

August 23, 2007

Mr. Gene F. St. Pierre, Site Vice President
c/o James M. Peschel
Seabrook Station
FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC
PO Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

SUBJECT: SEABROOK STATION, UNIT NO. 1 - ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT RE:
MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGES," (TAC
NO. MD2791)

Dear Mr. St. Pierre:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 116 to Facility Operating License (FOL) No. NPF-86 for the Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 (Seabrook), in response to your application dated August 7, 2006, as supplemented by letters dated January 22, May 14, and August 7, 2007.

The amendment revises the Seabrook Technical Specifications (TSs) to correct a joint-owner name in the operating license, remove a license condition from Appendix C to the FOL, and remove the list of Bases sections from the TS Index. Additionally, the amendment removes two manual valves from TS table 3.3-9, "Remote Shutdown System," adds the requirement that only one charging pump is permitted to be aligned for injection into the reactor coolant system in Modes 4, 5, and 6, removes a 1-hour reporting requirement for portable makeup pump system storage from TS 3.7.4, "Service Water System/Ultimate Heat Sink," deletes a footnote from TS 3.7.6.2, "Air Conditioning," and modifies TS 6.7.6, "Radioactive Effluent Controls Program."

G. St. Pierre

-2-

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,

/ra/

G. Edward Miller, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 116 to NPF-86
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

G. St. Pierre

-2-

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,

/ra/

G. Edward Miller, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 116 to NPF-86
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

RidsNRRLpl1-2	RidsOgcMailCenter	RidsRgn1MailCenter	RDennig, NRR
PUBLIC	RidsNrrRMGMiller	RidsAcrcsAcnwMailCenter	JNakoski, NRR
LPL1-2R/F	RidsNrrLAABaxter	DNold, NRR	JSegala, NRR
RidsNrrDorl	GHill (2)	FOrr, NRR	JTatum, NRR

Package Accession Number: ML072260451

Amendment Accession Number: ML072260459

Tech Specs. Accession Number: ML072390190*SE Input

OFFICE	LPL1-2/PM	LPL1-2/LA	LPL1-1/LA	DSS/SCVB/BC	DSS/SPWB/BC	DSS/SBPB/BC	OGC	LPL1-2/BC
NAME	GEMiller	ABaxter	MO'Brien	RDennig	GCranston*	JWermiel for SJones*	LSubin (NLO)	HChernoff (RBennis for)
DATE	8/23/07	8/22/07	8/23/07	8/23/07	5/17/07	7/18/07	8/17/07	8/23/07

Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1

cc:

Mr. J. A. Stall
Senior Vice President, Nuclear and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Peter Brann
Assistant Attorney General
State House, Station #6
Augusta, ME 04333

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Seabrook Nuclear Power Station
P.O. Box 1149
Seabrook, NH 03874

Town of Exeter
10 Front Street
Exeter, NH 03823

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

Office of the Attorney General
One Ashburton Place, 20th Floor
Boston, MA 02108

Board of Selectmen
Town of Amesbury
Town Hall
Amesbury, MA 01913

Mr. Robert Poole
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Region I
99 High Street, 6th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

Mr. Tom Crimmins
Polestar Applied Technology
One First Street, Suite 4
Los Altos, CA 94019

John Giarrusso
Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency
400 Worcester Road
Framingham, MA 01702-5399

Ms. Kelly Ayotte, Attorney General
Mr. Orvil Fitch, Deputy Attorney General
33 Capitol Street
Concord, NH 03301

Mr. Christopher M. Pope, Director
Homeland Security & Emergency Mgmt.
New Hampshire Department of Safety
Bureau of Emergency Management
33 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301

Mr. M. S. Ross, Managing Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Rajiv S. Kundalkar
Vice President - Nuclear Technical Services
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

James M. Peschel
Regulatory Programs Manager
FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC
PO Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

Ms. Marjan Mashhadi
Senior Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Suite 220
Washington, DC 20004

Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1

cc:

Mr. Mark E. Warner
Vice President, Nuclear Operations,
North Region
(Seabrook & Duane Arnold Plants)
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Joseph Roy
Director of Operations
Massachusetts Municipal
Wholesale Electric Company
Moody Street
Ludlow, MA 01056

Mr. Don E. Grissette
Vice President, Nuclear Training and
Performance Improvement
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 3340

Mr. Michael W. Kiley
Plant General Manager
FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC
P.O. Box 300
Seabrook, NH 03874

FPL ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, ET AL.*

DOCKET NO. 50-443

SEABROOK STATION, UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 116
License No. NPF-86

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment filed by FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC, et al. (the licensee), dated August 7, 2006, as supplemented by letters dated January 22, May 14, and August 7, 2007, 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.

*FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC (FPLE Seabrook) is authorized to act as agent for the: Hudson Light & Power Department, Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company, and Taunton Municipal Light Plant and has exclusive responsibility and control over the physical construction, operation and maintenance of the facility.

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-86 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 116, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications and the Environmental Protection Plan.

3. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to Appendix C to Facility Operating License No. NPF-86 as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.J of Facility Operating License No. NPF-86 is hereby amended to read as follows:

J. Additional Conditions

The Additional Conditions contained in Appendix C, as revised through Amendment No. 116, are hereby incorporated into this license. FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC, shall operate the facility in accordance with the Additional Conditions.

4. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/ra/ (RBennis for)

Harold K. Chernoff, Chief
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment: Changes to the License and
Technical Specifications

Date of Issuance: August 23, 2007

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 116

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-86

DOCKET NO. 50-443

Replace the following pages of Facility Operating License No. NPF-86 with the attached revised pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the area of change.

<u>Remove</u>	<u>Insert</u>
1	1
3	3
7	7

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A, Technical Specifications, with the attached revised pages as indicated. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the area of change.

<u>Remove</u>	<u>Insert</u>
x	x
xi	xi
xii	xii
xiii	--
xiv	--
xv	--
3/4 3-47	3/4 3-47
3/4 4-28	3/4 4-28
3/4 4-29	3/4 4-29
3/4 4-30	3/4 4-30
3/4 4-31	3/4 4-31
3/4 4-32	3/4 4-32
3/4 4-33	3/4 4-33
3/4 7-13	3/4 7-13
3/4 7-13A	3/4 7-13A
3/4 7-18a	3/4 7-18a
6-4	6-4
6-8	6-8

Replace the following page of the Appendix C, Additional Conditions, with the attached revised page as indicated. The revised page is identified by amendment number and contains marginal lines indicating the area of change.

<u>Remove</u>	<u>Insert</u>
1	1

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 116TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-86
FPL ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC
SEABROOK STATION, UNIT NO. 1
DOCKET NO. 50-443

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letters dated August 7, 2006 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS)) Accession No. ML062220354), as supplemented by letters dated January 22, May 14, and August 7, 2007 (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML070250206, ML071360401, and ML072220119 respectively), FPL Energy Seabrook, LLC (FPLE or the licensee) submitted License Amendment Request (LAR) No. 06-03, requesting changes to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Seabrook Station, Unit No. 1 (Seabrook). In response to Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff questions, the licensee submitted a revised significant hazards consideration via the May 14, 2007, letter. The supplements provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the NRC staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register* on June 5, 2007 (72 FR 31101).

The amendment would revise the Seabrook Technical Specifications (TSs) to correct a joint-owner name in the operating license, remove a license condition from Appendix C to the FOL, and remove the list of Bases sections from the TS Index. Additionally, the amendment would remove two manual valves from TS table 3.3-9, "Remote Shutdown System," add the requirement that only one charging pump is permitted to be aligned for injection into the reactor coolant system in Modes 4, 5, and 6, remove a 1-hour reporting requirement for portable makeup pump system storage from TS 3.7.4, "Service Water System/Ultimate Heat Sink," delete a footnote from TS 3.7.6.2, "Air Conditioning," and modify TS 6.7.6, "Radioactive Effluent Controls Program."

2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Appendix A, General Design Criterion (GDC) 15, "Reactor Coolant System Design," and 10 CFR, Appendix G, "Fracture Toughness Requirements," govern plant operations with respect to fracture toughness at low temperatures. Additionally, the NRC staff is guided by NUREG-0800, NRC Standard Review Plan, Section 5.2.2, "Overpressure Protection," Branch Technical Position (BTP) RSB 5-2, "Overpressure of Pressurized Water Reactors While Operating at Low Temperatures."

GDC 57, "Closed System Isolation Valves," states that each line that penetrates primary reactor containment and is neither part of the reactor coolant pressure boundary nor connected directly to the containment atmosphere shall have at least one containment isolation valve which shall be either automatic, or locked closed, or capable of remote manual operation. This valve shall be outside containment and located as close to the containment as practical. A simple check valve may not be used as the automatic isolation valve.

10 CFR 50.72, "Immediate notification requirements for operating nuclear power reactors," contains a description of those events requiring notification to the NRC and the maximum time allowed to make these notifications.

10 CFR 50.36, "Technical specifications," contains requirements relating to the content of the TSs, including required notifications for violations of safety limits.

The Seabrook Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) contains the licensing and design basis information associated with the design, construction, and operation of Seabrook.

3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

3.1 Changes to FOL No. NPF-86

The licensee proposed to make the following changes to FOL No. NPF-86:

1. Change "Taunton Municipal Light Plant" to "Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant."
2. Delete the license condition associated with Amendment No. 94.

The change to "Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant" corrects a simple misspelling of a name. The NRC staff considers this type of change to be administrative in nature and is therefore acceptable.

The license condition associated with Amendment No. 94 (Accession No. ML032740512) required FPLE to maintain a program in effect to control the administration of potassium iodide (KI) to control room personnel during core alterations when the primary containment equipment hatch is open. The program was to remain in effect until the licensing basis for unfiltered in-leakage was revised via Amendment No. 100 (Accession No. ML050320399). Given that the exit criteria of the license condition has been satisfied by issuance of Amendment No. 100, the NRC staff finds that the condition is no longer needed and its removal is acceptable.

3.2 Changes to TS Index

The licensee proposed to revise the TS index pages to remove references to the TS Bases pages. The TS Bases are licensee controlled by a Bases Control Program and can be changed outside of the license amendment process, resulting in inconsistencies between the TS Bases and the TS Index. Therefore, it is more appropriate for the index pages referring to sections of the TS Bases to be included in that document. Given this consideration, the NRC staff finds the proposed change to be acceptable.

3.3 Table 3.3-9, "Remote Shutdown System"

The licensee proposed to revise TS Table 3.3-9, "Remote Shutdown System," to remove valves MS-V-127 and 128 from the list of transfer switches/control circuits section of Table 3.3-9. The transfer switches/control circuits section of Table 3.3-9 lists the components required to have operable remote safe shutdown controls. Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.3.3.5.1 requires that each remote shutdown monitoring instrumentation channel in Table 3.3-9 be demonstrated operable by performance of a channel check every 31 days and a channel calibration every 18 months. SR 4.3.3.5.2 requires that each Remote Shutdown System transfer switch, power, and control circuit listed in Table 3.3-9, including the actuated components, be demonstrated operable at least once per 18 months.

3.3.1 Background

Plant design change DCR90-032 replaced the pneumatic actuators on valves MS-V-127 and MS-V-128 with gear operated manual operators. This change was implemented in 1991 to address the unreliability of the valves and the unavailability of spare parts for the actuators. Additionally, the design change upgraded the downstream branch header remote/manual isolation valves MS-V-393 and MS-V-394 for use as the GDC 57 containment isolation valves for the Emergency Feedwater Pump Steam Supply system. Currently, valves MS-V-127 and MS-V-128 are locked open, manually operated gate valves.

3.3.2 NRC Staff Evaluation of Proposed Changes

The NRC staff evaluated the acceptability of the proposed change to Table 3.3-9 against the requirements of 10 CFR 50.36(c)(3) which requires that the TS contain requirements relating to test, calibration, or inspection to assure that the necessary quality of systems and components is maintained, that facility operation will be within safety limits, and the limiting conditions for operation will be met. Following implementation of DCR90-032, Valves MS-V-127 and MS-V-128 were no longer assumed to be the containment isolation valves for the Emergency Feedwater Pump Steam Supply system. Therefore, verification of the operability of the remote monitoring instrumentation for these two valves is not necessary to assure that the associated Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) is met. Given that the an SR associated with the valves MS-V-127 and MS-V-128 is not required by 10 CFR 50.36(c)(3), the NRC staff finds the removal of the valves from Table 3.3-9 to be acceptable.

3.4 TS 3/4.4.9.3, "Overpressure Protection Systems"

The licensee proposed to add the following action statement to LCO 3.4.9.3, which is applicable during Modes 4, 5, and 6:

With more than one charging pump capable of injecting into the RCS, immediately initiate action to restore a maximum of one charging pump capable of injecting into the RCS.

Additionally, the licensee proposed to add an associated SR as SR 4.4.9.3.5, which requires verification of the appropriate system lineup.

The purpose of this limitation is to assure that the maximum increase in RCS pressure, by either heat or mass addition, would not overpressurize the RCS. Of specific concern is overpressure when the RCS is at low temperature by mass addition by one or more centrifugal charging pumps (CCPs). In all of these Modes, the reactor is subcritical. However, in Modes 4 and 5, all reactor vessel head closure bolts are fully tensioned, precluding one conceivable pressure release path.

FPLE stated that the cold overpressure protection system is capable of relieving the mass addition from the mass addition of a single CCP into a water-solid RCS. Further, FPLE stated that if one of the two required relief devices of the cold overpressure protection system fails, the remaining relief path is capable of relieving the mass addition of a single CCP.

Currently, FPLE has administrative controls that implement this limitation on plant operations, however, it was identified that the operating restriction meets Criterion 2 of 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii), being an operating restriction that is an initial condition of a design basis accident or transient analysis that either assumes the failure of, or presents a challenge to the integrity of a fission product barrier.

Additionally, the licensee proposed to include an allowance to permit the operation of two CCPs for a one-hour period during pump swap operations.

The NRC staff reviewed the proposed TS and finds that it is consistent with the current, administrative, restrictions on CCP operation and more restrictive than the current TSs. Further, since the cold overpressure protection system is capable of relieving the mass addition of a single CCP, the TSs meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. The allowance for having two CCPs aligned would permit the licensee to perform swap over activities. The NRC staff concurs with the licensee's assessment that there is a small likelihood of an event occurring during this brief period, and additionally finds that procedural controls in place during the evolution would be available to stop an inadvertently started CCP. Therefore, the NRC staff finds the proposed changes to TS 3.4.9.3 to be acceptable.

3.5 TS 3/4.7.4, "Service Water System/Ultimate Heat Sink"

The licensee proposed to modify Action e of LCO 3.7.4 from:

With the portable tower makeup pump system not stored in its design operational readiness state, restore the portable tower makeup pump system to its required condition within 72 hours, ~~or continue operation and notify the NRC within the following 1 hour in accordance with the requirement of 10 CFR 50.72~~ of actions to ensure an adequate supply of makeup water for the service water cooling tower for a minimum of 30 days.

to:

With the portable tower makeup pump system not stored in its design operational readiness state, restore the portable tower makeup pump system to its required condition within 72 hours, **or continue operation and notify the NRC within the following 8 hours** of actions to ensure an adequate supply of makeup water for the service water cooling tower for a minimum of 30 days.

The water inventory contained in the seismic Category 1 cooling tower basin at Seabrook Unit 1 is the ultimate heat sink (UHS) for safety-related applications. In accordance with TS 3.7.4, "Service Water System/Ultimate Heat Sink," the Seabrook UHS is required to maintain at least 7 days worth of cooling water inventory. Because the capacity of the Seabrook UHS is limited, a portable tower makeup pump system (PTMPS) is credited for replenishing the UHS and ensuring a 30-day cooling capability in accordance with the plant licensing basis. Seabrook TS 3.7.4.e requires that the licensee either restore an inoperable PTMPS to operational readiness within 72 hours, or contact the NRC during the following hour with a notification of actions that are being taken to ensure the 30-day cooling capability of the UHS while the PTMPS is being restored to service. Originally, FPLE proposed to completely remove the requirement to notify the NRC. However, in response to NRC staff questions, FPLE modified its LAR to change the notification requirement that is specified by TS 3.7.4.e from 1 hour to 8 hours.

Seabrook TS 3.7.4 differs from the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) in that it allows continued plant operation when the UHS is not capable of assuring a 30-day cooling water supply, while the STS requires that the plant enter a shutdown action for this situation. Although the selection of an alternate makeup source for long-term cooling is within the scope of TS 3.7.4.e, only the PTMPS has been specifically approved by the NRC staff for this purpose. Since the TS does not specify any other makeup sources that the NRC considers to be acceptable for providing long-term cooling, the plant does not fully satisfy its licensing basis and is in a degraded condition when the PTMPS is not available. The 8-hour notification requirements specified by 10 CFR 50.72 are reserved for situations such as this and in particular, 10 CFR 50.72(b)(3)(v)(B), "Eight-hour Reports," requires notification of the NRC within 8 hours of any event or condition that could have prevented the fulfillment of the safety function of structures or systems that are needed to remove residual heat. As such, the NRC staff agrees that the 8-hour notification requirement that is proposed by the licensee for situations when the PTMPS is not restored within the allowed outage time is consistent with the requirements specified by 10 CFR 50.72. Therefore, the staff considers the proposed change to be acceptable.

Additionally, FPLE proposed to revise the SR 4.7.4.3, such that required service water pumphouse water level from at or above 5'0" (-36'-0" Mean Sea Level) to 25.1' (-15.9' Mean Sea Level).

The service water system (SWS) provides cooling water for the plant's primary and secondary heat loads, and is relied upon for accident mitigation and for achieving and maintaining safe shutdown conditions. The supply of cooling water for the SWS is the service water pumphouse, which receives water from the ocean via an intake tunnel. The water level in the pumphouse will vary with the tides and cooling demand, and a minimum required water level is specified to ensure that sufficient net positive suction head (NPSH) is available for operating the service water pumps and maintaining the required cooling water flow rates in accordance with the plant licensing basis. A daily surveillance of the pumphouse water level is required by TS 4.7.4.3 to verify that the pumphouse water level is greater than 5 feet, 0 inches. The licensee identified in 1997 that this value was incorrect and that the correct pumphouse water level should be 25.1 feet. Administrative controls have been in place since then, requiring a minimum level of 25 feet. TS 3.7.4.a identifies service water pumphouse operability as a requirement for continued operation of the reactor, and acceptability of the proposed change

will be judged based upon confirmation that the proposed pumphouse water level requirement is an accurate indication of pumphouse operability consistent with the plant licensing basis.

The 5 feet minimum pumphouse water level requirement that is specified by TS 4.7.4.3 was originally established without properly accounting for the maximum possible SWS flow rates. The licensee indicated that the zero reference point for the pumphouse water level instrument corresponds to 41 feet below mean sea level (MSL). The Seabrook UFSAR, Section C-C of Figure 1.2-48, "Service and Circ. Water Pump House Sections, General Arrangement," shows that the service water pump suctions are located 41 feet, 6 inches, below MSL (6 inches below the zero reference). As stated by the licensee, Seabrook Calculation 4.3.08.72F indicates the minimum water level that is required to assure adequate NPSH for the service water pumps is 15.9 feet below MSL. This is based on a minimum required NPSH for the service water pumps of 25.6 feet of water in order to accommodate the maximum SWS flow rates. Consequently, the actual indicated pumphouse water level must be at least 25.1 feet (i.e., the height of water above the zero reference) in order to satisfy the NPSH requirements for the service water pumps. Based on a review of the information that was provided, the NRC staff agrees with the licensee's determination of the minimum required NPSH for the service water pumps and the corresponding pumphouse water level that is required. Consequently, the NRC staff agrees that TS 4.7.4.3 should be revised as requested and therefore, the proposed change is considered to be acceptable.

3.6 TS 3/4.7.6, "Control Room Subsystems"

The licensee proposed to remove the footnote associated with Action a of LCO 3.7.6.2. The footnote was inserted into the TSs via Amendment No. 62 (ADAMS Accession No. ML011920184) and allowed for a single Control Room Air Conditioning Subsystem to be inoperable for 60 days instead of the previous limit of 30 days. This relaxation was limited in applicability to cycle 7. Given that Seabrook has passed the period of applicability for this footnote and may no longer utilize the extended time-frame, its removal from the TSs is acceptable.

3.7 TS 6.6, "Safety Limit Violation"

The licensee has proposed to remove TS 6.6 in its entirety. Currently, TS 6.6 requires notification of the NRC within 1 hour of violating a safety limit and precludes restarting unit until without the authorization of the NRC. Additionally, TS 6.6 prescribes various internal notification and reporting requirements.

Currently, 10 CFR 50.36(c)(1)(i)(A) requires, if a safety limit is violated, the immediate shutdown of the reactor, notification of the violation to the NRC, and NRC approval to restart. Additionally, 10 CFR 50.72 contains notification requirements for various operational events with reporting time-frames commensurate with the safety significance of the event. The NRC staff finds that the regulations of 10 CFR 50.36 and 10 CFR 50.72 will continue to require appropriate and timely reporting of any violation of a safety limit. Further, the NRC staff finds that the licensee's internal notification and reporting requirements do not meet the criteria contained in 10 CFR 50.36(c)(5) for inclusion in the Seabrook TSs and more appropriately contained in licensee controlled documents. Therefore, the NRC staff finds the deletion of TS 6.6 to be acceptable.

3.8 TS 6.7.6.g, "Radioactive Effluent Controls Program"

The licensee has proposed to modify TS 6.7.6.g.5 from:

Determination of cumulative ~~and projected~~ dose contributions from radioactive effluents for the current calendar quarter and current calendar year in accordance with the methodology and parameters in the ODCM at least every 31 days,

to:

Determination of cumulative dose contributions from radioactive effluents for the current calendar quarter and current calendar year in accordance with the methodology and parameters in the ODCM at least every 31 days. **Determination of projected dose contribution from radioactive effluents in accordance with the methodology in the ODCM at least every 31 days.**

Generic Letter (GL) 89-01 combined the surveillance requirements for cumulative and projected doses. In combining these requirements in GL 89-01, the new program element inadvertently required determining projected dose contribution for the current calendar quarter and current calendar year every 31 days. The proposed change clarifies the wording of the existing TS to require projected dose contributions in accordance with the offsite dose calculation manual (ODCM) at least every 31 days. The ODCM currently requires projected dose contributions to cover a 31 day period, but not a calendar quarter or calendar year. The NRC staff finds that the proposed change will continue to require the licensee to calculate the projected doses for an appropriate lead time of 31 days at which point, the licensee would be required to recalculate the projected doses in accordance with the surveillance frequency. Therefore, the NRC staff finds the proposed changes acceptable.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the New Hampshire and Massachusetts State officials were notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State officials had no comments.

5.0 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 and changes SRs. 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 (72 FR 31101). The amendment also relates to changes in recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or requirements. Accordingly, the amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9) and (c)(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 Contributors: T. L. Wertz
J. Tatum
E. Davidson
D. Nold
G. E. Miller

Date: August 23, 2007