

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-263

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT TO
OPERATING LICENSE DPR-22

LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST DATED October 4, 1990

Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation, requests authorization for changes to Appendix A of the Monticello Operating License as shown on the attachments labeled Exhibits A, B and C. Exhibit A describes the proposed changes, describes the reasons for the changes, and contains a significant hazards evaluation. Exhibit B and C are copies of the Monticello Technical Specifications incorporating the proposed changes.

This letter contains no restricted or other defense information.

NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

By



Thomas M Parker
Manager
Nuclear Support Services

On this 4th day of October 1990 before me a notary public in and for said County, personally appeared Thomas M Parker, Manager Nuclear Support Services, and being first duly sworn acknowledged that he is authorized to execute this document on behalf of Northern States Power Company, that he knows the contents thereof, and that to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief the statements made in it are true and that it is not interposed for delay.



EXHIBIT A

Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant

License Amendment Request Dated October 4, 1990

Evaluation of Proposed Changes to the Technical Specifications
for Operating License DPR-22

Pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.59 and 50.90, the holders of Operating License DPR-22 hereby propose the following changes:

Proposed Change

- a) Update Specification 3.1 bases as shown in Exhibit B, page 39.
- b) 1) Add Specification 3.6.E.2 as shown in Exhibit B, page 127, 2) update Specification 3.6.E.1.c to include reference to LCO as shown in Exhibit B, page 127, and 3) delete reference to thirty day LCO in Specification 3.6.E bases as shown in Exhibit B, page 151.
- c) Update the wind conditions in Specification 4.7.C.1.a from "(2 < u < mph)" to "(2 < u < 5 mph)" as shown in Exhibit B, page 169.
- d) Update Specification 4.7.D bases as shown in Exhibit B, page 189.
- e) Update surveillance requirement reference in Specification 4.8.B.4.a from "4.8.B.5.c" to "4.8.B.5" as shown in Exhibit B, page 198b.

Reason for Change

- a) License Amendment 66, dated May 30, 1989, inadvertently dropped "operating setting error" in Specification 3.1 Bases.
- b) 1) License Amendment 3, Technical Specification Change No. 14, dated May 14, 1974, inadvertently dropped the action statement Specification 3.6.E.2 for Specification 3.6.E.1.a. 2) Specification 3.6.E.1.c action statement is found with Specification 3.2.H, Table 3.2.7. And 3) Specification 3.6.E basis references a thirty day out of service time, that has never been allowed in the Limiting Conditions for Operation.
- c) License Amendment 3, dated March 27, 1981, inadvertently dropped the 5 in Specification 4.7.C.1.a.
- d) License Amendment 71, dated October 19, 1989, deleted the containment isolation table from Specification 4.7.D. The bases were not updated.
- e) License Amendment 40, dated March 18, 1986, changed Specification 4.8.B.5.c to 4.8.B.5. The reference to Specification 4.8.B.5.a was never updated to Specification 4.8.B.5 in Specification 4.8.B.4.a.

Safety Evaluation and Determination of Significant Hazards Considerations

The proposed change to the Operating License has been evaluated to determine whether it constitutes a significant hazards consideration as required by 10 CFR Part 50, Section 50.91 using standards provided in Section 50.92. This analysis is provided below:

1. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated

These changes are administrative changes correcting errors in the Technical Specifications. Therefore, this amendment will not cause an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated for the Monticello plant.

2. The proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

The proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. The proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The proposed amendment will not reduce the margin of safety.

The Commission has provided guidance (March 6, 1986 Federal Register) concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples of amendments that will likely be found to involve no significant hazards considerations. The change to the Monticello Operating License proposed in this amendment request are similar to NRC example (i). Example (i) applies in this case since the proposed change is administrative in nature and does not carry any operational significance or hazards.

Based on this guidance and the reasons discussed above, we have concluded that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Environmental Assessment

This license amendment request does not change effluent types or total effluent amounts nor does it involve an increase in power level. The changes are administrative in nature. Therefore, this amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact.