

Post-it <sup>2</sup> Fax Note	7671	Date <u>6-26</u>	# of pages <u>3</u>
To <u>MARK ACKERMAN</u>	From <u>JIM FITCHUK</u>		
Co./Dept.	Co.		
Phone #	Phone #		
Fax #	Fax #		

PMP 1040.SES.001

uclear Plant

### Safety Evaluation Screening Checklist

SCREENING APPLICABLE TO PML-5070 Rev 12  
(Document Number, Rev. & CS#)

TITLE: Inservice Inspection and Testing

#### 1.0 DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE

Summary of proposed change: Upgraded instruction to incorporate the Third Interval inspection  
And testing requirements.

Reason for proposed change: Required by 10CFR50.55a.

#### 2.0 SAFETY EVALUATION APPLICABILITY DETERMINATION

Using a continuation page or pages, the screener must include a justification for each item marked "No". Documents that were used as references must be listed, including the specific sections.

The screener must likewise provide a reason for each item marked "Yes". A statement shall be made as to why a specific section of an affected document will need to be changed.

DOES THE PROCEDURE OR MODIFICATION TO WHICH THIS SCREENING IS APPLICABLE REPRESENT:

NOTE: Refer to the procedure text as needed for full explanation of each question.  
Please circle the appropriate answer to each of the following questions:

2.1 YES NO A change to the plant as described in the FSAR, Emergency Plan or Security Plan?

See Page 3.

2.2 YES NO A change to procedures as described in the FSAR, Emergency Plan or Security Plan?

See Page 3.

2.3 YES NO A test or experiment not described in the FSAR?

See Page 3.

PMP 1040.SES.001  
Revision 1

Attachment 1  
Page 1 of 3

9607020181 960627  
PDR ADOCK 05000315  
G PDR

PMP 1040.SES.001

- 2.4 YES ☒ NO A change to procedures, design, or a test or experiment which could affect the environment, or a change to Appendix B of the Technical Specifications (Environmental Protection Plan)?

See Page 3.

- 2.5 ☒ YES NO A change to the Technical Specifications or the Operating License?

See Page 3.

- 2.6 YES ☒ NO Is a Safety Evaluation requested because there is doubt as to whether this change affects the FSAR, the Emergency Plan or the Security Plan (MASP)? Provide reason.

See Page 3.

- 3.0 If the answer to ALL of the above questions is "NO", neither a Safety Evaluation or an Environmental Evaluation is required.

- 4.0 If the answer to any of the Questions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5 OR 2.6 is "YES" or if the document is a Design Change, a Safety Evaluation MUST be performed.

- 4.1 ☒ YES NO Is a Safety Evaluation required?

- 5.0 If the answer to Question 2.4 is "YES", then an Environmental Evaluation must be performed.

- 5.1 YES ☒ NO Is an Environmental Evaluation required?

Screening performed by:

J. M. FITCHUK

Print Name

J. M. Fitchuk

Sign Name

Plant Eng.06/11/969-25-95

Department /

Date /

Qualification Date

Review performed by:

K. R. WORTHINGTON

Print Name

K. R. Worthington

Sign Name

PLS6/11/96

Department /

Date /

Qualification Date

PMP 1040.SES.001

**SAFETY EVALUATION SCREENING  
CONTINUATION PAGE**

Document Title: PMI-5070 Rev. 12

2.1 - Per 10CFR50.55a, the third Interval update to the IST Program requires Inservice testing be performed to ASME OM Standards and not ASME Section XI as referenced in UFSAR 5.4.4, 6.2.5, 9.3.5, 9.4.4, 9.5.6.

2.2 - UFSAR 4.5.1.1, 4.5.1.2, 5.4.4, 6.2.5, 9.3.5, 9.4.4, 9.5.6 and QAPD 1.7.1.2.5, 1.7.2.2, 1.7.10 were reviewed for procedures that would be changed and none were noted. There is no reference to the ISI Program in the Emergency Plan and Security Plan per my discussion with Jeff Smith and Larry Smead and to the best of my knowledge.

2.3 - The ISI/IST Program is described UFSAR - see 2.2 references.

2.4 - There is no environmental impact resulting from the change of the instruction and the ISI Program is not referenced in the EP Plan per discussion with Rocky Beem and to the best of my knowledge.

2.5 - Tech. Spec. 4.0.5 must be changed to reflect the new regulatory requirements on the IST Program as stated in 2.1.

2.6 - There is no doubt that the Third Interval IST Program update affects the UFSAR.

