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

# SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

# SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 38 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-63

## NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

## NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1

# DOCKET NO. 50-220

## Introduction

By letter dated October 29, 1980 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) applied for amendment to License No. DPR-63 and the Technical Specifications (Appendix A) for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1. The amendment would authorize plant operation with limiting conditions of operation for the secondary containment integrity revised to agree with the "Standard Technical Specifications for General Electric Boiling Water Reactors." (NUREG 0123, Rev. 3); i.e., without secondary containment, restore secondary containment integrity within 4 hours or De in at least hot shutdown within the next 12 hours and in cold shutdown within the following 24 hours.

### Background

By letter dated October 29, 1980 the licensee requested operation of Nine Mile Point, Unit 1, with secondary containment (Reactor Building) leakage in excess of the 2000 CFM Technical Specification Limiting Condition of Operation. This interim relief is being requested to allow TMI related upgrading of several safety related systems.

A portion of the safety systems upgrade work consists of routing new electrical cable through secondary containment. To accomplish this work the existing Reactor Building electrical penetrations must be opened. This results in an inability of the Standby Gas Treatment System to maintain Reactor Building vacuum post accident; i.e., leakage in excess of system exhaust capability (2000 CFM).

The licensee has proposed several mitigating actions during the time upgrade work is in progress:

(1) At any one point in time no more than one electrical penetration will be opened and the time that it is open will be minimized;

• • • •

- (2) Activities which have the potential to result in significant radioactive releases to the secondary containment will be suspended; and
- (3) Administrative controls will be in effect which ensure that secondary containment integrity can be restored immediately, if necessary.

#### Evaluation

The present Nine Mile Point Unit 1 Technical Specifications allow operation for 4 hours if secondary containment integrity exceeds the limiting conditions of operation. If integrity is not restored within this specified period, then an orderly shutdown must be initiated. Continued plant operation for 4 hours is based on the very small likelihood of an accident occurring during such a brief interval.

Since the licensee request does not seek approval for periods of loss of secondary containment integrity for more than 4 hours the Nine Mile Point margins of safety would not be reduced. Moreover, the licensee has proposed three mitigating actions which: (1) limit the duration and degree of loss of secondary containment integrity; (2) preclude potential radioactive release while secondary containment has been opened; and (3) imposes administrative procedures which ensure that secondary containment integrity can be restored rapidly, if necessary. Based on this, as well as the fact that once upgrades have been accomplished, plant safety will actually be enhanced, we conclude that the requested upgrade work will not endanger public health and safety and is, therefore, allowable.

)

## Environmental Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR \$51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

#### Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable

- 2 -

•••? •\*\* 

•

1 • . . .

•

,**1** 

• • • •

.

assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: December 12, 1980

5 , · · .

.

• • 

.

.

•

.