

October 18, 1995

Mr. John F. Opeka
Executive Vice President, Nuclear
Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
Post Office Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (TAC NO. M91891)

Dear Mr. Opeka:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 120 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-49 for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, in response to your application dated March 29, 1995.

The amendment modifies the current Technical Specifications that have cycle-specific parameter limits in the Core Operating Limits Report to include an additional cycle-specific parameter and its supporting methodologies.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. The notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Vernon L. Rooney, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate I-3
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-423

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 120 to NPF-49
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

Distribution:

Docket File	SNorris	THuang
PUBLIC	VRooney	ACRS XX
PD I-3 Memo	OGC	LNicholson, RI
SVarga	GHill (2)	
PMcKee	CGrimes	

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\GRIGGS\M91891.AMD

OFFICE	LA:PDI-3	PM:PDI-3	PM:PDI-3	OGC	PDI-3
NAME	SNorris	MGriggs:cn	VRooney		
DATE	07/26/95	07/27/95	08/13/95	08/18/95	08/31/95

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

9510230401 951018
PDR ADOCK 05000423
P PDR

DFD1



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

October 18, 1995

Mr. John F. Opeka
Executive Vice President, Nuclear
Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
Post Office Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (TAC NO. M91891)

Dear Mr. Opeka:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 120 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-49 for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, in response to your application dated March 29, 1995.

The amendment modifies the current Technical Specifications that have cycle-specific parameter limits in the Core Operating Limits Report to include an additional cycle-specific parameter and its supporting methodologies.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. The notice of issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "V. Rooney", is written over the typed name.

Vernon L. Rooney, Senior Project Manager
Project Directorate I-3
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-423

Enclosures: 1. Amendment No. 120 to NPF-49
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encs: See next page

J. Opeka
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company

Millstone Nuclear Power Station
Unit 3

cc:

Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq.
Senior Nuclear Counsel
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270

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

F. R. Dacimo, Vice President
Haddam Neck Station
Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company
362 Injun Hollow Road
East Hampton, CT 06424-3099

First Selectmen
Town of Waterford
Hall of Records
200 Boston Post Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Kevin T. A. McCarthy, Director
Monitoring and Radiation Division
Department of Environmental Protection
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127

P. D. Swetland, Resident Inspector
Millstone Nuclear Power Station
c/o U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 513
Niantic, CT 06357

Allan Johanson, Assistant Director
Office of Policy and Management
Policy Development and Planning Division
80 Washington Street
Hartford, CT 06106

Donald B. Miller, Jr.
Senior Vice President
Millstone Station
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

S. E. Scace, Vice President
Nuclear Operations Services
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

M. H. Brothers, Nuclear Unit Director
Millstone Unit No. 3
Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

Nicholas S. Reynolds
Winston & Strawn
1400 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Burlington Electric Department
c/o Robert E. Fletcher, Esq.
271 South Union Street
Burlington, VT 05402

R. M. Kacich, Director
Nuclear Planning, Licensing & Budgeting
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

M. R. Scully, Executive Director
Connecticut Municipal Electric
Energy Cooperative
30 Stott Avenue
Norwich, CT 06360

W. J. Baranowski, Acting Director
Nuclear Quality and Assessment Services
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P.O. Box 128
Waterford, CT 06385

David W. Graham
Fuel Supply Planning Manager
Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale
Electric Company
P.O. Box 426
Ludlow, MA 01056



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY, ET AL.

DOCKET NO. 50-423

MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 120
License No. NPF-49

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al. (the licensee), dated March 29, 1995, 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. NPF-49 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 120 , and the Environmental Protection Plan contained in Appendix B, both of which are attached hereto are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance, to be implemented within 60 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



Phillip F. McKee, Director
Project Directorate I-3
Division of Reactor Projects - I/II
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: October 18, 1995

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 120

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-49

DOCKET NO. 50-423

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the attached pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain vertical lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove

3/4 2-5
3/4 2-6
3/4 2-8
3/4 2-11
3/4 2-12
3/4 2-13
3/4 2-15
3/4 2-17
6-20

Insert

3/4 2-5
3/4 2-6
3/4 2-8
3/4 2-11
3/4 2-12
3/4 2-13
3/4 2-15
3/4 2-17
6-20

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

3/4.2.2 HEAT FLUX HOT CHANNEL FACTOR - $F_Q(Z)$

FOUR LOOPS OPERATING

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

3.2.2.1 $F_Q(Z)$ shall be limited by the following relationships:

$$F_Q(Z) \leq \frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{P} K(Z) \text{ for } P > 0.5$$

$$F_Q(Z) \leq \frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{0.5} K(Z) \text{ for } P \leq 0.5$$

F_Q^{RTP} = the F_Q limit at RATED THERMAL POWER (RTP) provided in the core operating limits report (COLR).

Where: $P = \frac{\text{THERMAL POWER}}{\text{RATED THERMAL POWER}}$, and

$K(Z)$ = the normalized $F_Q(Z)$ as a function of core height specified in the COLR.

APPLICABILITY: MODE 1.

ACTION:

With $F_Q(Z)$ exceeding its limit:

- a. For RAOC operation with $F_Q(Z)$ outside the applicable limit specified in the COLR:
 - (1) Within 15 minutes, control the AFD to within new AFD limits which are determined by reducing the applicable AFD limits by 1% AFD for each percent $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds its limits. Within 8 hours, reset the AFD alarm setpoints to these modified limits, or

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION (Continued)

- (2) Reduce THERMAL POWER at least 1% for each 1% $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limit within 15 minutes and similarly reduce the Power Range Neutron Flux-High Trip Setpoints within the next 4 hours; POWER OPERATION may proceed for up to a total of 72 hours; subsequent POWER OPERATION may proceed provided the Overpower ΔT Trip Setpoints have been reduced at least 1% for each 1% $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limit, or
- (3) Verify that the requirements of Specification 4.2.2.1.3 for base load operation are satisfied and enter base load operation.

Where it is necessary to calculate the percent that $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limits for items (1) and (2) above, it shall be calculated as the maximum percent over the core height (Z) that $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds its limit by the following expression:

$$\left[\left[\frac{F_Q^M(Z) \times W(Z)}{\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{P} \times K(Z)} \right] - 1 \right] \times 100 \text{ for } P \geq 0.5$$

$$\left[\left[\frac{F_Q^M(Z) \times W(Z)}{\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{0.5} \times K(Z)} \right] - 1 \right] \times 100 \text{ for } P < 0.5$$

- b. For base load operation outside the applicable limit specified in the COLR, perform either of the following actions:
 - (1) Place the core in an equilibrium condition where the limit in 4.2.2.1.2.C is satisfied, and remeasure $F_Q^M(Z)$, or

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

- c. Satisfying the following relationship:

$$F_Q^M(Z) \leq \frac{F_Q^{RTP} \times K(Z)}{P \times W(Z)} \text{ for } P > 0.5$$

$$F_Q^M(Z) \leq \frac{F_Q^{RTP} \times K(Z)}{W(Z) \times 0.5} \text{ for } P \leq 0.5$$

where $F_Q^M(Z)$ is the measured $F_Q(Z)$ increased by the allowances for manufacturing tolerances and measurement uncertainty, F_Q^{RTP} is the F_Q limit, $K(Z)$ is the normalized $F_Q(Z)$ as a function of core height, P is the relative THERMAL POWER, and $W(Z)$ is the cycle-dependent function that accounts for power distribution transients encountered during normal operation. F_Q^{RTP} , $K(Z)$, and $W(Z)$ are specified in the CORE OPERATING LIMITS REPORT as per Specification 6.9.1.6.

- d. Measuring $F_Q^M(Z)$ according to the following schedule:

- (1) Upon achieving equilibrium conditions after exceeding by 10% or more of RATED THERMAL POWER, the THERMAL POWER at which $F_Q(Z)$ was last determined,* or
- (2) At least once per 31 Effective Full Power Days, whichever occurs first.

- e. With the maximum value of

$$\frac{F_Q^M(Z)}{K(Z)}$$

over the core height (Z) increasing since the previous determination of $F_Q^M(Z)$, either of the following actions shall be taken:

- (1) $F_Q^M(Z)$ shall be increased over that specified in Specification 4.2.2.1.2c by an appropriate factor specified in the COLR, or

* During power escalation at the beginning of each cycle, power level may be increased until a power level for extended operation has been achieved and power distribution map outlined.

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

- e. With the maximum value of

$$\frac{F_Q^M(Z)}{K(Z)}$$

over the core height (Z) increasing since the previous determination of $F_Q^M(Z)$, either of the following actions shall be taken:

- (1) $F_Q^M(Z)$ shall be increased over that specified in 4.2.2.1.4.c by an appropriate factor specified in the COLR, or
- (2) $F_Q^M(Z)$ shall be measured at least once per 7 Effective Full Power Days until 2 successive maps indicate that the maximum value of

$$\frac{F_Q^M(Z)}{K(Z)}$$

over the core height (Z) is not increasing.

- f. The limits specified in 4.2.2.1.4.c and 4.2.2.1.4.e are not applicable in the following core plane regions:

- (1) Lower core region 0% to 15%, inclusive.
- (2) Upper core region 85% to 100%, inclusive.

4.2.2.1.5 When $F_Q(Z)$ is measured for reasons other than meeting the requirements of Specifications 4.2.2.1.2 or 4.2.2.1.4, an overall measured $F_Q(Z)$ shall be obtained from a power distribution map and increased by 3% to account for manufacturing tolerances and further increased by 5% to account for measurement uncertainty.

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

HEAT FLUX HOT CHANNEL FACTOR - $F_Q(Z)$

THREE LOOPS OPERATING

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION

3.2.2.2 $F_Q(Z)$ shall be limited by the following relationships:

$$F_Q(Z) \leq \frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{P} [K(Z)] \text{ for } P > 0.375$$

$$F_Q(Z) \leq \left[\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{0.375} \right] [K(Z)] \text{ for } P \leq 0.375$$

F_Q^{RTP} = The F_Q limit at RATED THERMAL POWER (RTP) specified in the CORE OPERATING LIMITS REPORT (COLR).

Where: $P = \frac{\text{THERMAL POWER}}{\text{RATED THERMAL POWER}}$, and

$K(Z)$ = the normalized $F_Q(Z)$ as a function of core height specified in the COLR.

APPLICABILITY: MODE 1.

ACTION:

With $F_Q(Z)$ exceeding its limit:

- a. For RAOC operation with $F_Q(Z)$ outside the applicable limit specified in the COLR:
 - (1) Within 15 minutes, control the AFD to within new AFD limits which are determined by reducing the applicable AFD limits by 1% AFD for each percent $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds its limits. Within 8 hours, reset the AFD alarm setpoints to these modified limits, or
 - (2) Reduce THERMAL POWER at least 1% for each 1% $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limit within 15 minutes and similarly reduce the Power Range Neutron Flux-High Trip Setpoints within the next 4 hours; POWER OPERATION may proceed for up to a total of 72 hours; subsequent

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION (Continued)

POWER OPERATION may proceed provided the Overpower ΔT Trip Setpoints have been reduced at least 1% for each 1% $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limit. The Overpower ΔT Trip Setpoint reduction shall be performed with the reactor in at least HOT STANDBY, or

- (3) Verify that the requirements of Specification 4.2.2.1.3 for base load operation are satisfied and enter base load operation.

Where it is necessary to calculate the percent that $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limits for items (1) and (2) above, it shall be calculated as the maximum percent over the core height (Z) that $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds its limit by the following expression:

$$\left[\left[\frac{F_Q^M(Z) \times W(Z)}{\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{P} \times K(Z)} \right] - 1 \right] \times 100 \text{ for } P \geq 0.375$$

$$\left[\left[\frac{F_Q^M(Z) \times W(Z)}{\frac{F_Q^{RTP}}{0.375} \times K(Z)} \right] - 1 \right] \times 100 \text{ for } P < 0.375$$

- b. For base load operation outside the applicable limit specified in the COLR, perform either of the following actions:

- (1) Place the core in an equilibrium condition where the limit in 4.2.2.2.C is satisfied, and remeasure $F_Q^M(Z)$, or
- (2) Reduce THERMAL POWER at least 1% for each 1% $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limit within 15 minutes and similarly reduce the Power Range Neutron Flux-High Trip Setpoints within the next 4 hours; POWER OPERATION may proceed for up to a total of 72 hours; subsequent POWER OPERATION may proceed provided the Overpower ΔT Trip Setpoints have been reduced at least 1% for each 1% $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limit. The Overpower ΔT Trip Setpoint reduction shall be performed with the reactor in at least HOT STANDBY. The percent that F_Q exceeds the limit shall be calculated as the maximum percent over the core height (Z) that $F_Q(Z)$ exceeds the limit using the following expression:

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

d. Measuring $F_Q^M(Z)$ according to the following schedule:

- (1) Upon achieving equilibrium conditions after exceeding by 10% or more of RATED THERMAL POWER, the THERMAL POWER at which $F_Q(Z)$ was last determined,* or
- (2) At least once per 31 Effective Full Power Days, whichever occurs first.

e. With the maximum value of

$$\frac{F_Q^M(Z)}{K(Z)}$$

over the core height (Z) increasing since the previous determination of $F_Q^M(Z)$, either of the following actions shall be taken:

- (1) $F_Q^M(Z)$ shall be increased over that specified in Specification 4.2.2.2.2c by an appropriate factor specified in the COLR, or
- (2) $F_Q^M(Z)$ shall be measured at least once per 7 Effective Full Power Days until two successive maps indicate that the maximum value of

$$\frac{F_Q^M(Z)}{K(Z)}$$

over the core height (Z) is not increasing.

f. The limits specified in Specifications 4.2.2.2.2c and 4.2.2.2.2e are not applicable in the following core plane regions:

- (1) Lower core region from 0% to 15%, inclusive.
- (2) Upper core region from 85% to 100%, inclusive.

*During power escalation at the beginning of each cycle, the power level may be increased until a power level for extended operation has been achieved and power distribution map obtained.

POWER DISTRIBUTION LIMITS

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

- c. Satisfying the following relationship:

$$F_Q^M(Z) \leq \frac{F_Q^{RTP} \times K(Z)}{P \times W(Z)_{BL}} \text{ for } P > APL^{ND}$$

where: $F_Q^M(Z)$ is the measured $F_Q(Z)$. The F_Q^{RTP} is the F_Q limit, the normalized $F_Q(Z)$ as a function of core height. P is the relative THERMAL POWER. $W(Z)_{BL}$ is the cycle-dependent function that accounts for limited power distribution transients encountered during base load operation. F_Q^{RTP} , $K(Z)$, and $W(Z)_{BL}$ are specified in the COLR as per Specification 6.9.1.6.

- d. Measuring $F_Q^M(Z)$ in conjunction with target flux difference determination according to the following schedule:

- (1) Prior to entering base load operation after satisfying Section 4.2.2.2.3, unless a full core flux map has been taken in the previous 31 Effective Full Power Days with the relative THERMAL POWER having been maintained above APL^{ND} for the 24 hours prior to mapping, and
- (2) At least once per 31 Effective Full Power Days.

- e. With the maximum value of

$$\frac{F_Q^M(z)}{K(z)}$$

over the core height (Z) increasing since the previous determination of $F_Q^M(Z)$, either of the following actions shall be taken:

- (1) $F_Q^M(Z)$ shall be increased over that specified in 4.2.2.2.4.c by an appropriate factor specified in the COLR, or

CORE OPERATING LIMITS REPORT (Cont.)

2. Shutdown Rod Insertion Limit for Specification 3/4.1.3.5,
3. Control Rod Insertion Limits for Specification 3/4.1.3.6,
4. Axial Flux Difference Limits, target band, and APLND for Specifications 3/4.2.1.1 and 3/4.2.1.2,
5. Heat Flux Hot Channel Factor, $K(z)$, $W(z)$, APLND, and $W(z)_{BL}$ for Specifications 3/4.2.2.1 and 3/4.2.2.2.
6. Nuclear Enthalpy Rise Hot Channel Factor, Power Factor Multiplier for Specification 3/4.2.3.

6.9.1.6.b The analytical methods used to determine the core operating limits shall be those previously reviewed and approved by the NRC in:

1. WCAP-9272-P-A, "WESTINGHOUSE RELOAD SAFETY EVALUATION METHODOLOGY," July 1985 (W Proprietary). (Methodology for Specifications 3.1.1.3--Moderator Temperature Coefficient, 3.1.3.5--Shutdown Bank Insertion Limit, 3.1.3.6--Control Bank Insertion Limits, 3.2.1--Axial Flux Difference, 3.2.2--Heat Flux Hot Channel Factor, 3.2.3--Nuclear Enthalpy Rise Hot Channel Factor.)
2. WCAP-8385, "Power Distribution Control and Load Following Procedures - Topical Report," September 1981 (W Proprietary).
3. T. M. Anderson to K. Kniel (Chief of Core Performance Branch, NRC), January 31, 1980--Attachment: Operation and Safety-Analysis Aspects of an Improved Load Follow Package.
4. NUREG-800, Standard Review Plan, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Section 4.3, Nuclear Design, July 1981 Branch Technical Position CPB 4.3-1, Westinghouse Constant Axial Offset Control (CAOC), Revision 2, July 1981.
5. WCAP-10216-P-A, "RELAXATION OF CONSTANT AXIAL OFFSET CONTROL FQ SURVEILLANCE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION," Rev. 1, October 1993 (W Proprietary). (Methodology for Specifications 3.2.1--Axial Flux Difference [Relaxed Axial Offset Control] and 3.2.2--Heat Flux Hot Channel Factor [$W(z)$ surveillance requirements for F_Q Methodology].)
6. WCAP-9561-P-A, ADD. 3, Rev. 1, "BART A-1: A COMPUTER CODE FOR THE BEST ESTIMATE ANALYSIS OF REFLOOD TRANSIENTS--SPECIAL REPORT: THIMBLE MODELING W ECCS EVALUATION MODEL," July 1986 (W Proprietary). (Methodology for Specification 3.2.2--Heat Flux Hot Channel Factor.)
7. WCAP-10266-P-A, Rev. 2, "THE 1981 VERSION OF WESTINGHOUSE EVALUATION MODEL USING BASH CODE," March 1987 (W Proprietary). (Methodology for Specification 3.2.2--Heat Flux Hot Channel Factor.)



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 120

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-49

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY, ET AL.

MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3

DOCKET NO. 50-423

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated March 29, 1995, the Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, submitted a request for changes to the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3 Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes would modify the current Technical Specifications that have cycle-specific parameter limits in the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR) to include an additional cycle-specific parameter and its supporting methodologies.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee requested TS changes in accordance with Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 50.90. The revised Specifications were proposed as follows:

- (a) Specifications 3.2.2.1 and 3.2.2

The proposed changes involve deletion of the words "perform one of the following actions" and addition of words "or" between the three options provided by the action statement. These changes are administrative in nature, therefore, are acceptable.

- (b) Surveillance Requirements 4.2.2.1.2.e, 4.2.2.1.4.e, 4.2.2.2.2.e and 4.2.2.2.4.e

The present TS call for a fixed penalty of 2% to be applied to the measured heat flux hot channel factor, $F_q^M(Z)$. The proposed change involves using a penalty factor which is a cycle-specific parameter over certain burnup ranges and core design. The penalty factors are specified in the COLR. The penalty factor is calculated using an NRC-approved method indicated in a letter dated November 26, 1993, "Acceptance for Referencing of Revised Version of Licensing Topical Report WCAP-10216-P, Rev. 1, Relaxation of Constant Axial Offset Control - F_q Surveillance Technical Specifications." Therefore, the proposed change is acceptable.

(c) Specification 6.9.1.6

The approved supporting methodology is identified in reference 5 of TS 6.9.1.6.b.

The bases of affected specifications have been modified by the licensee to include appropriate reference to the COLR. Based on the NRC staff's review, the staff has no objection to the changes to these bases.

The NRC staff concludes that the licensee provided an acceptable response to those items addressed in the NRC guidance in Generic Letter 88-16 on modifying cycle-specific parameter limits in TS. Because plant operation continues to be limited in accordance with the values of cycle-specific parameter limits that are established using NRC approved methodologies, the NRC staff concludes that these changes to these specifications are acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Connecticut State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The amendment also relates to changes in administrative procedures or requirements. The NRC 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (60 FR 24912). Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9) and (10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: T. Huang

Date: October 18, 1995