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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 76 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 April 26, 1985, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) requested an amendment to Appendix A of the Operating License No. DPR-63 for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1. The amendment request involves changes to the Limiting Conditions for Operation, Surveillance Requirements, and Bases for (1) maintaining the suppression pool temperature within specified limits and (2) deleting the requirement to maintain a drywell to suppression chamber differential pressure.

2.0 EVALUATION

The Technical Specifications (TS) proposed by the licensee will add the suppression pool temperature monitoring system to TS Sections 3.6.11 and 4.6.11. The proposed changes restrict the envelope of reactor conditions so that the reactor can be depressurized in a timely manner to avoid the regime of potentially high suppression chamber loading resulting from unstable steam condensation at high pool temperature. The Staff had previously reviewed this issue during the Mark I Long Term Implementation Program and found the temperature profile to be acceptable (Safety Evaluation dated January 22, 1985). Since the changes proposed to the TS reflect this temperature profile, we find the proposed changes acceptable.

In addition, the licensee requested that the requirements for operation with drywell to suppression chamber differential pressure, i.e., TS 3.3.2, 3.3.8, 3.5.2, 4.3.2, 4.3.8 and 4.6.2 be deleted. The Staff had previously performed a post-implementation audit of the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit 1 plant unique analysis against the hydrodynamic load criteria in NUREG-0661. The results of that audit review (Safety Evaluation dated January 22, 1985) indicated that the pool dynamic loads utilized by the licensee to demonstrate that adequate margins exist, did not take credit for a differential pressure between the drywell and the suppression chamber. Accordingly, we conclude that operation of the facility without a drywell to suppresion chamber differential pressure is acceptable and, therefore, we find the proposed changes to the TS acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes to the surveillance requirements. The 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 this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement nor environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations presented 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 nor to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: F. Eltawila and R. Hermann.

Dated: January 7, 1986.