

April 10, 1989

Docket No. 50-220

DISTRIBUTION

Mr. Lawrence Burkhardt III
Executive Vice President, Nuclear Operations
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
301 Plainfield Road
Syracuse, New York 13212

Docket file
NRC & Local PDRs
PDI-1 Rdg
GLainas
BBoger
CVogan
MSlosson
OGC
EJordan
BGrimes
TMeek (4)
WJones
EButcher
ACRS (10)
GPA/PA
ARM/LEMB
DHagan
JJohnson, RI

Dear Mr. Burkhardt:

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (TAC NO. 62288)

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 104 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 for the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1 (NMP-1). The amendment consists of deletion of paragraph 2.C.(3) from Facility Operating License DPR-63 and changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application transmitted by letter dated August 21, 1986.

This amendment adds Technical Specification 3.1.7.h to permit end-of-cycle coastdown operation to as low as 40 percent of rated power and to prohibit increasing core power level, once operation in the coastdown mode has begun, by reduced feedwater heating. The inclusion of Technical Specification 3.1.7.h transfers to the Technical Specifications the limiting conditions of license condition 2.C.(3), thereby permitting deletion of that license condition.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next regular bi-weekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Marylee M. Slosson, Project Manager
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects, I/II

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No.104 to DPR-63
- 2. Safety Evaluation

cc: w/enclosures
See next page

DFOI

[Amend 62288]

*SEE ATTACHED CONCURRENCE

OFC	:PDI-1	:PDI-1	:PDI-1	:PDI-1	:*OGC	:	:
NAME	:CVogan	:RBenedict/bah	:MSlosson	:RCapra	:	:	:
DATE	:4/10/89	:4/10/89	:4/10/89	:4/10/89	:3/ /89	:	:

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

8904180032 890410
PDR ADOCK 05000220
PDC

c/p-1
cut

Mr. L. Burkhardt III
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,
Unit No. 1

cc:

Mr. Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esquire
Conner & Wetterhahn
Suite 1050
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Mr. Kim Dahlberg
Unit 1 Station Superintendent
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station
Post Office Box 32
Lycoming, New York 13093

Mr. Frank R. Church, Supervisor
Town of Scriba
R. D. #2
Oswego, New York 13126

Mr. Peter E. Francisco, Licensing
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
301 Plainfield Road
Syracuse, New York 13212

Mr. James L. Willis
General Supt.-Nuclear Generation
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station
Post Office Box 32
Lycoming, New York 13093

Charlie Donaldson, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General
New York Department of Law
120 Broadway
New York, New York 10271

Resident Inspector
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 126
Lycoming, New York 13093

Mr. Paul D. Eddy
State of New York
Department of Public Service
Power Division, System Operations
3 Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Mr. Gary D. Wilson, Esquire
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
300 Erie Boulevard West
Syracuse, New York 13202

Regional Administrator, Region I
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Ms. Donna Ross
New York State Energy Office
2 Empire State Plaza
16th Floor
Albany, New York 12223



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

DOCKET NO. 50-220

NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 104
License No. DPR-63

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) dated August 21, 1986, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.
2. Accordingly, the license is amended by deleting paragraph 2.C.(3) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 and by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 is hereby amended to read as follows:

8904180034 890410
PDR ADOCK 05000220
P FDC

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 104, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Robert A. Capra, Director
Project Directorate I-1
Division of Reactor Projects, I/II

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: April 10, 1989

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 104 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-63

DOCKET NO. 50-220

Revise Appendix A as follows:

Remove Pages

64d

70c

Insert Pages

64d

70c

70e

f. Recirculation Loops

During all operating conditions with irradiated fuel in the reactor vessel, at least two (2) recirculation loop suction valves and their associated discharge valves will be in the full open position except when the reactor vessel is flooded to a level above the main steam nozzles or when the steam separators and dryer are removed.

g. Reporting Requirements

If any of the limiting values identified in Specification 3.1.7.a, b, c, d, and e are exceeded, a Reportable Occurrence Report shall be submitted. If the corrective action is taken, as described, a thirty-day written report will meet the requirements of this Specification.

h. Operations Beyond the End-of-Cycle (Coastdown)

For coastdown operations beyond the End-of-Cycle (i.e., when the core reactivity has decreased such that full power cannot be maintained by further control rod withdrawal), steady state thermal power shall be limited to forty (40) percent minimum. Increasing core power level via reduced feedwater heating, once operation in the coastdown mode has begun, is not allowed.

Reporting Requirements

The LCO's associated with monitoring the fuel rod operating conditions are required to be met at all times, i.e., there is no allowable time in which the plant can knowingly exceed the limiting values of MAPLHGR, LHGR, MCPR, or Power/Flow Ratio. It is a requirement, as stated in Specifications 3.1.7a, b, c, and d that if at any time during power operation, it is determined that the limiting values for MAPLHGR, LHGR, MCPR, or Power/Flow Ratio are exceeded, action is then initiated to restore operation to within the prescribed limits. This action is initiated as soon as normal surveillance indicates that an operating limit has been reached. Each event involving operation beyond a specified limit shall be reported as a Reportable Occurrence. If the specified corrective action described in the LCO's was taken, a thirty-day written report is acceptable.

Operations Beyond the End-of-Cycle (Coastdown)

The General Electric generic BWR analysis of coastdown operation (Reference 17) concludes that operation beyond the end-of-cycle (coastdown) is acceptable. Amendment No. 7 to GESTAR (Reference 18) concludes that the analysis conservatively bounds coastdown operation to forty (40) percent power. The margin to all safety limits analyzed increased linearly as the power decreased.

REFERENCES FOR BASES 3.1.7 AND 4.1.7 FUEL RODS

- (17) Communication: R. E. Engel (GE) to T. A. Ippolito (NRC) - "End-of-Cycle Coastdown Analyzed with ODYN/TASC", dated September 1, 1981.
- (18) Amendment No. 7 to GESTAR, NEDE-24011-P-A-7-US, dated August 1985.



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 104 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-63
NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION
NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1
DOCKET NO. 50-220

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated August 21, 1986, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) made application to amend the license of the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (NMP-1). The proposed amendment would remove a license condition that limits the end-of-cycle coastdown to a minimum of 70 percent power and replace it with a Technical Specification which would permit coastdown to 40 percent power. The staff has reviewed the application and has prepared the following evaluation.

EVALUATION

The present license for Nine Mile Point Unit 1 (DPR-63) includes a condition in paragraph 2.C.(3) that permits end-of-cycle coastdown to 70 percent of full power. The licensee has submitted by reference a document (Ref. 1) that supports, on a generic basis, the end-of-cycle coastdown to 40 percent of full power for the boiling water reactor product line up to BWR/4. The conclusions of Reference 1 were included in NEDE-24011-P-A-7-US (GESTAR II, Revision 7) and were approved by the staff. Since Nine Mile Point Unit 1 is a BWR/2, the conclusions are applicable to NMP-1 and the staff concludes that the proposed coastdown operation is acceptable.

The licensee has proposed to delete the license condition that permits coastdown to 70 percent power and to replace it with a Technical Specification 3.1.7.h that limits the coastdown to a minimum value of 40 percent full power. Because the generic analysis did not include the effect of reduced feedwater heating, increasing core power level by this technique is prohibited by the specification. The licensee asserts that the Technical Specification restriction is preferred for administrative reasons because operators are more familiar with Technical Specifications than with license conditions. We find this to be acceptable and conclude that the proposed removal of the license condition and addition to the Technical Specification is acceptable.

The bases for Specification 3.1.7 have been altered to reflect the change and two references have been added. These are acceptable. In order to maintain proper continuity of reference number with license amendment number, the references for the present amendment are now 17 and 18 and are listed on new page 70e.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of the facility components located within the restricted areas as defined in 10 CFR 20. The staff has determined that this amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: April 10, 1989

PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTOR:

W. Brooks

REFERENCE

1. Letter, R. E. Engel (GE) to T. A. Ippolito (NRC), "End-of-Cycle Coastdown Analyzed with ODYN/TASC," dated September 1, 1981.