

Public Service Electric and Gas Company P.O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey 08038-0236

Nuclear Business Unit

MAR 1 5 1999

LR-N99118

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Document Control Desk Washington, DC 20555

Gentlemen:

MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION UNIT 1 DOCKET NO. 50-354

In compliance with Section 6.9, Reporting Requirements for the Hope Creek Technical Specifications, the operating statistics for **February 1999** are being forwarded. Also being forwarded to you, pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.59(b), is the summary of changes, tests, and experiments that were implemented during February **1999**.

:40- 1

Sincerely,

Mark B. Bezilla General Manager -Hope Creek Operations

DVH Attachments

C Distribution

9903250370 PDR ADOCK 05

The power is in your hands.

42

INDEX

SECTION	NUMBER OF PAGES
Operating Data Report	1
Monthly Operating Summary	1
Summary of Changes, Tests, and Experiments	2

DATE: 03/09/99 COMPLETED BY: F. Todd TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1316

Reporting Period February 1999

OPERATING DATA REPORT

Design Electrical Rating (MWe-Net) Maximum Dependable Capacity (MWe-Net)

No. of hours reactor was critical

No. of hours generator was on line (service hours)

Unit reserve shutdown hours

Net Electrical Energy (MWH)

1067	Real The second			
1031	Arrest the second			
Month	Year-to-date	Cumulative		
289	1033	90162		
288	1032	88641		
0	0	0		
297543	1074548	89672069		

UNIT SHUTDOWNS

NO.	DATE	TYPE F=FORCED S=SCHEDULED	DURATION (HOURS)	REASON (1)	METHOD OF SHUTTING DOWN THE REACTOR (2)	CORRECTIVE ACTION/ COMMENT
1	2/13/99 2/28/99	S	360	С	1	Refuel Outage

(1) Reason

- A Equipment Failure (Explain)
- B Maintenance or Test
- C Refueling
- D Regulatory Restriction
- E Operator Training/License Examination
- F Administrative
- G Operational Error (Explain)
- H Other

- (2) Method
 - 1 Manual
 - 2 Manual Trip/Scram
 - 3 Automatic Trip/Scram
 - 4 Continuation
 - 5 Other (Explain)

DOCKET NO.: 50-354 UNIT: Hope Creek DATE: 03/09/99 COMPLETED BY: D. Hassler TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1445

Summary Of Monthly Operating Experience

- Hope Creek entered the month of January at approximately 100% reactor power.
- Restart from RF08 is expected on March 30, 1999.

.

DOCKET NO.: <u>50-354</u> UNIT: <u>Hope Creek</u> DATE: <u>03/09/99</u> COMPLETED BY:D. <u>Hassler</u> TELEPHONE: (609) <u>339-1989</u>

SUMMARY OF CHANGES, TESTS, AND EXPERIMENTS FOR THE HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

MONTH February 1999

The following items completed during **February 1999** have been evaluated to determine:

1. If the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the safety analysis report may be increased; or

2. If a possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the safety analysis report may be created; or

3. If the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any technical specification is reduced.

The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations showed that these items did not create a new safety hazard to the plant nor did they affect the safe shutdown of the reactor. These items did not change the plant effluent releases and did not alter the existing environmental impact. The 10CFR50.59 Safety Evaluations determined that no unreviewed safety or environmental questions are involved.

Design Changes Summary of Safety Evaluations

4EC-3203, Package 3, Iron Reduction Test Skid Removal. This design change removed the iron filter and ion exchange test skid. When in operation the test skid took a draw off of the discharge side of Primary Condensate Pumps and returned it to the suction side.

The design basis, system descriptions, system classifications, etc of the Condensate and Condensate Demineralizer systems, as described in the UFSAR, will not be affected. This design change does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

4EC-3538, Packages 3 and 4, RHR and CORE Spray Suction Strainers. This design change installs Emergency Core Cooling System suction strainers in the suppression pool with new strainers for the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) and Core Spray (CS) pumps.

This design change replaces the existing bolt-on Zurn strainers with larger Performance Contracting, Inc. (PCI) stacked disk strainers. The new larger PCI suction strainer provides increased surface area and thus increases the flow area of the strainer. The new strainers meet the same function and flow capacity of the plant systems. This design change does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

4EC-3658, Package 1, Hope Creek Plant Historian. This design change installed the Plant Historian System (PHS) which will collect data from CRIDS and store the data for historical information.

The PHS system consists of a digital equipment computer server, computer workstations, color printers and an interface card to the CRIDS computer. The functions of the plant process computers were not changed by this design change and this design change does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Temporary Modifications Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no reportable changes in this category implemented during January1999.

Procedures Summary of Safety Evaluations

NC.NA-AP.ZZ-0024(Q) Revision 9, Radiation Protection Program. This procedure revision addressed minor organization changes as well as changes to conform to 10 CFR 20.

The organizational changes reflect the current organization structure. The revision also changed the doses to minors and pregnant members of the public making them consistent with 10 CFR 20 that was effective October 24, 1998. This procedure revision does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

HC.OP-SO.3B-0001(Q) Revision 15, Reactor Protection System Operation. This procedure revision addresses a change that affects the Reactor Protection System (RPS) scram signal generated when the mode switch is placed in the shutdown position. This signal is addressed in the UFSAR and is not a Technical Specifications requirement.

During the course of a refueling outage, it is necessary to move the mode switch between the refueling and shutdown positions for testing and surveillance purposes and to conduct core alterations. The procedure revision facilitates bypassing of the RPS scram signal generated when the mode switch is placed in the shutdown position. All other scram signals remain unaffected and the rod block generated when the mode switch is in the shutdown position remains in effect. This change will allow the signal to be bypassed and therefore inoperable in Mode 5. I accordance with the prerequisites of the procedure, the evolution will not be performed unless permission has been obtained from the Operations Superintendent, all control rods have been inserted (or the core is off-loaded) and no core alterations are in progress. This procedure revision does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

UFSAR Change Notices Summary of Safety Evaluations

Change Notice HCN 98-037, NBU Reorganization – Maintenance/Engineering. This UFSAR change shifted selected programmatic responsibilities between the Nuclear Maintenance and Nuclear Engineering Departments.

This UFSAR change does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Change Notice HCN 98-039, FRVS Testing Compliance with Reg Guide 1.52. This UFSAR change was made to address issues related to testing of the Hope Creek Filtration, Recirculation and Ventilation System (FRVS).

The change clarify the testing requirements to state that the FRVS ventilation and recirculation heaters will be dissipating heat during the 10 hour monthly test required by the Technical Specifications. The changes restore conformance between the UFSAR descriptions and Hope Creek's licensing basis. This UFSAR change does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Change Notice HCN 99-002, Allow Use of Combined CRB/FSB Grapple. This UFSAR change was to allow use of the General Electric Combined Control Rod/Fuel Support Piece (CRB/FSP) Grapple and associated Grid Guide.

The combined CRB/FSP Grapple is used for the same purposes as the Control Rod Grapple and Fuel Support Piece Grapple. The combined CRB/FSP Grapple will grapple both items effectively simultaneously and as such is considered a change to a procedure described in the SAR. This UFSAR change does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Change Notice HCN 99-003, Editing of Nonessential Fuel Handling Tools and Servicing Equipment. This UFSAR change was to delete reference to certain fuel handling system tools and equipment that are no longer used.

The information relating to nonessential (not essential to safety) fuel handling tools and servicing equipment was simplified in order to improve focus, clarity and maintenance. This UFSAR change does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Deficiency Reports Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no reportable changes in this category implemented during January1999.

Other Summary of Safety Evaluation

Safety Evaluation H99-008, Hope Creek Reload Safety Evaluation for Cycle 8 Extension. This safety evaluation was to permit the Hope Creek Generating Station to continue operation beyond its previously reviewed and approved reload design basis.

Operation beyond the original end of cycle condition to February 13, 1999 can be accomplished with either continued full power operation or power coast down. A power coast down does not involve the reduction of feedwater temperature for the purposes of cycle extension which is prohibited by the License Condition No. 11. Cycle extension by means of *a* power coast down is within the existing current capabilities and design of the plant. This safety evaluation does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Safety Evaluation H99-009, Hope Creek Cycle 9/Relaod 8 Core Operation. This safety evaluation was to review the Hope Creek Generating Station (HCGS) Cycle 9 core and fuel designs.

The core design is different from that previously evaluated against SAR design basis via 10 CFR 50.59 and approved for HCGS cycle 8. Operation of cycle 9 will be accomplished within the existing power-flow map utilizing existing operating controls. Operation during cycle 9 will not require any new or different functions from structures, systems or components or the need for new procedures. No new operating practices are required due to the cycle 9 reload core design. This safety evaluation does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Safety Evaluation H99-012, processing of Chemical Waste Tank Effluents Through the Radwaste Floor Drain System. This safety evaluation reviewed the operation of three of five Liquid Waste Management System (LWMS) and evaluates an alternate disposal method.

The change allows liquid wastes collected in the Chemical Waste Processing subsystem to be drained to and neutralized within the Regenerant Waste Processing (RWP) subsystem. The liquid waste would then be transferred from the RWP to the Floor Drain system via a temporary hose. Once treated in the floor drain system, the liquid effluent could then be discharged to the Condensate Storage Tank for reuse in the plant or could be discharged from the plant to the Delaware River after mixing with the cooling tower blowdown as stated in section 11.2.2.1.2 of the UFSAR. This method will be acceptable as an alternate method if the normal processing path is not available. This safety evaluation does not increase the possibility or consequences of any accident or malfunction, does not reduce the margin of safety, and therefore, does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.