	0PG1	P05-ZA-0002	Rev. 4	Page 3	8 of 44	
	100	CFR50.59 Evaluations				
Form 1	10CFR	50.59 Screening Form (Sam	ple)	Page 1 of 1		
	UFSAR CN		OTHER	n an den man an a	Name Concerns of the	
				distance in		
Вотн						
ORIGINATING DOCUM	IENT NO. Supplement to	USQE 96-0046		REV. NO. 0		
DESCRIPTION OF CHA	NGE					
mane evitorial changes (U WOWE DO-0040, 80080 1998	were clarification notes.(section A.1.II	and the summery)			
				х.		
	PI	RELIMINARY SCREENING	e nër para den në të në të së të		*	
1. Does the proposed	change represent a change to	the Plant Technical Specifications?		YES	NO	
	energe represent e cruige to	and many reconstruction operationation is r			\boxtimes	
2. Is an Unreviewed Safety Question known to be associated with the subject change?					\boxtimes	
NOTE: If "YES" to	either questions 1 or 2 refer to	0PGP05-ZN-0004.				
Does the proposed chan	ge represent.	a da Bia a con ch				
o. A criticipe to only co	ятеся в туродтарпісь, есітопаї с	or draming error?		\boxtimes		
 A change which is k Screening/USQE or 	dentical to and addressed in its NRC approved licensing subm	entirety by an existing approved 10CF hittal?	R50.59			
				\boxtimes		
A spare or replacem	ent part/component change wi	th an equivalent part/component?			57	
(See Section 2.3 for	a definition of equivalent)			L		
A configuration chan	nge within existing design speci	fications?		r~1	101	
(- 1)					Ø	
fall answers to the above fithe answer to any quest	e questions are "NO" perform th tion (3) through (6) is "YES" a fi	he final screening and mark N/A in the inal screening is not necessary.	approval blocks be	How.		
Provide a justification and	w and discard pages 2 and 3. references if any of items (3) t	hrough (6) is answered "YES".				
his change clarifies state	ements made in the original US	QE, these changes are editorial and do	oes not change the	basis of th	e original	
Notice and is bounded by	the original 50.59 evaluation.					
6						
spared by Frank Cox			5-20-97			
	1 former	Originator	-	Da	ite	
pproved by	es (12 au			5/22/97		
and the second se	Concerning and the second s	the second s	the second s	al al 15	and the second s	

Plant Operations Review Committee 30113351

· Z25

6 6 64 8 11

PORC REVIEW COVER SHEET

Driginating Document No.	USQE 96-0046	Revision No.	. 0
--------------------------	--------------	--------------	-----

TITLE Revise FHAR From Dual Train Protection To Single Train Protection

The PORC has reviewed this item and has determined that (check as appropriate) :

It ____ does NOT involve an UNREVIEWED EAFETY QUESTION.

It does does NOT adversely impact plant nuclear safety.

It ___ does ___ does NOT adversely impact the health and safety of plant personnel or the public.

It____ does ____ does NOT require further review by the Plant Mgr, the NSRB, or other individuals/groups. Plant Mgr _____ other, specify below.

REMARKS

The PORC recommends this item for:

DISAPPROVAL OTHER PORC MEETING NO. 95-069 APPROVAL DATE 10 23/96 Re Sigu Completed by Sechetary

This form, when completed, SHALL be retained in accordance with the retention requirements of the originating document.

	OPO	GP05-ZA-(002		Re	ev. 5	Page of	anna an amainn an ann an
	NUMBER OF STREET, STRE	10C7R50.59	Evaluations	-	and the second second second		A	
Form 2	Unreview	ed Safety Quest	tion Byaluation	n For	m (Sample)	and process descension	Page 1 o	14
Unreviewed Safety Ques	tion Evaluation #	96-0046	Rev. h	No	Û	Page	1 of	6
Originating Document:	OR 96-7692		B	ev. h	10.0		*	
NOTE: Atlach 10CFR50	.59 Screening For	n or Lloense C	Compliance P	lovie	w Form to	this USC	λE.	
TPNS #_N/A								
System two-letter design	ator or structure na	ime <u>N/A</u> UN	IIT 1 C	3	UNIT 2	C) 6	вотн 🖾	
JOTE: Use additional sh	eels as necessary	to provide the	bases.	eninine e	ngal di dimeningka katan kara		*	
A.1 I. Does the subject occurrence of an Analysis Report	t of this evaluation accident previous ?	Increase the p sty evaluated in	probability of n the Salety		YES		NO	
II. Does the subject	of this evaluation I	norease the or	onsequences					
of an accident pre Report? Bases: See attac	avlously evaluated	In the Salety /	Analysis		YES	Ø	NO	
III. Does the subject of a more of a	of this evaluation in halfunction of equip ted in the Safety A hed sheet.	ncrease the pr pment importa nalysis Repor	robability of nt to safety 1?	0	YES	Ø	NQ	
IV. Does the subject of of a malfunction o evaluated in the S Bases: See attack	of this evaluation in If equipment import afety Analysis Rej	crease the co tant to safety port?	insequences previously		YES	ß	NO	

et et j

A.1.I (continued)

The subject of this evaluation does not increase the probability of occurrence of an accident as evaluated in the FHAR. The accident of concern is a fire in any plant Fire Area which prevents the plant from achieving post fire safe shutdown. The probability of a plant fire is assumed by the FHAR to be "1.0", so the probability of a fire in the plant can not be increased. Appendix R, Section III.G requires that one train of equipment capable of achieving and maintaining post fire safe shutdown remain svallable, and this requirement will continue to be met. Since the subject of this evaluation does not impair the plant's ability to achieve and maintain post fire safe shutdown, the probability of an accident occurring which will prevent the plant from achieving post fire safe shutdown is not increased.

A.1.II

This evaluation shows no increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the FHAR. Post fire safe shutdown of the plant can be achieved for each Fire Area using credited equipment not affected by the fire. That is, at least one post fire safe shutdown pathway will remain available in all fire areas. The previous safe shutdown assessment reached a similar conclusion. There will be no increase in public dose due a fire in any Fire Area.

*An update to the STP PSA was performed on selected fire zones to determine the impact of removing Thermo-Lag on the postulated Fire Induced Core Damage Frequency (CDF) and the Fire Induced Large Early Release Frequency (LERF). The update concluded that *possible failures of Thermo-Lag barriers (will) have a negligible impact on the risk of core damage and large early release at STPGES.* Therefore, the consequences of a fire in any area are not increased.

A.1.III (continued)

As explained in item (1) above, the subject of this evaluation does not increase the probability of an accident as evaluated in the FHAR, and therefore it does not increase the probability of equipment malfunction. The equipment of concern in this evaluation is that equipment comprising the available pathway to post fire safe shutdown. Since one path remains available and free of fire damage, the probability of fire induced equipment malfunction adversely affecting post fire safe shutdown is not increased.

A.1.IV (continued)

As explained in item (2) above, the subject of this evaluation does not increase the consequences of equipment malfunction. Post fire safe shutdown can be achieved for all fire areas. No malfunction of the credited post fire safe shutdown pathway is postulated, cince it will remain free of fire damage. The potential adverse affects of fire induced malfunctions in the unprotected pathways have been considered in the safe shutdown analysis, and compensatory actions are taken when necessary. The plant's ability to achieve and maintain post fire safe shutdown is not adversely affected.

Reviewers clarification note:

The original Probabilistic Safety Analysis (PSA) did not model Thermo-lag protection. In 1994, A Fire Analysis Update (PSA for Selected Fire Zones) performed a sensitivity studiy to determine the maximum possible benefit that may be achieved by taking credit for existing Thermo-lag protection of raceways. The results of this analysis was that the use of Thermo-lag would have a negligible (decrease) impact on the risk of core damage and large early release at South Texas Project. Therefore, the removal of, or damage to the Thermo-lag barrier is bounded by the original PSA results and the consequences of a fire in any area are not increased.

0PGP05-ZA-0002 Rev. 5 Page of **10CFR50.59** Evaluations Form 2 Unreviewed Safety Question Evaluation Form (Sample) Page 2 of 4 Unreviewed Safety Question Evaluation # 96-0046 Rev. No. 0 Page 3 of 6 Originating Document: CR 96-7692 Rev. No. 0 A.2 Does the subject of the evaluation create the possibility of an accident of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Safety Analysis Report? NO YES \otimes The previous sale shutdown assessment assumed all equipment in a given fire area was lost as a result of the "maximum postulated fire", and demonstrated that post fire sale shutdown is still assured for all areas of the plant utilizing equipment unaffected by the fire. Post fire sale shutdown is still assured for all areas of the plant utilizing equipment unaffected by the fire. Therefore, the subject of this evaluation does not create the possibility of an accident of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Safety Analysis Report or Fire Hazards Analysis Report. Bases: Does the subject of this evaluation create the possibility of a different type of matfunction than any previously evaluated in the Safety Analysis Report? 11. YES \boxtimes NO As explained in A.2.1 above, the previous analysis assumed all equipment in a given fire area was lost as a result of the maximum postulated fire. The analysis also included a review of all potential spurious actuations which could adversely affect post fire safe shutdown. The subject of this evaluation considers these same malfunctions, and therefore does not create the possibility of a Bases: malfunction not previously evaluated. A.3 4. Does the subject of this evaluation reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification? YES \boxtimes NO Bases: Fire Protection and post fire safe shutdown are not specifically addressed in the Technical Specifications. Therefore, this evaluation does not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification.

-

÷.