

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

# SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 82 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 28, 1986, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation (the licensee) requested an amendment to Appendix A of Facility Operating License No. DPR-63 for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1. The amendment would modify the Technical Specifications (TS) to eliminate the requirement for Emergency Cooling System (Emergency Condenser) operability during hydrostatic testing with the reactor not critical and reactor coolant temperature greater than 212°F.

## 2.0 EVALUATION

The proposed change to the TS requested by the licensee deletes the requirement for operability of the Emergency Condenser during hydrostatic testing while the reactor coolant temperature is in excess of 212°F and the reactor is not critical.

The Emergency Cooling System provides removal of decay heat in the event that feedwater capability is lost and the main condenser is not available. The system is designed as a redundant backup to the main condenser following reactor vessel isolation and scram. It is not a part of the Emergency Core Cooling or Residual Heat Removal Systems: Further, during hydrostatic testing, control rods are fully inserted and the reactor is maintained in a shutdown mode. Therefore, the intended function of the Emergency Cooling Sytem is not required when the hydrostatic test is performed. Based on the above, the staff concludes that the proposed change to TS Section 3.1.3 is 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. 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

 $\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\mathbf{y}_{j}}{\mathbf{y}_{j}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{y}_{j} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\mathbf{y}_{j}}{\mathbf{y}_{j}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\mathbf{y}_{j}}{\mathbf{y$ 

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

The staff has 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 nor to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: T. M. Su

Dated: May 12, 1986.

4 • , . • q •