

January 23, 1985

Docket No. 50-271

Mr. J. B. Sinclair
Licensing Engineer
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation
1671 Worcester Road
Framingham, Massachusetts 01701

Dear Mr. Capstick:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 85 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-28 for the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated February 7, 1984, as supplemented May 18, 1984.

The amendment revises the Technical Specifications related to the limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements to delete the requirements for the design feature that automatically transfers high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) suction to the suppression pool from the condensate storage tank, upon high water level in the suppression pool.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Original signed by/

Vernon L. Rooney, Project Manager
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 85 to License No. DPR-28
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

8502040235 850123
PDR ADDCK 05000271
P PDR

DISTRIBUTION

Docket File
NRC PDR
Local PDR
ORB#2 Reading
DEisenhut

EMarinos
SNorris
V Rooney
OELD
LJHarmon
ELJordan

PMcKee
TBarnhart (4)
WJones
DBrinkman
ACRS (10)

OPA, CMiles
RDiggs
Gray File
Extra - 5
JPartlow

DL:ORB#2
SNorris:ajs
11/14/84

DL:ORB#2
V Rooney
11/23/84

DL:ORB#2
DVassallo
11/10/85

DL:ORB#2
Sachmann
12/15/84

DL:AD-OR
GLandis
12/21/84

Mr. R. W. Capstick
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station

cc:

Mr. W. F. Conway
President & Chief Executive Officer
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.
R. D. 5, Box 169
Ferry Road
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

Mr. Donald Hunter, Vice President
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.
1671 Worcester Road
Framingham, Massachusetts 01701

New England Coalition on
Nuclear Pollution
Hill and Dale Farm
R. D. 2, Box 223
Putney, Vermont 05346

Mr. Walter Zaluzny
Chairman, Board of Selectman
Post Office Box 116
Vernon, Vermont 05345

J. P. Pelletier, Plant Manager
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.
Post Office Box 157
Vernon, Vermont 05354

Raymond N. McCandless
Vermont Division of Occupational
& Radiological Health
Administration Building
10 Baldwin Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Honorable John J. Easton
Attorney General
State of Vermont
109 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

John A. Ritscher, Esquire
Ropes & Gray
225 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

W. P. Murphy, Vice President &
Manager of Operations
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.
R. D. 5, Box 169
Ferry Road
Brattleboro, Vermont 05301

U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Region I Office
Regional Radiation Representative
JFK Federal Building
Boston, Massachusetts 02203

Public Service Board
State of Vermont
120 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Vermont Yankee Decommissioning
Alliance
Box 53
Montpelier, Vermont 05602-0053

Resident Inspector
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 176
Vernon, Vermont 05354

Vermont Public Interest
Research Group, Inc.
43 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Thomas A. Murley
Regional Administrator
Region I Office
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Mr. Richard Saudek, Commissioner
Vermont Department of Public Service
120 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602



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

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION

DOCKET NO. 50-271

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER STATION

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 85
License No. DPR-28

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation (the licensee) dated February 7, 1984, as supplemented May 18, 1984, 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 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-28 is hereby amended to read as follows:

8502040240 850123
PDR ADDCK 05000271
P PDR

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. , 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



Domenic B. Vassallo, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: January 23, 1985

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 85

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-28

DOCKET NO. 50-271

Revise the Technical Specifications as follows:

<u>Remove</u>	<u>Insert</u>
38	38
52	52

VYNPS

TABLE 3.2.1 (Cont)

EMERGENCY CORE COOLING SYSTEM ACTUATION INSTRUMENTATION

<u>High Pressure Coolant Injection System</u>			
<u>Minimum Number of Operable Instrument Channels per Trip System</u>	<u>Trip Function</u>	<u>Trip Level Setting</u>	<u>Required Action When Minimum Conditions for Operation are Not Satisfied</u>
2 (Note 3)	Low-Low Reactor Vessel Water Level	Same as LPCI	Note 5
2 (Note 4)	Low Condensate Storage Tank Water Level	$\geq (-) 2$ inches	Note 5
2 (Note 3)	High Drywell Pressure	Same as LPCI	Note 5
1 (Note 3)	Bus Power Monitor	--	Note 5
1 (Note 4)	Trip System Logic	--	Note 5
2 (Note 7)	High Reactor Vessel Water Level	≤ 177 inches above top of enriched fuel	Note 5

VYNPS

TABLE 4.2.1 (Cont)

High Pressure Coolant Injection System			
<u>Trip Function</u>	<u>Functional Test (8)</u>	<u>Calibration (8)</u>	<u>Instrument Check</u>
Low-Low Reactor Vessel Water Level	(Note 1)	Once/operating cycle	Once each day
Low Condensate Storage Tank Water Level	(Note 1)	Every 3 months	---
High Drywell Pressure	(Note 1)	Once/operating cycle	Once each day
Bus Power Monitor	(Note 1)	None	Once each day
Trip System Logic	Every 6 months (Note 2)	Every 6 months (Note 3)	---



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 85 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-28

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-271

1.0 Introduction

The Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation (VYNPC/the licensee), by letter dated February 7, 1984 proposed a modification to the Technical Specifications. The modification would involve the removal of the automatic transfer of high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) suction, on high torus water level, from the condensate storage tank (CST) to the torus. The request for removal of the automatic transfer is based on the licensee's review of the Browns Ferry report on Station Blackout (NUREG/CR-2182). This report reveals that elevated suppression pool water temperatures during that event can damage the HPCI pumps which use the water pumped from the pool for cooling the lubricating oil of the HPCI pump turbines.

Following a station blackout event, the combination of remote-manual operation of the primary relief valves to control primary pressure and the loss of suppression pool cooling would result in suppression pool temperature of about 160°F after about three hours. At that time the suppression pool level would have increased enough to cause the HPCI pump suction to automatically transfer from the CST to the torus. The temperature limit for an effective lubricating oil cooling of the HPCI turbine is 140°F. Therefore, exceeding this temperature limit could threaten the viability of the HPCI system.

2.0 Evaluation

The licensee, by letter dated May 18, 1984, in response to the staff's request for additional information dated April 12, 1984, indicated that no safety study, accident analyses, procedure, or any other requirement has been identified which requires auto-transfer of HPCI suction as a safety function, or even as necessary for any particular event sequence. It appears that the auto-transfer was put in as an operator aid.

The staff has considered various accident sequences and has not identified a safety requirement to retain automatic transfers of HPCI suction on high torus water level. If the auto transfer on high water level remains functional and the pumps are required to pump water which is 160°F it could render the HPCI system inoperable at a time when the system is needed for plant safety. The auto transfer on low CST water level will still be

8502040254 850123
PDR ADDCK 05000271
P PDR

operable. After removal of the auto-transfer, the manual transfer capability will still exist as will the high level alarm to alert the operator of the high level.

3.0 Summary

Based on the licensee's submittals we have concluded that removal of the automatic transfer of HPCI suction from the CST to the torus will not cause unacceptable consequences on the torus as a result of high water level and there is adequate time for manual transfer if deemed necessary by the operator. Thus we conclude that the proposed Technical Specification change, to delete limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements pertaining to the HPCI automatic suction transfer is acceptable.

4.0 Environmental Considerations

This amendment involves changes in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes in surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the 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.

5.0 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.

Principal Contributor: E. Marinos

Dated: January 23, 1985