



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-7001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 136 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-38

ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC.

WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3

DOCKET NO. 50-382

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application dated February 6, 1996, Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee), submitted a request for changes to the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, Technical Specifications (TSs). The requested changes would modify the TS to correct several inconsistencies.

- a) Revise the following allowable values for parameters identified in Table 3.3-4, "Engineering Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation Trip Values," to be consistent with Table 2.2-1, "Reactor Protection Instrumentation Trip Setpoint Limits".

	<u>Old Value</u>	<u>New Value</u>
Containment Pressure - High	$\leq 17.3$ psia	$\leq 17.4$ psia
Pressurizer Pressure - Low	$\geq 1644$ psia	$\geq 1649.9$ psia
Steam Generator Pressure - Low	$\geq 748$ psia	$\geq 749.9$ psia
Steam Generator Level - Low	$\geq 26.7\%$	$\geq 26.48\%$

- b) Revise TS 4.10.2.2 and TS 4.10.4.2 of section 3/4.10 Special Test Exceptions to delete reference to previously removed TS 3.3.3.2.
- c) Revise Table 4.3-2, Item 5.c. to specify Mode 4 applicability to be consistent with TS Table 3.3-3.

2.0 EVALUATION

- a) On September 5, 1995, Amendment 113 to Facility Operating License NPF-38 revised several allowable values for parameters identified in Table 2.2-1, "Reactor Protective Instrumentation Trip Setpoint Limits" so that they would be consistent with the setpoint/uncertainty methodology. The licensee's application dated December 9, 1994, requesting the proposed change failed to identify the duplicate parameters and values appearing in Table 3.3-4, "Engineering Safety Features Actuation System Instrumentation Trip Values". Since this change is requesting that the allowable values

for parameters in Table 3.3-4 be consistent with Table 2.2-1, the change is administrative. The technical basis for revising the values is provided in the staff's safety evaluation for Amendment 113.

- b) On May 30, 1995, Amendment 107 to Facility Operating License NPF-38 removed the Incore Detection System Requirements specified in TS 3.3.3.2 and deleted TS 3.3.3.2. The basis for moving the incore detector requirements from the TS to the UFSAR is provided in the staff's safety evaluation for Amendment 107. This change is only deleting reference in TS 4.10.2.2 and TS 4.10.4.2 to the previously deleted TS 3.3.3.2 and is administrative.
- c) On November 9, 1992, Amendment 78 to Facility Operating License NPF-38 inadvertently deleted Mode 4 from specified surveillance requirements of TS Table 4.3-2, Item 5.c. Revising Table 4.3-2, Item 5.c. to specify Mode 4 applicability to be consistent with TS Table 3.3-3 is an administrative change to correct this earlier error.

The staff has concluded that all of the above changes to the TS to improve consistency and to correct previous inadvertent errors are acceptable.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Louisiana State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes surveillance requirements. The NRC 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding 61 FR 28615. Accordingly, the 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 the amendment.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Marsha Gamberoni

Date: November 20, 1997