



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

Hope Creek Generating Station

February 11, 1993

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

Dear Sir:

MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT  
HOPE CREEK GENERATION 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 January are being forwarded to you with the summary of changes, tests, and experiments that were implemented during January 1993 pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.59(b).

Sincerely yours,

*ALL for JJH*  
J. J. Hagan  
General Manager -  
Hope Creek Operations

*CEH RAR*  
RAR:ld  
Attachments  
C Distribution

18:106

## INDEX

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF PAGES</u>
Average Daily Unit Power Level. . . . .	1
Operating Data Report . . . . .	2
Refueling Information . . . . .	1
Monthly Operating Summary . . . . .	1
Summary of Changes, Tests, and Experiments. . . . .	6

# AVERAGE DAILY UNIT POWER LEVEL

DOCKET NO. 50-354  
UNIT Hope Creek  
DATE 2/11/93  
COMPLETED BY V. Zabielski  
TELEPHONE (609) 339-3506

MONTH January 1993

DAY AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL  
(MWe-Net)

1.	<u>1064</u>
2.	<u>1072</u>
3.	<u>1061</u>
4.	<u>1060</u>
5.	<u>1056</u>
6.	<u>1066</u>
7.	<u>1064</u>
8.	<u>1069</u>
9.	<u>1068</u>
10.	<u>1063</u>
11.	<u>1076</u>
12.	<u>1062</u>
13.	<u>1063</u>
14.	<u>1073</u>
15.	<u>1057</u>
16.	<u>1065</u>

DAY AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL  
(MWe-Net)

17.	<u>1064</u>
18.	<u>1063</u>
19.	<u>1080</u>
20.	<u>1064</u>
21.	<u>1062</u>
22.	<u>1070</u>
23.	<u>995</u>
24.	<u>1060</u>
25.	<u>1061</u>
26.	<u>1073</u>
27.	<u>1072</u>
28.	<u>1065</u>
29.	<u>1079</u>
30.	<u>1058</u>
31.	<u>1052</u>

# OPERATING DATA REPORT

DOCKET NO. 50-354  
UNIT Hope Creek  
DATE 2/11/93  
COMPLETED BY V. Zabielski  
TELEPHONE (609) 339-3506

## OPERATING STATUS

1. Reporting Period January 1993 Gross Hours in Report Period 744

2. Currently Authorized Power Level (MWt) 3293  
Max. Depend. Capacity (MWe-Net) 1031  
Design Electrical Rating (MWe-Net) 1067

3. Power Level to which restricted (if any) (MWe-Net) None

4. Reasons for restriction (if any)

	This Month	Yr To Date	Cumulative
5. No. of hours reactor was critical	<u>744.0</u>	<u>744.0</u>	<u>44,999.6</u>
6. Reactor reserve shutdown hours	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
7. Hours generator on line	<u>744.0</u>	<u>744.0</u>	<u>44,248.9</u>
8. Unit reserve shutdown hours	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
9. Gross thermal energy generated (MWH)	<u>2,440,787</u>	<u>2,440,787</u>	<u>140,654,005</u>
10. Gross electrical energy generated (MWH)	<u>825,410</u>	<u>825,410</u>	<u>46,573,464</u>
11. Net electrical energy generated (MWH)	<u>790,922</u>	<u>790,922</u>	<u>44,493,306</u>
12. Reactor service factor	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>83.9</u>
13. Reactor availability factor	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>83.9</u>
14. Unit service factor	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>82.5</u>
15. Unit availability factor	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>82.5</u>
16. Unit capacity factor (using MDC)	<u>103.1</u>	<u>103.1</u>	<u>80.5</u>
17. Unit capacity factor (Using Design MWe)	<u>99.6</u>	<u>99.6</u>	<u>77.7</u>
18. Unit forced outage rate	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4.7</u>
19. Shutdowns scheduled over next 6 months (type, date, & duration):			
None			
20. If shutdown at end of report period, estimated date of start-up:			
N/A			

OPERATING DATA REPORT  
UNIT SHUTDOWNS AND POWER REDUCTIONS

DOCKET NO. 50-354  
UNIT Hope Creek  
DATE 2/11/93  
COMPLETED BY V. Zabielski  
TELEPHONE (609) 339-3506

MONTH January 1993

NO.	DATE	TYPE F=FORCED S=SCHEDULED	DURATION (HOURS)	REASON (1)	METHOD OF SHUTTING DOWN THE REACTOR OR REDUCING POWER (2)	CORRECTIVE ACTION/COMMENTS
						None

Summary



# REFUELING INFORMATION

DOCKET NO. 50-354  
UNIT Hope Creek  
DATE 2/11/93  
COMPLETED BY S. Hollingsworth  
TELEPHONE (609) 339-1051

MONTH January 1993

1. Refueling information has changed from last month:

Yes No ☒

2. Scheduled date for next refueling: 3/5/94

3. Scheduled date for restart following refueling: 4/23/94

4. A. Will Technical Specification changes or other license amendments be required?

Yes No ☒

B. Has the Safety Evaluation covering the COLR been reviewed by the Station Operating Review Committee?

Yes No ☒

If no, when is it scheduled? 2/18/94

5. Scheduled date(s) for submitting proposed licensing action: N/A

6. Important licensing considerations associated with refueling:

- Highly likely that will use same or similar fresh fuel as current cycle: no new considerations.

7. Number of Fuel Assemblies:

A. Incore	<u>764</u>
B. In Spent Fuel Storage (prior to refueling)	<u>1008</u>
C. In Spent Fuel Storage (after refueling)	<u>1232 to 1264</u>

8. Present licensed spent fuel storage capacity: 4006

Future spent fuel storage capacity: 4006

9. Date of last refueling that can be discharged to spent fuel pool assuming the present licensed capacity: 11/4/ 2010  
(EOC16)

(does not allow for full-core offload)

HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

MONTHLY OPERATING SUMMARY

JANUARY 1993

Hope Creek entered the month of January at approximately 100% power. The unit operated throughout the month without experiencing any shutdowns or reportable power reductions. As of January 31, the plant had been on line for 57 consecutive days.

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

JANUARY 1993



The following items 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.

## DCP

## Description of Safety Evaluation

4EC-1010/06

This DCP installed six high pressure sodium flood light fixtures in the Torus room at elevation 77. It also installed four convenience receptacles on the wall above the catwalk directly below four of the light fixtures.

This DCP provides better lighting/receptacle availability and enhances the personnel safe working environment. Torus lighting is non-safety related and non-class 1E. The new light fixtures, receptacles, cable, and junction boxes meet the applicable seismic and separation criteria. Therefore, this DCP does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

4EC-3293/01

This DCP added a handrail in the Reactor Building around the center line of the Torus. The handrail is being supported from existing structural framing steel.

The new handrail is not integral with any operating plant system and does not contribute towards malfunction of any equipment important to safety. Additionally, this DCP meets the applicable seismic requirements. Therefore, this DCP does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

4EC-3320/01

4EC-3320/02

These DCPs rewired limit switches on motor operated valves. INPO SOER 86-02 documented industry operating experience showing that when the open (red) light for the valve actuated by a limit switch is on the same rotor as the open torque bypass switch, the red light would go out at the same time as the bypass switch actuation. Because the bypass switch was set to be closed from a valve position of almost full closed to full closed, a valve position indication could show the valve full closed when the valve was only almost full closed.

This DCP rewired the limit switches so that the red light is actuated from a different rotor than the open torque switch bypass. The rotor that operates the light is set for full closed. The red light will not go out when the bypass switch closes, but only when the valve is full closed.

The failure of the new limit switch is no more probable than the failure of the previous limit switch. The new limit switch is standard equipment supplied with the operator. It was installed in the equipment, this DCP used a spare switch and spared a switch that was in use. Therefore, this DCP does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

DCP

Description of Safety Evaluation

4EC-3359/01

This DCP added a platform and widened an existing platform in the Reactor Building. The platforms are classified as Seismic Category II/I and are attached to the Seismic Category I drywell concrete wall.

The platforms are not integral with any operating plant system and do not contribute towards the malfunction of any equipment important to safety. Therefore, this DCP does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

4EX-3183

This DCP changed the setpoint on the flow controllers on the Radwaste Tank Vent Filters. Due to inaccuracies in the flow measurement introduced by flow in the sensing lines, actual flow was greater than measured flow. Changing the setpoint reduced actual flow to design flow. This DCP is a test to verify that filter life will be extended by operating at design flow.

The Radwaste Tank Vent Filter trains are not safety related. They play no part in the prevention or mitigation of an accident. This DCP did not alter the design intent of the system. Therefore, this DCP does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

4HE-0006

This DCP replaced a portion of the blowdown line from the bottom of a Steam Seal Evaporator "T" connection to downstream of a 90° elbow. The original piping was Schedule 80 carbon steel, it was replaced with Schedule 40 stainless steel.

The Steam Seal system does not have any safety related function and does not compromise any safety related system or component. Therefore, this DCP does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

TMR

Description of Safety Evaluation

93-003

This TMR installed two jumpers to simulate a high differential water level signal across the 'A' Service Water Travelling Screen, inhibiting low speed operation. This TMR will remain in place until corroded conduit that is associated with a level element is replaced.

While the simulated high differential water level signal is in place, the screen will operate in the high speed mode. The failure of one Station Service Water Loop will not prevent the Reactor from being brought to a safe shutdown. Therefore, this TMR does not involve any Unreviewed Safety Questions.

Procedure  
Revision

NC.NA-AP.ZZ-0058(Q)  
Rev. 1

Description of Safety Evaluation

This procedure revision changed titles and responsibilities for the Nuclear Department Corrective Action Program. The title Vice President - Nuclear Engineering was changed to General Manager - Engineering and Plant Betterment, and the responsibility for the procurement of nuclear fuel was transferred to the Vice President - Nuclear Operations. The title General Manager - Procurement and Material Control was changed to General Manager - Material Control. Additionally, responsibilities were added/revised for the Vice President - Nuclear Operations, the General Manager - Nuclear Operations Support, General Manager - Nuclear Services, and the General Manager - Nuclear Human Resources.

This procedure revision includes administrative changes only and does not affect any system operation. Therefore, this procedure revision did not involve Unreviewed Safety Questions.