



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

Nuclear Business Unit

NOV 15 1996

LR-N96376

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 **October 1996** are being forwarded to you with the summary of changes, tests, and experiments that were implemented during **August and September 1996** pursuant to the requirements of 10CFR50.59(b).

Sincerely yours,

Mark B. Bezilla
General Manager -
Hope Creek Operations

RH:LK:DS
Attachments

C Distribution

9611220204 961031
PDR ADOCK 05000354
R PDR

220045

The power is in your hands.

IE24 1/1

INDEX

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF PAGES</u>
Operating Data Report	2
Average Daily Unit Power Level	1
Refueling Information	1
Monthly Operating Summary	1
Summary of Changes, Tests, and Experiments	3

DOCKET NO.: 50-354
UNIT: Hope Creek
DATE: 11/07/96
COMPLETED BY: R. Harris
TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1777

OPERATING DATA REPORT
OPERATING STATUS

1. Reporting Period October 1996 Gross Hours in Report Period 745
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)

	<u>This Month</u>	<u>Yr To Date</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>
5. No. of hours reactor was critical	<u>745</u>	<u>5458.2</u>	<u>72382.1</u>
6. Reactor reserve shutdown hours	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
7. Hours generator on line	<u>745</u>	<u>5300.4</u>	<u>71242.0</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>2417959</u>	<u>16850480</u>	<u>227624730</u>
10. Gross electrical energy generated (MWH)	<u>816390</u>	<u>5627821</u>	<u>75453443</u>
11. Net electrical energy generated (MWH)	<u>784265</u>	<u>5373065</u>	<u>72090300</u>
12. Reactor service factor	<u>100.0</u>	<u>74.6</u>	<u>83.7</u>
13. Reactor availability factor	<u>100.0</u>	<u>74.6</u>	<u>83.7</u>
14. Unit service factor	<u>100.0</u>	<u>72.4</u>	<u>82.4</u>
15. Unit availability factor	<u>100.0</u>	<u>72.4</u>	<u>82.4</u>
16. Unit capacity factor (using MDC)	<u>102.1</u>	<u>71.2</u>	<u>80.8</u>
17. Unit capacity factor (using Design MWe)	<u>98.7</u>	<u>68.8</u>	<u>78.1</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):
20. If shutdown at end of report period, estimated date of start-up:

DOCKET NO.: 50-354
UNIT: Hope Creek
DATE: 11/07/96
COMPLETED BY: R. Harris
TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1777

OPERATING DATA REPORT
UNIT SHUTDOWNS AND POWER REDUCTIONS

MONTH OCTOBER 1996

NO.	DATE	TYPE F=FORCED S=SCHEDULED	DURATION (HOURS)	REASON (1)	METHOD OF SHUTTING DOWN THE REACTOR OR REDUCING POWER (2)	CORRECTIVE ACTION/COMMENTS
n/a						

DOCKET NO.: 50-354
UNIT: Hope Creek
DATE: 11/07/96
COMPLETED BY: R. Harris
TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1777

AVERAGE DAILY UNIT POWER LEVEL

MONTH OCTOBER 1996

DAY	AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL (MWe-Net)	DAY	AVERAGE DAILY POWER LEVEL (MWe-Net)
1	<u>1041</u>	17	<u>1043</u>
2	<u>1074</u>	18	<u>1045</u>
3	<u>1021</u>	19	<u>1053</u>
4	<u>1058</u>	20	<u>1045</u>
5	<u>1083</u>	21	<u>1055</u>
6	<u>1033</u>	22	<u>1054</u>
7	<u>1048</u>	23	<u>1046</u>
8	<u>1054</u>	24	<u>1048</u>
9	<u>1052</u>	25	<u>1056</u>
10	<u>1052</u>	26	<u>1052</u>
11	<u>1057</u>	27	<u>1100</u>
12	<u>1058</u>	28	<u>1051</u>
13	<u>1051</u>	29	<u>1046</u>
14	<u>1047</u>	30	<u>1046</u>
15	<u>1061</u>	31	<u>1060</u>
16	<u>1045</u>		

DOCKET NO.: 50-354
UNIT: Hope Creek
DATE: 11/07/96
COMPLETED BY: L. Kepley
TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1106

REFUELING INFORMATION

MONTH OCTOBER 1996

1. Refueling information has changed from last month:
Yes — No X
2. Scheduled date for next refueling (RF07): 9/6/97
3. Scheduled date for restart following refueling: 11/5/97
- 4A. Will Technical Specification changes or other license amendments be required?
Yes — No X
- B. Has the Safety Evaluation covering the COLR been reviewed by the Station Operating Review Committee (SORC)?
Yes — No X
If no, when is it scheduled? To Be Determined for Cycle 8 COLR
5. Scheduled date(s) for submitting proposed licensing action:
Not required
6. Important licensing considerations associated with refueling:
N/A
7. Number of Fuel Assemblies:
A. Incore 764
B. In Spent Fuel Storage 1472
8. Present licensed spent fuel storage capacity: 4006
Future spent fuel storage capacity: 4006
9. Date of last refueling that can be discharged 5/3/2006
to spent fuel pool assuming the present licensed capacity: (EOC13)

(Does allow for full-core off-load)
(Assumes 244 bundle reloads every 18 months until then)
(Does not allow for smaller reloads due to improved fuel)

DOCKET NO.: 50-354
UNIT: Hope Creek
DATE: 11/07/96
COMPLETED BY: R. Harris
TELEPHONE: (609) 339-1777

MONTHLY OPERATING SUMMARY

MONTH OCTOBER 1996

- The Hope Creek Generating Station remained on-line for the entire month and operated at essentially 100% power for the month of October 1996 except two load reductions identified below.
- Power was reduced to 87% on October 20, 1996 starting at 0308 hours to perform monthly turbine valve testing. The unit was returned to 100% power on October 20, 1996 at 0548 hours.
- At the end of the month the unit had been on-line for 221 days.

DOCKET NO.: 50-354
UNIT: Hope Creek
DATE: 11/07/96
COMPLETED BY: L. Kepley
TELEPHONE: (609) 339-3517

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

MONTH OCTOBER 1996

The following items completed during **August or September 1996** 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

DCP 4EC-3438, Pkg. 1, Modification of Makeup Demineralized Water Analyzers: This design change removes the existing three Hach Model 651B and one Hach model 651C Silica Anion Beds/Mixed Beds Analyzers and replaced them with two Hach Model 55,000 Silica Analyzers. The reason for this change is that the replacement parts for model 651B and C have become obsolete. The new analyzers will provide reliable means to monitor silica concentration in the makeup demineralized water system. The modification does involve configuration changes to the racks to remove the existing analyzers and install the new analyzers. Tubing and wiring will be modified accordingly. The Makeup Demineralizer System has no safety related function. Failure of the system does not compromise any safety related systems or components, does not prevent a safe shutdown of the plant, and will have no effect on the margin of safety.

Therefore, this UFSAR change does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the UFSAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

UFSAR Change Notices Summary of Safety Evaluations

Hope Creek UFSAR Change Notice H 96-26: This administrative revision changes the structure and reporting relationships of Radiological Safety by separating Emergency Preparedness from Radiation Protection, Chemistry, Dosimetry and Radiological Instruments. The functions and responsibilities remain the same. The two separate groups will both report to the Director of Nuclear Training. There are no operational impacts on the programs operated by

the affected groups, other than the reporting relationship. With respect to transients or accidents described in the UFSAR and equipment important to safety, the changes do not relate to design, material, or construction standards, and do not affect system performance. The change does not change the calculated radiation dose as a consequence of any accident, does not restrict access or impede actions on site, and does not affect fission product barriers. The change does not affect design criteria, specifications, margin of safety or operation of systems or components relating to the fuel cladding, reactor coolant system boundary, or containment.

Therefore, this UFSAR change does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the UFSAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Hope Creek UFSAR Change Notice H 96-020: This change transfers organizational responsibility for Site Access Training from the Manager - Nuclear Security to the Director - Nuclear Training Center. This change is administrative in nature and has no impact on the design or licensing bases of Hope Creek. The requirement for and the content of site access training is not changed. No structures, systems or components will be affected by this change in organizational responsibility. There are no credible failure modes associated with this change. There are no anticipated operational transients or postulated design basis accidents that are applicable to this change.

Therefore, this UFSAR change does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the UFSAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Temporary Modifications Summary of Safety Evaluations

There were no temporary modifications, not evaluated under a previously reported generic safety evaluation, installed in the plant during the month of September, 1996.

Deficiency Reports Summary of Safety Evaluations

DR 960906213, Electrical Backseating of 1ABHV-2016B to Stop Packing Leakage: This change will alter the normal operational valve position for 1ABHV-2016B, which isolates main steam to the 'B' steam jet air ejector train, as described in UFSAR Figure 10.4-1. The valve position is being modified from normally closed to open and backseated to reduce the valves packing leakage. The use of the valve backseat is within the valve design. However, this valve will be declared inoperable but available due to the fact that once the valve is backseated, the valve may not be capable of electrically closing. Failure of the valve to electrically close would require a manned entry into the steam jet air ejector room to manually close the valve. The valve will be disassembled during the next refueling outage and the backseat area will be inspected for any cracking. As a result of this valve being opened and backseated, the 'B' steam jet air ejector train will be in service. This valve does not perform a containment isolation function, nor does it receive an isolation signal. This valve does not perform a safety related function.

Therefore, this deficiency does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the UFSAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

DR 960905130, 1ABHV-F019 Closed to Isolate Downstream Steam Leak. This change places 1ABHV-F019, the main steam line isolation valve (MSIV) outboard drain valve, in the closed position to isolate a downstream steam leak. 1ABHV-F019 and associated piping is designed to remove moisture from the inboard MSIVs and upstream piping during startup operations. The UFSAR describes 1ABHV-F019 as being in the open position. This valve is a containment isolation valve that is designed to close upon receipt of an isolation signal. Placing the valve in the closed position will fulfill the design requirement with no impact on plant or system operation. The valve and drywell penetration are still operable and will continue to be surveilled to ensure operability until repair of the downstream leak. The valve can be opened to perform moisture removal as required. This change will not affect the ability of the eight MSIVs or other equipment to perform their design function, nor the ability of the other redundant moisture removal subsystems located on the downstream piping from performing their design function. This change will not affect normal plant operation.

Therefore, this change does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the UFSAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.

Procedures Summary of Safety Evaluations

HC.OP-SO.EG-0001(Q) Revision 15, Safety Auxiliaries Cooling Water System Operation. During an Engineering Assurance review of the Safety Auxiliaries Cooling System (SACS), discrepancies were identified in a Start-Up Test Procedure. In response to the identified discrepancy, an engineering evaluation was performed to determine the capability of a single SACS loop to provide design flow rate to necessary equipment under the limiting design basis conditions. This was based on providing sufficient flow to the minimum complement of plant equipment required by Technical Specifications to permit use of the 72 hour allowed outage time specified for an inoperable SACS loop. This minimum complement consists of the safety related equipment supplied by the operable SACS loop in addition to one diesel generator, one Filtration Recirculation Ventilation System (FRVS) recirculation unit and the High Pressure Coolant Injection or Reactor Core Isolation Cooling room cooler associated with the inoperable SACS loop. Based upon the evaluation, it was determined that under the limiting condition, design flowrates for the aligned components would be available. Therefore, continued operability of the unaffected SACS loop could be assured and the 72 hour AOT could be utilized. Revision 15 of HC.OP-SO.EG-0001(Q) incorporates instructions to realign SACS loads in the event that one SACS loop becomes inoperable, whether due to planned or unplanned circumstances. This will ensure that the resulting plant configuration is consistent with what is assumed in the engineering evaluation as discussed above.

Therefore, this procedure change does not increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously described in the UFSAR and does not involve an Unreviewed Safety Question.