



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 65 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-63

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION  
NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1  
DOCKET NO. 50-220

1.0 Introduction

By application dated January 31, 1984, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) requested an amendment to Appendix A of Operating License No. DPR-63 for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1. This amendment changes the Administrative Controls section of the Technical Specifications pertaining to the following:

1. A definition of responsibility has been added for the Station Shift Supervisor. (Section 6.1)
2. Footnotes have been added to accommodate any unexpected absences for the Radiation Protection qualified individual, the Fire Brigade and for the Shift Crew Composition: (Section 6.2)
3. Provisions for limiting overtime were added to meet the requirements of TMI Item I.A.1.3, NUREG-0737. (Section 6.2)
4. The requirements for minimum shift crew composition were changed to require two Senior Reactor Operators on shift. Further, at least one Senior Reactor Operator is required in the Control Room during power operation and when the Emergency Plan is activated. In the case where the Emergency Plan is activated, the Assistant Station Shift Supervisor assumes the function of the Shift Technical Advisor and the other Senior Reactor Operator on shift is restricted to the Control Room until the arrival of an additional Senior Reactor Operator. (Table 6.2-1)
5. The responsibility of the Site Operation Review Committee has been changed by removing the following items (Section 6.5.1):
  - a. Review of procedures required by Specification 6.8.
  - b. Review of proposed tests and experiments that affect nuclear safety.
  - c. Review of proposed changes to Appendix "A" Technical Specifications.

8411190031 841029  
PDR ADDOCK 05000220  
PDR

11 2022/02/28 10:00:00

- d. Review of proposed changes or modifications to plant systems or equipment that affect nuclear safety.
- e. Review of Plant Security Plan and implementing procedures.
- f. Review of Emergency Plan and implementing procedures.

These items were removed from the Site Operations Review Committee because the heavy workload restricted the smooth, efficient and timely operation of each meeting. However, the requirement for review and control of these items is still required by the Technical Specifications. A new section 6.5.2 Technical Review and Control has been created. This section incorporated those items deleted from the Site Operations Review Committee. To summarize, this section requires an independent review by members of the plant supervisory staff and, if necessary, additional cross-disciplinary review. As stated in this section, approval from the General Superintendent - Nuclear Generation or the Station Superintendent - Nuclear Generation; or their designee, is required for many of the items. Section 6.5.2.10 states that reports documenting each of the activities performed under 6.5.2 shall be maintained. The procedure(s) will assure that cross-disciplinary review, if required, is obtained.

- 6. The reporting requirements of the Technical Specifications have been changed to meet the revision to the requirements in reporting of 10 CFR Part 50, Sections 50.72 and 50.73 that became effective January 1, 1984. The change was requested of the licensee by the Commission in Generic Letter No. 83-43. (Sections 6.6 and 6.9)
- 7. Several purely administrative changes such as those required to achieve consistency in numbering or change in nomenclature are included to support the actions described above. Further, section 6.15, Environmental Qualification was deleted for consistency because the references have been superseded by a new regulation and the new regulation (10 CFR 50.49) does not require this subject to be addressed as part of the Technical Specifications.

In a telecon on May 23, 1984, the staff and the licensee agreed it was appropriate that the period of time to accommodate unexpected absences discussed in item 2 above be changed from four to two hours and that the new Section 6.5.2 be changed in Subsections 6.5.2.7 and 6.5.2.8 to clarify audit frequency requirements at a minimum of 12 months rather than periodically. These clarifying remarks do not represent a substantive change to the items noticed in the Federal Register on April 25, 1984 (49 FR 17866).



• • • •

• •

v

-B

v  
r  
A  
C  
P

## 2.0 Evaluation

The specifics of our evaluation are as follows:

- Section 6.1.1      The proposed change is a change in position title only. It is acceptable.
- Section 6.1.2      This is an additional specification that delineates the management responsibility for the control room command function. It is consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) as endorsed by Chapter 16 of the Standard Review Plan (SRP) and is, therefore, acceptable.
- Section 6.2.2.d     The proposed change, the addition of an asterisked note concerning less-than-minimum required staffing for radiation protection and fire brigade personnel, is generally acceptable because it is consistent with the STS as endorsed by Chapter 16 of the SRP. However, the time period originally specified (four hours) was not acceptable; with the reduction to two hours, discussed above, it is acceptable.
- Section 6.2.2.e     This proposed additional specification establishes the requirements for a licensed SRO in the control room. The specification is consistent with the NRC's response of December 28, 1983, to the licensee's letter of October 6, 1983, concerning how the licensee intended to meet the requirement for an additional SRO on shift. The proposed specification is, therefore, acceptable.
- Section 6.2.2.f     The proposed change is a numbering change only and is, therefore, acceptable.
- Section 6.2.2.g     The proposed change is the same as that proposed for 6.2.2.d and, as modified, it is acceptable.
- Section 6.2.2.h     The proposed additional specification concerning overtime work limitations is consistent with Generic Letter 83-02 and is, therefore, acceptable.
- Figure 6.2.2       The proposed changes to the plant organization effect primarily an increase in the number of plant staff positions. These are acceptable. However, the positions of Supervisor Mechanical Maintenance and Supervisor Electrical Maintenance have been deleted. In the old organization, these positions represented



Small, faint marks or characters at the top right of the page.

Small, faint marks or characters in the upper right quadrant.

A single small, faint mark in the upper right quadrant.

A vertical column of small, faint marks on the left side of the page.

A single small, faint mark on the left side of the page.

A single small, faint mark in the lower middle section.

A single small, faint mark in the lower middle section.

A single small, faint mark in the lower middle section.

A single small, faint mark in the lower right section.

A single small, faint mark on the left side of the page.

the additional supervision available for outages. This additional supervision is still shown by the footnote to the Table. The change is strictly administrative and, therefore, acceptable.

Table 6.2-1

With the exception of Footnotes (6) and (7), the proposed changes are editorial only and are acceptable. Footnote (7) addresses the same matter as does Specification 6.2.2.e and is, therefore, acceptable. Footnote (6), which is consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications as endorsed by Chapter 16 of the SRP is acceptable with the time period (four hours) changed to two hours. We further note that Footnote (2) has been corrected such that "Operating" reads "Operator."

Section 6.5.1.6  
Section 6.5.1.7  
Section 6.5.2

The proposed changes to the responsibilities and functions of the Site Operations Review Committee (SORC) are generally acceptable because all of SORC's original functions will continue to be performed, some by SORC and the rest by other parts of the plant organization as has been approved for other plants. In this context, proposed Specifications 6.5.1.6 and 6.5.1.7 are acceptable with the following changes that have been accepted by the licensee.

Section 6.5.2.7  
Section 6.5.2.8

"Periodic" review of the security program and the emergency plan has been specified as at least once per 12 months, as is required by STS endorsed by Chapter 16 of the SRP.

Section 6.5.3

The proposed changes are editorial in nature and are, therefore, acceptable.

Section 6.6  
Section 6.9

The proposed changes are acceptable because they make the specification consistent with the requirements of Generic Letter 83-43.

Section 6.8

The proposed changes to specifications 6.8.2 and 6.8.3 are acceptable because they make these specifications consistent with the changes made to Specifications 6.5.1.6, 6.5.1.7, and 6.5.2.

The deletion of the Environmental Qualification Section, 6.15, from the Technical Specifications is acceptable because equipment is required to be qualified by 10 CFR 50.49. The other changes to the Technical Specifications are strictly editorial and are, therefore, acceptable.



2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100



### 3.0 Environmental Considerations

This amendment relates to changes in recordkeeping, reporting, or administrative procedures or requirements. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(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 this amendment.

### 4.0 Conclusion

We have 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, and (2) 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.

Principal Contributor: R. Benedict

Dated: October 29, 1984

