



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 20 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-57

PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-354

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated March 7, 1988, Public Service Electric & Gas Company (PSE&G) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-57 for the Hope Creek Generating Station. The proposed amendment would delete license condition 2.C.(3). License condition 2.C.(3) granted relief from certain pump and valve testing requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a(g) as requested in the Hope Creek Inservice Testing (IST) Program, Revision 0, dated July 12, 1987, until April 11, 1988 or until a detailed review of this Revision 0 IST Program was completed, whichever came first.

By letter dated September 21, 1987, prior to completion of the staff's review of the Revision 0, Hope Creek IST Program, PSE&G submitted Revision 1 to this IST Program. The Revision 1 IST Program superseded the Revision 0 IST Program in its entirety. The Revision 0 IST Program incorporated the requirements of the 1980 Edition of ASME Code Section XI through the 1981 Winter Addenda. The Revision 1 IST Program incorporated the requirements of the 1983 Edition of ASME Code Section XI through Summer 1983 Addenda. It deleted some of the Revision 0 Program relief requests and added some new relief requests. It also deleted some components that were included in the Revision 0 Program and incorporated some additional components not previously identified with the program.

The staff and its consultant, EG&G, Idaho, performed a preliminary review of the Revision 1 Program, with emphasis on requests for relief from the Code requirements. The purpose of the preliminary review was to provide an assessment of the acceptability of Revision 1 to the Hope Creek IST Program for the period of time until the staff's review of the Revision 1 IST Program is completed.

Based on this preliminary review, the staff concluded that PSE&G should follow the Revision 1 Hope Creek IST program to establish pump and valve operability. By letters to the licensee dated December 7, 1987 and February 23, 1988, the staff granted interim relief for all except 5 of

the Revision 1 IST Program relief requests until the staff review of the Revision 1 IST Program is completed.

## 2.0 EVALUATION

Since the Revision 0 IST Program dated July 12, 1985 was acceptably superseded in its entirety by the Revision 1 IST Program dated September 21, 1987, License Condition 2.C.(3) which refers the Revision 0 IST Program is no longer appropriate. On this basis, we conclude that the proposed deletion of license condition 2.C.(3) is acceptable.

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves 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 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.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (53 FR 20045) on June 1, 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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security nor to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: G. Rivenbark

Dated: October 26, 1988