Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Dockets Nos. 50–277 and 50–278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: August 3, 1994.

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes would delete a footnote in the Technical Specifications (TS) regarding snubber functional testing frequency and make permanent the current one-time snubber functional test frequency of 24 months.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) The proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, because the probability of a seismic or other dynamic event is independent of the surveillance period for snubber tests. The change does not introduce any failure mechanisms to the previously considered events. The consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the SAR [Safety Analysis Report] is not increased by the proposed revision to [t]he snubber TS. No physical changes are being made to the plant. The snubbers' role in mitigating the consequences of an accident is to provide restraint during seismic or other dynamic events while permitting the slow movement of piping and components during heatup and cooldown. The proposed TS change will not affect the snubbers ability to continue to perform this role for the following reasons: (1) Changing the inspection cycle to 24 months will not reduce the ability of the functional testing to confirm the operability of the snubber population. The original interval of 18 months was selected to accommodate the need to test snubbers that were inaccessible during normal operation. Since snubbers do not require preventative maintenance during the operating cycle, the additional time added by a 24 month operating cycle has minimal impact, if any, on snubber operability. (2) The requirement to monitor service life remains part of TS. The review of snubber service life records is a documentation review of the snubbers service life. If a snubber's service life would expire prior to the next scheduled review then the snubber is reconditioned, replaced or reevaluated to extend its service life. (3) Snubber functional testing has shown no failure mechanism which would be aggravated by an extension of the test interval to 24 months. A historical search of completed snubber functional STs was completed. The historical search indicated that even though the snubbers did not always meet the initial screening functional test criteria of the ST, the piping system was

operable based on an engineering evaluation and there was no evidence of a time dependent failure mechanism. To ensure the snubber remains operational during the next operating cycle, snubbers not meeting the screening ST acceptance criteria are either replaced or reconditioned.

(2) The proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because the proposed change does not involve operational procedure or physical changes to the plant. Since snubbers will continue to meet their design basis of protecting the piping and equipment during dynamic events, the possibility of a different type of accident will not be created.

(3) The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. There may be a slight increase, if any, in the possibility of undetected snubber failures because of the increase in the interval of functional testing for snubbers; however, the historical data of previous snubber functional surveillance testing and the supporting engineering evaluations indicate that on those occasions where snubbers did not meet initial surveillance testing requirements, the piping systems were all operable. Therefore, the probability of occurrence of a malfunction of equipment is minimal and equipment important to safety (ITS) that use snubbers will continue to meet design requirements and the margin of safety will be unaffected.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Attorney for Licensee: J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire, Sr. V.P. and General Counsel, Philadelphia Electric Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101. NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz.

Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Docket No. 50–354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: September 29, 1994.

Description of amendment request: This amendment requests revision of Table 4.3.6–1 "Control Rod Block Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements." The channel calibration frequencies for the Source Range Monitor (SRM) and the Intermediate Range Monitor (IRM) would be changed as follows: the up-scale and the downscale trip functions on each instrument would be changed from Note "SA", once-per-184 days to note "R", onceper-refuel interval.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes involve no hardware changes, no changes to the operation of any systems or components, and no changes to existing structures. The revision of channel calibration frequencies for the SRM and IRM trip function portion of the control rod block instrumentation represent changes that do not affect plant safety and do not alter existing accident analyses.

2. Will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are procedural in nature concerning the calibration frequency of instrumentation that have historically shown little set point drift. The channel calibration methodology for the SRM and IRM control rod block trip functions remain unchanged. The proposed changes while slightly increasing the possibility of an undetected instrument error will not create a new or unevaluated accident or operating condition.

3. Will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes are in accordance with recommendations provided by the NRC regarding the improvement of Technical Specifications. These changes will result in the perpetuation of current safety margins while reducing regulatory burden and decreasing equipment degradation.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Pennsville Public Library, 190 S. Broadway, Pennsville, New Jersey 08070.

Attorney for licensee: M. J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005–3502. NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz.

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50–305, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: December 16, 1994.