consider normal movement of the source range monitors, intermediate range monitors, traversing in-core probes, or special moveable detectors to be considered a core alteration. This change request would provide the same exclusion for LPRMs.

River Bend Station is a BWR/6 boiling water reactor which incorporates certain design changes compared to earlier boiling water reactors. One of these changes is the introduction of a dry tube that houses the LPRM strings. The dry tubes extend from the bottom of the reactor pressure vessel vertically to the top of the core. Thus, removal and installation of the LPRMs from underneath the reactor pressure vessel can be accomplished without the removal of the reactor vessel head and fuel does not need to be moved from around the dry tube for maintenance or replacement of LPRMs. The LPRM strings are only removed from the core when they are being replaced and they have no normal drive mechanisms. Based on the above discussion, the staff concludes that the exclusion of the LPRMs in the definition of core alteration is acceptable.

With the modification of the definition of core alteration discussed above, the footnote excepting replacement of LPRM strings applicable to Action 3 and Action 9 of Table 3.3.1-1 is no longer necessary. The staff concludes that deletion of the footnote is acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The 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. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant

8810260045 881012
PDR ADOCK 05000458
P PDC

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 exposures. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the 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 Section 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 amendment.

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

Date: October 12, 1998

Principal Contributor: W. Paulson