

ATTACHMENT A

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

LICENSE NO. NPF-69

DOCKET NO. 50-410

Proposed Changes to Technical Specifications

The existing page 3/4 0-3 will be replaced with the attached revised page.
This page has been retyped in its entirety with marginal markings to indicate changes to the text.

8811160194 881110
PDR ADOCK 05000410
P PDC



5786G



APPLICABILITY

SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.0.5 (Continued)

ASME BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSEL
CODE AND APPLICABLE ADDENDA
TERMINOLOGY FOR INSERVICE
INSPECTION AND TESTING ACTIVITIES

REQUIRED FREQUENCIES
FOR PERFORMING INSERVICE
INSPECTION AND TESTING
ACTIVITIES

Weekly	At least once per 7 days
Monthly	At least once per 31 days
Quarterly or every 3 months	At least once per 92 days
Semiannually or every 6 months	At least once per 184 days
Every 9 months	At least once per 276 days
Yearly or annually	At least once per 366 days

- c. The provisions of Specification 4.0.2 are applicable to the above required frequencies for performing inservice inspection and testing activities.
- d. Performance of the above inservice inspection and testing activities shall be in addition to other specified Surveillance Requirements.
- e. Nothing in the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code shall be construed to supersede the requirements of any Technical Specification.
- f. The Inservice Inspection Program for piping identified in NRC Generic Letter 88-01 shall be performed in accordance with the staff positions on schedule, methods, personnel and sample expansion included in this generic letter.



Handwritten scribbles or marks in the top right corner.

A vertical line or mark on the left side of the page.

ATTACHMENT B

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

LICENSE NO. NPF-69

DOCKET NO. 50-410

Supporting Information and No Significant Hazards Consideration Analysis

The proposed Technical Specification submittal revises Technical Specification 4.0.5, Surveillance Requirements for Inservice Inspection and Testing, to incorporate the requirements of Generic Letter 88-01. Niagara Mohawk's position with respect to austenitic stainless steel piping at Nine Mile Point Unit 2 was delineated in our July 28, 1988 submittal.

At the time a licensee requests an amendment, 10 CFR 50.91 requires the licensee to provide to the Commission its analysis, using the standards in Section 50.92 about the issue of no significant hazards consideration. Therefore, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 10 CFR 50.92, the following analysis has been performed.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment incorporates the recommendations of NUREG 0313 Revision 2, "Technical Report on Material Selection and Process Guidelines for BWR Coolant Pressure Boundary Piping." Since these inspection programs are not a factor in calculating accident probabilities or consequences, incorporating this later revision of NUREG 0313 has no effect on the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The examinations required by the Inservice Inspection Program are normally performed during refueling and maintenance outages. These examinations are designed to detect service generated defects. Since these examinations do not affect the operation of plant equipment, no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident will result from the proposed changes.

The operation of Nine Mile Point Unit 2, in accordance with the proposed amendment, will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes incorporate the requirements of Generic Letter 88-01 for the inspection of austenitic BWR stainless steel piping. The new requirements of Generic Letter 88-01 provide an increase in the level of safety by requiring augmented inspections of all austenitic materials. However, no credit is assumed in the calculation of the safety margin for inservice inspection. Therefore, there will be no reduction in the margin of safety.

As determined by the analysis above, this proposed amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.



Handwritten marks and scribbles in the top right corner.

1
2