Entergy

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
Vermont Yankee
P.O. Box 0250
320 Governor Hunt Rd
Vernon, VT 05354
Tel 802 257 7711

Michael J. Colomb
Site Vice President

BVY 10-017

April 13, 2010

ATTN: Document Control Desk
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

SUBJECT: Technical Specifications Proposed Change No. 290
Administrative Changes
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
Docket No. 50-271
License No. DPR-28

Dear Sir or Madam:

In accordance with 10CFR50.90, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (ENO) is proposing an amendment to Operating License DPR-28 for the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (VY) by incorporating the attached proposed changes into the VY Technical Specifications (TS). The proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not materially change any technical requirements.

ENO has reviewed the proposed amendment in accordance with 10CFR50.92 and concludes it does not involve a significant hazards consideration. In accordance with 10CFR50.91, a copy of this application, with attachments, is being provided to the State of Vermont, Department of Public Service.

Attachment 1 to this letter provides a description and evaluation of the proposed changes. Attachment 2 contains a markup of the current TS pages. Attachment 3 contains the retyped TS pages.

ENO requests review and approval of the proposed license amendment by May 1, 2011 with a 60 day implementation period from the date of the amendment approval.

There are no new regulatory commitments made in this letter.

If you have any questions on this transmittal, please contact Mr. James DeVincentis at 802-451-3150.

A001
NRR

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on April 13, 2010.

Sincerely,

MJC/PLC

Attachments
1. Description and Evaluation of the Proposed Changes
2. Markup of the Current Technical Specifications Pages
3. Retyped Technical Specifications Pages

cc: Mr. Samuel J. Collins
Regional Administrator, Region 1
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406-1415

Mr. James S. Kim, Project Manager
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop O8C2A
Washington, DC 20555

USNRC Resident Inspector
Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC
320 Governor Hunt Rd
Vernon, Vermont 05354

Mr. David O'Brien, Commissioner
VT Department of Public Service
112 State Street – Drawer 20
Montpelier, Vermont 05620-2601

Attachment 1

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station

Proposed Change No. 290

Description and Evaluation of Proposed Changes

1. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

The proposed amendment would revise the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (VY) Technical Specifications (TS) by:

1. Updating the Table of Contents (TOC) as a result of changes made by License Amendments 230 and 239.

2. Updating the Applicability and Objective portions of TS 4.12 as result of changes made by License Amendment 239.

3. Revise TS 3.7.A.8 to revise wording that requires an "orderly shutdown be initiated immediately" if certain primary containment specifications "cannot" be met. The revised wording would still require that the reactor be in a cold shutdown condition within 24 hours if the applicable specifications are not met.

The proposed changes are considered administrative in nature and do not materially change any technical requirement. No corresponding TS Bases pages were found to be affected.

2. DETAILED DESCRIPTION

The following changes are proposed to the VY TS:

1. Revise the TOC to reflect that TS 3/4.6.I Shock Suppressors and TS 3/4.12.G Crane Operability have been deleted. TS 3/4.6.I was relocated to the VY Technical Requirements Manual (TRM), as authorized by License Amendment 230 (Reference (a)). TS 3/4.12.G was also relocated to the VY TRM, as authorized by License Amendment 239 (Reference (b)).

2. Revise the Applicability and Objective portions of TS 4.12 to remove reference to the testing and operability of the reactor building crane. License Amendment 239 (Reference (b)) authorized the relocation of the reactor building crane specifications, TS 3/4.12.G, to the VY TRM. Currently, the Applicability and Objective portions of TS 4.12 state:

   <u>Applicability</u>:

   Applies to the periodic testing of those interlocks and instruments used during refueling and to the testing of the reactor building crane.

   <u>Objective</u>:

   To verify the operability of the instrumentation and interlocks used in refueling and the operability of the reactor building crane.

   The proposed Applicability and Objective portions of TS 4.12 would be revised to state:

   <u>Applicability</u>:

   Applies to the periodic testing of those interlocks and instruments used during refueling.

Objective:

To verify the operability of the instrumentation and interlocks used in refueling.

3. Revise TS 3.7.A.8 to revise the wording that requires an immediate shutdown of the reactor be initiated if primary containment specifications TS 3.7.A.1 through 3.7.A.6 cannot be met. Currently, TS 3.7.A.8 states:

   > If Specification 3.7.A.1 through 3.7.A.6 cannot be met, an orderly shutdown shall be initiated immediately and the reactor shall be in a cold shutdown condition within 24 hours.

   Proposed TS 3.7.A.8 would be revised to state:

   > If Specification 3.7.A.1 through 3.7.A.6 are not met, the reactor shall be in a cold shutdown condition within 24 hours.

3. TECHNICAL EVALUATION

The proposed change to revise the TOC to reflect that TS 3/4.6.I and TS 3/4.12.G are no longer contained in the TS is an administrative change as the relocation of TS 3/4.6.I and TS 3/4.12.G to the VY TRM were previously approved by the NRC License Amendments 230 and 239 (References (a) and (b)), respectively. Similarly, the revision of the Applicability and Objective portions of TS 4.12.G to remove reference to the testing and operability of the reactor building crane is an administrative change as the relocation of TS 3/4.12.G to the VY TRM was approved by License Amendment 239 (Reference (b)). This was an oversight in the previous amendments. VY identified these issues and entered them into the Corrective Action Process.

The proposed change to revise TS 3.7.A.8 would reword the requirement that an orderly shutdown be initiated immediately in the event that primary containment specifications 3.7.A.1 through 3.7.A.6 cannot be met.

The requirement to "immediately" initiate a reactor shutdown is considered unnecessary as it could lead to undesired manipulations of plant equipment in order to meet the intent of the word "immediately" in the current TS. Removing the requirement to immediately initiate a reactor shutdown would allow for an assessment of plant status and necessary planning of the required reactor shutdown to the cold shutdown condition within 24 hours. This is consistent with the approach used in the Standard Technical Specifications, NUREG-1433, (Reference (c)) for defining conditions and required actions for an inoperable primary containment.

Also, replacing the word "cannot" with "are not" is consistent with the intent of 10CFR50.36(c)(2) which uses the term "is not" for defining actions to be taken when an LCO "is not" met ("are not" is the plural of "is not"). This change makes the TS consistent with the intent of the regulation.

These are considered administrative changes.

4. EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION

The proposed amendment would revise Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (VY) Technical Specifications (TS) by updating the Table of Contents and Applicability and Objective portions of TS 4.12 to reflect previous changes made by License Amendments 230 and 239. The proposed amendment would also revise TS 3.7.A.8 to reword the requirement to immediately initiate a

reactor shutdown if certain primary containment specifications cannot be met. The revised wording would still require that the reactor be in a cold shutdown condition within 24 hours if the applicable specifications are not met. These changes are considered to be administrative in nature and do not materially change any technical requirements.

Pursuant to 10CFR50.92, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (ENO) has reviewed the proposed change and concludes that the changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration since the proposed changes satisfy the criteria in 10CFR50.92(c). These criteria require that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The discussion below addresses each of these criteria and demonstrates that the proposed amendment does not constitute a significant hazard.

The proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration because:

1. <u>The operation of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (VY) in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.</u>

   The proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not involve any physical changes to the plant. The changes do not revise the methods of plant operation which could increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No new modes of operation are introduced by the proposed changes such that a previously evaluated accident is more likely to occur or more adverse consequences would result.

   Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. <u>The operation of VY in accordance with the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.</u>

   The proposed changes are administrative in nature and do not affect the operation of any systems or equipment, nor do they involve any potential initiating events that would create any new or different kind of accident. There are no changes to the design assumptions, conditions, configuration of the facility, or manner in which the plant is operated and maintained. The changes do not affect assumptions contained in plant safety analyses or the physical design and/or modes of plant operation. Consequently, no new failure mode is introduced.

   Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. <u>The operation of VY in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.</u>

   There are no changes being made to the Technical Specification (TS) safety limits or safety system settings. The operating limits and functional capabilities of systems, structures and components are unchanged as a result of these administrative changes. These changes do not affect any equipment involved in

potential initiating events or plant response to accidents. There is no change to the basis for any TS related to the establishment, or maintenance of, a nuclear safety margin. The proposed changes do not impact any safety limits, safety settings or safety margins.

Therefore, operation of VY in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin to safety.

Based on the above, ENO concludes that the proposed amendment presents no significant hazards consideration under the standards set forth in 10CFR50.92(c), and accordingly, a finding of "no significant hazards consideration" is justified.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

This amendment request meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion from environmental review set forth in 10CFR51.22(c)(9) as follows:

(i) The amendment involves no significant hazards determination.

As described in this evaluation, the proposed change involves no significant hazards consideration.

(ii) There is no significant change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluent that may be released offsite.

The proposed amendment does not involve any physical alterations to the plant configuration that could lead to a change in the type or amount of effluent release offsite.

(iii) There is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

Based on the above, ENO concludes that the proposed change meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion as set forth in 10CFR51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10CFR51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

6. REFERENCES

a) Letter, USNRC to Entergy, "Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station – Issuance of Amendment RE: Adoption of Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Change TSTF-372, The Addition of Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.0.8 on the Inoperability of Snubbers (TAC No. MD1664)," NVY 07-028, dated March 26, 2007

b) Letter, USNRC to Entergy, "Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station – Issuance of Amendment RE: Relocation of Reactor Building Crane Technical Specification (TAC No. MD9725)," NVY 09-077, dated July 13, 2009

c) NUREG-1433 "Standard Technical Specifications General Electric Plants, BWR/4," Revision 3

Attachment 2

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station

Proposed Change No. 290

Markup of the Current Technical Specifications Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

3.7 LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION

ii. 24 Hours prior to reducing thermal power to less than 15% rated thermal power prior to the next shutdown.

8. If Specification 3.7.A.1 through 3.7.A.6 ~~cannot~~ are not ~~be~~ met, ~~an orderly shutdown shall be initiated immediately and~~ the reactor shall be in a cold shutdown condition within 24 hours.

9. If Specification 3.7.A.7 cannot be met, and the primary containment oxygen concentration cannot be restored to less than 4% oxygen by volume within the subsequent 24 hour period, reactor thermal power shall be less than 15% rated thermal power within the next 8 hours.

10. Drywell/Suppression Chamber d/p

a. Differential pressure between the drywell and suppression chamber shall be maintained ≥1.7 psid while in the RUN MODE during the time period:

i. From 24 hours after thermal power is greater than 15% rated thermal power following startup, to

ii. 24 hours prior to reducing thermal power to less than 15% rated thermal power prior to the next shutdown,

iii. Except as specified in 3.7.A.10.b.

4.7 SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

10. Drywell/Suppression Chamber d/p

a. The differential pressure between the drywell and suppression chamber shall be recorded once per shift.

b. The operability of the low differential pressure alarm shall be verified once per week.

3.12 LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION

3.12 REFUELING AND SPENT FUEL HANDLING

Applicability:

Applies to fuel handling, core reactivity limitations, and spent fuel handling.

Objective:

To assure core reactivity is within capability of the control rods, to prevent criticality during refueling, and to assure safe handling of spent fuel casks.

Specification:

A. Refueling Interlocks

The reactor mode switch shall be locked in the "Refuel" position during core alterations and;

1. The refueling interlocks shall be operable during in-vessel fuel movement for the equipment utilized in moving fuel.

   If one or more of the required refueling interlocks are inoperable;

   Immediately suspend fuel movement with equipment associated with the inoperable interlock(s),

   -or-

   Immediately insert a control rod withdrawal block and verify all control rods are fully inserted.

2. The refueling interlocks shall be operable except as specified in Specification 3.12.D and 3.12.E.

4.12 SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.12 REFUELING AND SPENT FUEL HANDLING

Applicability:

Applies to the periodic testing of those interlocks and instruments used during refueling. ~~and to the testing of the reactor building crane~~.

Objective:

To verify the operability of instrumentation and interlocks used in refueling. ~~and the operability of the reactor building crane~~.

Specification:

A. Refueling Interlocks

Prior to any fuel handling, with the Head off the reactor vessel, the following required refueling interlock inputs shall be functionally tested once every 7 days:

a. All-rods-in;
b. Refuel platform position;
c. Refuel platform fuel grapple, fuel loaded;
d. Refuel platform frame mounted hoist, fuel loaded;
e. Refuel platform monorail mounted hoist, fuel loaded.

Attachment 3

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station

Proposed Change No. 290

Retyped Technical Specifications Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

3.7 LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION

ii. 24 Hours prior to reducing thermal power to less than 15% rated thermal power prior to the next shutdown.

8. If Specification 3.7.A.1 through 3.7.A.6 are not met, the reactor shall be in a cold shutdown condition within 24 hours.

9. If Specification 3.7.A.7 cannot be met, and the primary containment oxygen concentration cannot be restored to less than 4% oxygen by volume within the subsequent 24 hour period, reactor thermal power shall be less than 15% rated thermal power within the next 8 hours.

10. Drywell/Suppression Chamber d/p

a. Differential pressure between the drywell and suppression chamber shall be maintained ≥1.7 psid while in the RUN MODE during the time period:

i. From 24 hours after thermal power is greater than 15% rated thermal power following startup, to

ii. 24 hours prior to reducing thermal power to less than 15% rated thermal power prior to the next shutdown,

iii. Except as specified in 3.7.A.10.b.

4.7 SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

10. Drywell/Suppression Chamber d/p

a. The differential pressure between the drywell and suppression chamber shall be recorded once per shift.

b. The operability of the low differential pressure alarm shall be verified once per week.

3.12 LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION

3.12 REFUELING AND SPENT FUEL HANDLING

Applicability:

Applies to fuel handling, core reactivity limitations, and spent fuel handling.

Objective:

To assure core reactivity is within capability of the control rods, to prevent criticality during refueling, and to assure safe handling of spent fuel casks.

Specification:

A. Refueling Interlocks

The reactor mode switch shall be locked in the "Refuel" position during core alterations and;

1. The refueling interlocks shall be operable during in-vessel fuel movement for the equipment utilized in moving fuel.

   If one or more of the required refueling interlocks are inoperable;

   Immediately suspend fuel movement with equipment associated with the inoperable interlock(s),

   -or-

   Immediately insert a control rod withdrawal block and verify all control rods are fully inserted.

2. The refueling interlocks shall be operable except as specified in Specification 3.12.D and 3.12.E.

4.12 SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.12 REFUELING AND SPENT FUEL HANDLING

Applicability:

Applies to the periodic testing of those interlocks and instruments used during refueling.

Objective:

To verify the operability of instrumentation and interlocks used in refueling.

Specification:

A. Refueling Interlocks

Prior to any fuel handling, with the Head off the reactor vessel, the following required refueling interlock inputs shall be functionally tested once every 7 days:

a. All-rods-in;
b. Refuel platform position;
c. Refuel platform fuel grapple, fuel loaded;
d. Refuel platform frame mounted hoist, fuel loaded;
e. Refuel platform monorail mounted hoist, fuel loaded.