

December 28, 1995

Mr. Robert E. Busch  
President - Energy Resources Group  
Northeast Utilities Service Company  
c/o Mr. Richard M. Kacich  
P.O. Box 128  
Waterford, CT 06385

Distribution:

<u>Docket File</u>	RClark	ACRS
PUBLIC	VRooney	JDurr, RI
PD I-3 Plant	OGC	
SVarga	GHill (2)	
PMcKee	RClark	
SNorris	CGrimes	

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (TAC NO. M93020)

Dear Mr. Busch:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 124 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-49 for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, in response to your application dated July 14, 1995.

The amendment revises the frequency of those surveillance requirements for the emergency core cooling systems that now require that the surveillances be performed "at least once per 18 months" to specify that the surveillances be performed "at least once each refueling interval."

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

Sincerely,

Original signed by Phillip F. McKee

for: 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. 124 to NPF-49  
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

9601030262 951228  
PDR ADDOCK 05000423  
PDR

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\ROONEY\M93020.AMD

OFFICE	LA:PDI-3	DRPE	PM:PDI-3	BC:OTSB	OGC	D:PDI-3
NAME	SNorris	RClark:cn	VRooney	CGrimes	OGC	PMcKee
DATE	11/29/95	11/29/95	11/29/95	12/8/95	12/8/95	11/29/95

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

030044

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DF011  
changes noted

CP

December 28, 1995

Mr. Robert E. Busch  
President - Energy Resources Group  
Northeast Utilities Service Company  
c/o Mr. Richard M. Kacich  
P.O. Box 128  
Waterford, CT 06385

Distribution:  
Docket File  
PUBLIC  
PD I-3 Plant  
SVarga  
PMcKee  
SNorris

RClark      ACRS  
VRooney    JDurr, RI  
OGC  
GHill (2)  
RClark  
CGrimes

SUBJECT:      ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (TAC NO. M93020)

Dear Mr. Busch:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 124 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-49 for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, in response to your application dated July 14, 1995.

The amendment revises the frequency of those surveillance requirements for the emergency core cooling systems that now require that the surveillances be performed "at least once per 18 months" to specify that the surveillances be performed "at least once each refueling interval."

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

Sincerely,

Original signed by Phillip F. McKee

for:      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. 124 to NPF-49  
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\ROONEY\M93020.AMD

#95-192

with changes noted

OFFICE	LA:PDI-3	DRPE	PM:PDI-3	BC:OTSB	OGC	D:PDI-3
NAME	SNorris	RClark:cn	VRooney	CGrimes	OGC	PMcKee
DATE	11/20/95	11/29/95	12/21/95	12/5/95	12/8/95	12/24/95

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY



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

December 28, 1995

Mr. Robert E. Busch  
President - Energy Resources Group  
Northeast Utilities Service Company  
c/o Mr. Richard M. Kacich  
P.O. Box 128  
Waterford, CT 06385

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT (TAC NO. M93020)

Dear Mr. Busch:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 124 to Facility Operating License No. NPF-49 for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, in response to your application dated July 14, 1995.

The amendment revises the frequency of those surveillance requirements for the emergency core cooling systems that now require that the surveillances be performed "at least once per 18 months" to specify that the surveillances be performed "at least once each refueling interval."

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vernon L. Rooney".

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. 124 to NPF-49  
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

R. Busch  
Northeast Utilities Service 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

William D. Meinert  
Nuclear Engineer  
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. 124  
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 July 14, 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. 124, 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 90 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: December 28, 1995

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 124

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 5-4

3/4 5-5

3/4 5-6

Insert

3/4 5-4

3/4 5-5

3/4 5-6

## EMERGENCY CORE COOLING SYSTEMS

### SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.5.2 Each ECCS subsystem shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- a. At least once per 12 hours by verifying that the following valves are in the indicated positions with power to the valve operators removed:

<u>Valve Number</u>	<u>Valve Function</u>	<u>Valve Position</u>
3SIH*MV8806	RWST Supply to SI Pumps	OPEN
3SIH*MV8802A	SI Pump A to Hot Leg Injection	CLOSED
3SIH*MV8802B	SI Pump B to Hot Leg Injection	CLOSED
3SIH*MV8835	SI Cold Leg Master Isolation	OPEN
3SIH*MV8813	SI Pump Master Miniflow Isolation	OPEN
3SIL*MV8840	RHR to Hot Leg Injection	CLOSED
3SIL*MV8809A	RHR Pump A to Cold Leg Injection	OPEN
3SIL*MV8809B	RHR Pump B to Cold Leg Injection	OPEN

- b. At least once per 31 days by:
- 1) Verifying that the ECCS piping, except for the RSS pump, heat exchanger and associated piping, is full of water by venting the ECCS pump casings and accessible discharge piping high points, and
  - 2) Verifying that each valve (manual, power-operated, or automatic) in the flow path that is not locked, sealed, or otherwise secured in position, is in its correct position.
- c. By a visual inspection which verifies that no loose debris (rags, trash, clothing, etc.) is present in the containment which could be transported to the containment sump and cause restriction of the pump suction during LOCA conditions. This visual inspection shall be performed:
- 1) For all accessible areas of the containment prior to establishing CONTAINMENT INTEGRITY, and
  - 2) At least once daily of the areas affected (during each day) within containment by containment entry and during the final entry when CONTAINMENT INTEGRITY is established.
- d. At least once each REFUELING INTERVAL by:
- 1) Verifying automatic interlock action of the RHR System from the Reactor Coolant System by ensuring that with a simulated or actual Reactor Coolant System pressure signal greater than or equal to 390 psia the interlocks prevent the valves from being opened.

## EMERGENCY CORE COOLING SYSTEMS

### SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

---

---

- 2) A visual inspection of the containment sump and verifying that the subsystem suction inlets are not restricted by debris and that the sump components (trash racks, screens, etc.) show no evidence of structural distress or abnormal corrosion.
- e. At least once each REFUELING INTERVAL by:
- 1) Verifying that each automatic valve in the flow path actuates to its correct position on a Safety Injection actuation test signal, and
  - 2) Verifying that each of the following pumps start automatically upon receipt of a Safety Injection actuation test signal:
    - a) Centrifugal charging pump,
    - b) Safety Injection pump, and
    - c) RHR pump.
  - 3) Verifying that the Residual Heat Removal pumps stop automatically upon receipt of a Low-Low RWST Level test signal.
- f. By verifying that each of the following pumps develops the indicated differential pressure on recirculation flow when tested pursuant to Specification 4.0.5:
- 1) Centrifugal charging pump  $\geq 2411$  psid,
  - 2) Safety Injection pump  $\geq 1348$  psid,
  - 3) RHR pump  $\geq 165$  psid, and
  - 4) Containment recirculation pump  $\geq 130$  psid.
- g. By verifying the correct position of each electrical and/or mechanical position stop for the following ECCS throttle valves:
- 1) Within 4 hours following completion of each valve stroking operation or maintenance on the valve when the ECCS subsystems are required to be OPERABLE, and
  - 2) At least once each REFUELING INTERVAL.

#### ECCS Throttle Valves

Valve Number

Valve Number

3SIH\*V6

3SIH\*V25

3SIH\*V7

3SIH\*V27

## EMERGENCY CORE COOLING SYSTEMS

### SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

---

<u>ECCS Throttle Valves</u>	
<u>Valve Number</u>	<u>Valve Number</u>
3SIH*V8	3SIH*V107
3SIH*V9	3SIH*V108
3SIH*V21	3SIH*V109
3SIH*V23	3SIH*V111

- h. By performing a flow balance test following completion of modifications to the ECCS subsystems that alter the subsystem flow characteristics and verifying that:
- 1) For centrifugal charging pump lines, with a single pump running:
    - a) The sum of the injection line flow rates, excluding the highest flow rate, is greater than or equal to 339 gpm, and
    - b) The total pump flow rate is less than or equal to 560 gpm.
  - 2) For Safety Injection pump lines, with a single pump running:
    - a) The sum of the injection line flow rates, excluding the highest flow rate, is greater than or equal to 442.5 gpm, and
    - b) The total pump flow rate is less than or equal to 670 gpm for the A pump and 650 gpm for the B pump.
  - 3) For RHR pump lines, with a single pump running, the sum of the injection line flow rates is greater than or equal to 3976 gpm.



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 124

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 July 14, 1995, the Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee), submitted a request for changes to the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3 Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes would revise the frequency of those surveillance requirements for the emergency core cooling systems (ECCS) that now require that the surveillances be performed "at least once per 18 months" to specify that the surveillances be performed "at least once each refueling interval." The application was submitted in accordance with the guidance in NRC Generic Letter (GL) 91-04, "Changes in Technical Specification Surveillance Intervals to Accommodate a 24-Month Fuel Cycle" dated April 2, 1991.

2.0 EVALUATION

Millstone Unit 3 shutdown for the fifth refueling outage on April 14, 1995, and started up in Cycle 6 on June 7, 1995. During the outage, the core was reloaded with fuel designed for a nominal 24 months of operation. To permit operation with this longer fuel cycle, the licensee has submitted 7 applications, in addition to the subject application, to support the nominal 24-month fuel cycle surveillance extensions. This application pertains to the ECCS.

2.1 Design Bases

The ECCS is an integrated set of subsystems that perform emergency coolant injection and recirculation functions to maintain reactor core coolant inventory and adequate decay heat removal following possible major breaks in the reactor coolant or steam system piping, multiple steam generator tube ruptures or rupture of a control rod drive mechanism. The coolant injection function is performed during a relatively short-term period after a pipe break, followed by realignment to a recirculation mode of operation to maintain long-term core cooling. The ECCS consists of the centrifugal charging, the high pressure safety injection (HPSI) and the residual heat removal (RHR) pumps, the passive cold leg accumulators, the containment recirculation pumps, the containment recirculation coolers, the RHR heat

exchangers and the refueling water storage tank (RWST), along with the associated piping, valves, instrumentation and other related equipment.

The HPSI system provides high pressure coolant injection capability and consists of parallel redundant flow trains. Each flow train contains a pump, piping and associated valves. Four accumulators are provided on each ECCS cold leg injection point.

The RHR system performs the low pressure injection function and consists of parallel redundant flow trains. Each RHR flow train consists of a pump, a heat exchanger and associated piping and valves.

The RWST is the water source for both the high and low pressure injection systems during emergency coolant injection. Both systems inject coolant into all four reactor coolant system (RCS) cold legs. The HPSI system can also inject into all four hot legs, while the RHR system, operating in the low pressure safety injection mode, can inject into two hot legs.

After the injection phase is completed, emergency coolant recirculation is performed by the containment recirculation system pump drawing suction from the containment sump and discharging to the pump suctions of either the HPSI or charging pumps, or directly to the RCS cold legs. Heat is transferred from the containment recirculation system heat exchangers to the Reactor Plant Component Cooling Water System by the RHR heat exchangers.

## 2.2 Technical Specification Changes

### 3/4.5.2 ECCS Subsystems - $T_{avg}$ Greater Than or Equal to 350°F.

#### 2.2.1 Overpressure Protection of RHR System and Visual Inspection of Containment Sump

Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.d currently requires that each ECCS subsystem shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- d. At least once per 18 months by:
  - 1) Verifying automatic interlock action of the RHR system from the Reactor Coolant System by ensuring that with a simulated or actual Reactor Coolant System pressure signal greater than or equal to 390 psia the interlocks prevent the valves from being opened.
  - 2) A visual inspection of the containment sump and verifying that the subsystem suction inlets are not restricted by debris and that the sump components (trash racks, screens, etc.) show no evidence of structural distress or abnormal corrosion.

The licensee proposes to change the surveillance interval from once per 18 months to once each refueling interval.

2.2.2 Automatic Valve Positions, Automatic Start of the Charging, Safety Injection and RHR Pumps and Cut-Off from RWST

Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.c. currently requires that each ECCS subsystem shall be demonstrated OPERABLE:

- e. At least once per 18 months, during shutdown, by:
  - 1) Verifying that each automatic valve in the flow path actuates to its correct position on a Safety Injection actuation test signal, and
  - 2) Verifying that each of the following pumps start automatically upon receipt of a Safety Injection actuation test signal:
    - a) Centrifugal charging pump,
    - b) Safety Injection pump, and
    - c) RHR pump.
  - 3) Verifying that the Residual Heat Removal pumps stop automatically upon receipt of a Low-Low RWST Level test signal.

The licensee proposes to change the surveillance interval from once per 18 months to once each refueling interval and to delete the words "during shutdown."

2.2.3 Correct Position of Throttle Valves

Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.g. 2) currently requires that each ECCS subsystem shall be demonstrated OPERABLE by verifying the correct position of each electrical and/or mechanical position stop for the following ECCS throttle valves:

- 2) At least once per 18 months.

ECCS Throttle Valves

Valve Number

Valve Number

3SIH\*V6  
3SIH\*V7  
3SIH\*V8  
3SIH\*V9  
3SIH\*V21  
3SIH\*V23

3SIH\*V25  
3SIH\*V27  
3SIH\*V107  
3SIH\*V108  
3SIH\*V109  
3SIH\*V111

The licensee proposes to change the surveillance interval from once per 18 months to once each refueling interval.

#### 2.2.4 Flow Balance Tests

Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.h currently requires that each ECCS subsystem shall be demonstrated OPERABLE by performing a flow balance test, during shutdown, following completion of modifications to the ECCS subsystems that alter the subsystem flow characteristics and to perform specified verifications. The licensee proposes to delete the words "during shutdown."

#### 2.3 Justification For Changes

In accordance with the guidance in GL 91-04, for each of the proposed changes in surveillance intervals, the licensee has reviewed the historical plant maintenance and surveillance results to support their conclusion that extending the surveillance intervals does not have a significant effect on operability of the ECCS or safety of plant operation.

Generic Letter 91-04 stated that licensees may omit the TS qualification that surveillances be performed "during shutdown." Because the terms "Hot" and "Cold" Shutdown are defined in the TS as operating modes or conditions, the restriction to perform certain surveillances during shutdown could be misinterpreted. The generic letter noted that if the performance of a refueling interval surveillance during plant operation would adversely affect safety, the licensee should postpone the surveillance until the plant is shutdown for refueling or in a condition or mode consistent with safe conduct of that surveillance. In the application, the licensee stated that they agreed with this position. Deletion of the term "during shutdown" is, therefore, acceptable.

##### 2.3.1 Overpressure Protection of RHR System and Visual Inspection of Containment Sump

As noted above, the RHR is a relatively low pressure injection system. The RHR system isolation valves are normally closed and are only opened for residual heat removal after the reactor system pressure is reduced to approximately 390 psia. There are three motor-operated valves in series for each of the two RHR pump suction lines from the reactor coolant system hot legs. Two valves located close to the containment walls, one inside containment and one outside containment, are provided with interlocks. Each of the two valves is interlocked so that it cannot be opened unless the reactor system pressure is below approximately 390 psia. The interlocks for each train are independent and diverse. If a valve were to open or to remain open when primary system pressure was being increased, an alarm will sound alerting the operators to take action. The licensee's evaluation of past surveillances and preventative and corrective maintenance records indicated that the circuits remained within the acceptance criteria and that there was no indication of time dependent drift. The records provide reasonable assurance that extending the surveillance interval will not degrade the performance of the interlocks. The proposed change is, therefore, acceptable.

The four containment recirculation pumps take suction from a common containment sump which is enclosed by a protective screen assembly. Three stages of trash rejection are provided: grating, coarse mesh and a fine mesh. The assembly is divided at the centerline by fine mesh screening so that failure of either half does not adversely affect the other half. The containment recirculation pumps from each subsystem take suction from each half of the sump. If half of the screen assembly should become clogged, water is still available to all suction points via the screening separating the two sections of the sump. There is also a 1½ inch grating at elevation -24 feet, 6 inches, which covers the sump and acts as a vortex breaker to prevent air entrainment in the pumps.

The licensee's review of the past four inspections of the containment sump and subsystem suction inlets did not indicate any evidence of structural distress or abnormal corrosion of the containment subcomponents and did not indicate any significant debris that could restrict the subsystem suction inlets. In all cases, the inspection acceptance criteria were met. A review of corrective maintenance records show that no corrective maintenance has been necessary or performed. It is also noted that no preventive maintenance is required on an 18 month basis. Based on the above evaluation, the proposed change is considered acceptable.

#### 2.3.2 Automatic Valve Positions, Automatic Start of the Charging, Safety Injection and RHR Pumps and Cut-Off from RWST

Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.e.1 verifies the operability of each automatic valve in the ECCS flow path. Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.e.2 verifies the operability of each charging pump, safety injection pump and RHR pump by verifying that each of the pumps start automatically upon receipt of a safety injection (SI) test signal.

Equipment performance over the last four operating cycles was evaluated by the licensee to determine the impact on extending the frequency of Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.e.1 and 4.5.2.e.2. This evaluation included a review of the past surveillance results, preventive maintenance records, and the frequency and type of corrective maintenance.

The review indicated that the automatic valves in the 'A' and 'B' trains actuated as required in response to the SI test signal in each case. In all cases, the charging pump and the charging pump cooling pumps, SI pumps and SI pump cooling pumps, and RHR pumps started automatically in response to the SI test signal.

A review of the preventive maintenance records for all the above pumps revealed that no mechanical preventive maintenance is required on an 18 month basis. For the above pumps, an oil change is performed on an 18 month basis but the manufacturer does not require oil changes unless there is oil discoloration or foreign particles appear in the oil. The oil change could be performed with the plant on line if necessary. Hypot testing of the motors and cables has shown a very low failure rate.

Corrective maintenance work performed on these pumps during the last four operating cycles involved minor gasket leaks and oil level adjustments. In all cases, repairs were able to be performed with no adverse impact on plant operation.

In addition to the 18 month surveillance which verifies the pumps start on receipt of an SI test signal, the pump differential pressure and vibration are monitored by the inservice testing program (Specification 4.0.5) on a quarterly basis. Also, Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.b.2 verifies that each valve (manual, power-operated, or automatic) in the flow path is in its correct position at least once per 31 days. These surveillances provide additional assurance that the ECCS subsystem components will be operable and will perform their integrated function. On the basis of the above evaluation, the proposed changes are acceptable.

The RWST low-low level setpoint stops the RHR pumps which is alarmed to alert the operator to realign the ECCS from injection to the recirculation mode following a design basis accident. Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.e.3 verifies that the RHR pumps stop automatically upon receipt of a low-low RWST level test signal. A review of the past surveillance results indicate that these instruments were calibrated within the acceptance criteria and there was no indication of linear time dependent drift with regard to the circuit components.

The review of past preventive maintenance and corrective maintenance activities did not identify any significant activities that were required to correct component failures. On the basis of the above, there is reasonable assurance that extending the surveillance interval from 18 to 24 months will not degrade the capability of the equipment of performing the intended functions. The proposed changes to the TS are, therefore, acceptable.

### 2.3.3 Correct Position of Throttle Valves

Surveillance Requirement 4.5.2.g.2 verifies the operability of certain ECCS throttle valves by checking the correct position of each electrical and/or mechanical position stop. The licensee evaluated the performance of the throttle valves over the last four operating cycles including a review of past surveillance results, preventive maintenance records and the frequency and type of corrective maintenance. The review of surveillance results indicate that the valve positions were within acceptable tolerance for all surveillances performed, except in cases where the valves had maintenance performed. Valves were restored to their throttle position at the completion of maintenance activity.

Corrective maintenance performed on these valves was limited to packing adjustments and replacements. After each maintenance activity, the valve was restored to its required throttle position. A review of preventive maintenance records revealed that no preventive maintenances are performed on an 18 month basis.

Based on the above, extending the surveillance frequency from 18 to 24 months is very unlikely to affect the operability of these throttle valves. The proposed change to the TS is, therefore, acceptable.

#### 2.4 Trisodium phosphate storage baskets

In the July 14, 1995 submittal, the licensee provided a discussion of Surveillance Requirement 4.5.5 which requires verification each REFUELING INTERVAL that there is a minimum total of 974 cubic feet of trisodium phosphate in the storage baskets. This page was revised by Amendment No. 115 on May 26, 1995, which was after the first of the licensee's submittals for TS changes to accommodate a 24 month refueling cycle. The staff's previous assessment took into account that "refueling interval" would likely be 24 months. There are no changes required to surveillance requirement 4.5.5 and no additional evaluation is necessary.

#### 2.5 Probabilistic Risk Assessment

As discussed in the NRC staff's safety evaluation on the first submittal (May 1, 1995) related to a 24-month fuel cycle, the licensee's staff performed a probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) of the proposed TS changes to supplement the deterministic type assessment discussed above. The PRA review concluded that there was a negligible or minimal impact on postulated core damage frequency by the changes in surveillance intervals. The independent risk assessment fully supports and confirms the deterministic evaluation that the change in surveillance frequencies results in no significant reduction in the margin of safety and 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 requirements with respect to the installation or use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes surveillance 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 58402). Accordingly, the 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 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: R. Clark

Date: December 28, 1995