

ATTACHMENT A

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION  
LICENSE NO. NPF-69  
DOCKET NO. 50-410

PROPOSED CHANGES TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

Existing Pages iv and 3/4 0-2 will be replaced with the attached revised pages iv and 3/4 0-2. Existing Page 3/4 0-4 will be deleted in its entirety. Bases page B 3/4 0-2 will be replaced with the attached revised page B 3/4 0-2. These pages have been retyped in their entirety with a marginal marking to indicate the changes.

8433G3

9011290007 901120  
PDR ADCK 05000410  
P PDC



## INDEX

### BASES FOR SECTION 2.0

#### PAGE

#### SAFETY LIMITS (Continued)

Reactor Coolant System Pressure.....	B2-5
Reactor Vessel Water Level.....	B2-5

#### 2.2 LIMITING SAFETY SYSTEM SETTINGS

Reactor Protection System Instrumentation Setpoints.....	B2-6
--	------

### 3.0/4.0 LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION AND SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

<u>3/4.0 APPLICABILITY</u> .....	3/4 0-1
----------------------------------	---------

#### 3/4.1 REACTIVITY CONTROL SYSTEMS

3/4.1.1 SHUTDOWN MARGIN.....	3/4 1-1
------------------------------	---------

3/4.1.2 REACTIVITY ANOMALIES.....	3/4 1-2
-----------------------------------	---------

#### 3/4.1.3 CONTROL RODS

Control Rod Operability.....	3/4 1-3
Control Rod Maximum Scram Insertion Times.....	3/4 1-6
Control Rod Average Scram Insertion Times.....	3/4 1-7
Four Control Rod Group Scram Insertion Times.....	3/4 1-8
Control Rod Scram Accumulators.....	3/4 1-9
Control Rod Drive Coupling.....	3/4 1-11
Control Rod Position Indication.....	3/4 1-13
Control Rod Drive Housing Support.....	3/4 1-15

#### 3/4.1.4 CONTROL ROD PROGRAM CONTROLS

Rod Worth Minimizer.....	3/4 1-16
Rod Sequence Control System.....	3/4 1-17
Rod Block Monitor.....	3/4 1-18



## SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.0.1 Surveillance Requirements shall be met during the OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS or other conditions specified for individual Limiting Conditions for Operation unless otherwise stated in an individual Surveillance Requirement.

4.0.2 Each Surveillance Requirement shall be performed within the specified time interval with a maximum allowable extension not to exceed 25% of the surveillance interval.

4.0.3 Failure to perform a Surveillance Requirement within the specified time interval shall constitute a failure to meet the OPERABILITY requirements for a Limiting Condition for Operation. Exceptions to these requirements are stated in the individual specifications. Surveillance requirements do not have to be performed on inoperable equipment.

4.0.4 Entry into an OPERATIONAL CONDITION or other specified applicable condition shall not be made unless the Surveillance Requirement(s) associated with the Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the applicable surveillance interval or as otherwise specified.

4.0.5 Surveillance Requirements for inservice inspection and testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 components shall be applicable as follows:

- a. Inservice inspection of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 components and inservice testing of ASME Code Class 1, 2 and 3 pumps and valves shall be performed in accordance with Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable addenda as required by 10CFR50.55a(g), except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10CFR50.55a(g)(6)(i).
- b. Surveillance intervals specified in Section XI of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable addenda for the inservice inspection and testing activities required by the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code and applicable addenda shall be applicable as follows in these Technical Specifications:



## APPLICABILITY

### BASES

---

4.0.1 This specification provides that surveillance activities necessary to ensure the Limiting Conditions for Operation are met and will be performed during the OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS or other conditions for which the Limiting Conditions for Operation are applicable. Provisions for additional surveillance activities to be performed without regard to the applicable OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS or other conditions are provided in the individual Surveillance Requirements. Surveillance Requirements for Special Test Exceptions need only be performed when the Special Test Exception is being utilized as an exception to an individual specification.

4.0.2 Specification 4.0.2 establishes the limit for which the specified time interval for Surveillance Requirements may be extended. It permits an allowable extension of the normal surveillance interval to facilitate surveillance scheduling and consideration of plant operating conditions that may not be suitable for conducting the surveillance; e.g., transient conditions or other ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. It also provides flexibility to accommodate the length of a fuel cycle for surveillances that are performed at each refueling outage and are specified with an 18 month surveillance interval. It is not intended that this provision be used repeatedly as a convenience to extend surveillance intervals beyond that specified for surveillances that are not performed during refueling outages. The limitation of Specification 4.0.2 is based on engineering judgement and the recognition that the most probable result of any particular surveillance being performed is the verification of conformance with the Surveillance Requirements. This provision is sufficient to ensure that the reliability ensured through surveillance activities is not significantly degraded beyond that obtained from the specified surveillance interval.

4.0.3 The provisions of this specification set forth the criteria for determination of compliance with the OPERABILITY requirements of the Limiting Conditions for Operation. Under this criteria, equipment, systems, or components are assumed to be OPERABLE if the associated surveillance activities have been satisfactorily performed within the specified time interval. Nothing in this provision is to be construed as defining equipment, systems, or components OPERABLE, when such items are found or known to be inoperable although still meeting the Surveillance Requirements.

4.0.4 This specification ensures that surveillance activities associated with a Limiting Condition for Operation have been performed within the specified time interval prior to entry into an applicable OPERATIONAL CONDITION or other specified applicability condition. The intent of this provision is to ensure that surveillance activities have been satisfactorily demonstrated on a current basis as required to meet the OPERABILITY requirements of the Limiting Condition for Operation.

Under the terms of this specification, for example, during initial plant startup or following extended plant outage, the applicable surveillance activities must be performed within the stated surveillance interval prior to placing or returning the system or equipment into OPERABLE status.





ATTACHMENT B

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

LICENSE NO. NPF-69

DOCKET NO. 50-410

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION AND NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION ANALYSIS**

**Discussion**

Specification 4.0.2 of the Nine Mile Point Unit 2 Technical Specifications permits surveillance intervals to be extended up to 25 percent of the specified interval. This extension facilitates the scheduling of surveillance activities and allows surveillances to be postponed when plant conditions are not suitable for conducting a surveillance, for example, under transient conditions or other ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. Specification 4.0.2 limits extending surveillance so that the combined time interval for any three consecutive surveillance intervals shall not exceed 3.25 times the specified surveillance interval. The intent of the 3.25 limit is to preclude routine use of the provision for extending a surveillance interval by 25 percent.

Experience has shown that the refueling surveillance interval, with the provision to extend it by 25 percent, is usually sufficient to accommodate normal variations in the length of a fuel cycle. However, the NRC staff has routinely granted requests for one-time exceptions to the 3.25 limit on extending refueling surveillances because the risk to safety is low in contrast to the alternative of a forced shutdown to perform these surveillances. Therefore, the 3.25 limitation on extending surveillances has not been a practical limit on the use of the 25 percent allowance for extending surveillances that are performed on a refueling outage basis and is being proposed for deletion.

The use of the allowance to extend surveillance intervals by 25 percent can also result in a significant safety benefit for surveillances that are performed on a routine basis during plant operation. This safety benefit is incurred when a surveillance interval is extended at a time that conditions are not suitable for performing the surveillance. Examples of this include transient plant operating conditions or conditions in which safety systems are out of service because of ongoing surveillance or maintenance activities. In such cases, the safety benefit of allowing the use of the 25 percent allowance to extend a surveillance interval would outweigh any benefit derived by limiting three consecutive surveillance intervals to the 3.25 limit. Also, there is the administrative burden associated with tracking the use of the 25 percent allowance to ensure compliance with the 3.25 limit. On the basis of these considerations, the Commission concluded that removal of the 3.25 limit will have an overall positive impact on safety.



Amendment 18 to the Technical Specifications contained, in paragraph C of Specification 4.0.2, a one time exemption from the requirements of Specification 4.0.2 for a limited number of surveillances which were due prior to the scheduled shutdown date for the first refueling outage and which would have necessitated a plant shutdown to perform. Unit 2 has shutdown for the first refueling outage and the surveillances are being performed during the current outage. Therefore, the one time exemption contained in paragraph c of Specification 4.0.2 has served its purpose and is also being proposed for deletion.

The changes to the Bases for Specification 4.0.2, as proposed by Generic Letter 89-14, also incorporate the recommendations of Generic Letter 87-09. These changes were previously submitted to the Commission in NMP2L 1142, dated June 14, 1988 (TAC No. 68463) and are included as a part of this change request.

#### **No Significant Hazards Consideration**

Nine Mile Point Unit 2 can be safely operated with the incorporation of the changes in the proposed amendment. 10 CFR 50.91 requires that at the time a licensee requests an amendment, it must provide to the Commission its analysis using the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 concerning the issue of no significant hazards consideration. Therefore, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91, 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 changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The removal of the 3.25 limit on extending surveillance intervals does not impact plant design or the operation of plant systems. It is not intended that this provision be routinely used to extend surveillance intervals beyond that specified in Technical Specifications. The provision is intended for use when plant conditions are not suitable for the conduct of surveillances due to safety systems being out-of-service for maintenance or due to other ongoing surveillance activities. In such cases, the safety benefit of extending a surveillance interval up to 25 percent would exceed the risk reduction derived by conforming to the 3.25 limitation. The removal of the exemption for those surveillances associated with the first refueling outage is administrative in nature and as such has no effect on the probability or consequences of any accident. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not involve a significant increase in 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 proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes introduce no new mode of plant operation nor do they require physical modification to the plant. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

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.

Surveillance testing performed in accordance with Specification 4.0.2 and the maximum 25 percent interval extension criteria will continue to ensure adequate system reliability. The removal of the exemption associated with the first refueling outage is administrative in nature and does not affect any margin of safety. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.



1  
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