



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 111 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 application for amendment dated May 4, 1988, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation requested a revision of the Technical Specifications, Appendix A, to Operating License DPR-63 for Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit No. 1 (NMP-1). The proposed change clarifies the Surveillance Requirements for APRM Scram and Rod Withdrawal Block instrumentation. The APRM surveillance intervals as shown on Table 4.6.2a have been changed and a note clarifying weekly surveillance requirements has been added. Also, a comment was added to Table 3.6.2g identifying that either or both APRM trips will initiate a Rod Block. This evaluation encompassed the referenced changes as applicable to Sections 3.6.2 and 4.6.2 of the Technical Specifications.

DISCUSSION

NMP-1 Technical Specification Table 4.6.2a identified surveillance requirements for instrumentation that initiates scram signals. The requested change revised the channel calibration surveillance interval for the APRM instrumentation. Note M of Table 4.6.2a has been revised to clarify that the weekly calibration of the APRM instrumentation includes only APRM power level adjustments based on heat balance calculations performed during reactor operation. A three-month channel calibration interval has been added for both APRM upscale and downscale parameters. The APRM weekly instrument channel calibration requirement for an inoperative APRM has been deleted.

NMP-1 Technical Specifications Table 3.6.2g was revised to point out that actuation of an APRM trip will cause a Rod Withdrawal Block. Table 4.6.2g was revised to eliminate the Rod Withdrawal Block surveillance requirement for calibration of an inoperative APRM.

The proposed Technical Specification change revises the frequency of currently established surveillances. However, the proposed three-month surveillance requirement for both upscale and downscale parameters is conservative when compared with the frequency given in the Standard Technical Specifications for

8912010113 891121
PDR ADOCK 05000220
P PNU



Handwritten marks and scribbles in the top right corner, including several small dots and faint lines.

APRM calibration. The addition of note M to Table 4.6.2a and the elimination of the inoperative APRM surveillance calibration are also in agreement with the Standard Technical Specifications. The three-month calibration frequency and the deletion of inoperative APRM calibration also agree with the Standard Technical Specification surveillance requirements regarding Rod Withdrawal Block instrumentation.

A comparison of the NMP-1 APRM Technical Specification change for upscale and downscale parameters with the BWR Owners Group Improved Technical Specifications indicates that the proposed three-month calibration frequency is acceptable. The Improved Technical Specifications do not include APRM instrumentation as part of the Rod Withdrawal Block surveillance scope and as a result the three-month surveillance requirement is in fact conservative. The proposed elimination of the inoperative APRM calibration requirement is also consistent with the requirements outlined in the Improved BWR Technical Specifications. Comparison of the NMP-1 Technical Specification changes to other BWR plant Technical Specifications also indicates the proposed surveillance revisions to be consistent with industry practice.

Although the proposed change revises surveillance requirements and intervals for the APRM and Rod Block instrumentation, these changes are consistent with industry practice and the Standard Technical Specifications. The revised APRM/Rod Block surveillance requirements will not impact the safe operation of the plant. The amendment is therefore found to be acceptable to the staff.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves 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 or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

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 these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: November 21, 1989

PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTOR: Cliff Doult

