



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 37

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-21

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-245

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated July 31, 1989, Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) submitted a request to amend the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Technical Specifications (TS). The requested change would add four valves to Table 3.7.1, "Primary Containment Isolation Automatic Valves," to reflect the use of a drywell pumpback system.

EVALUATION

Section 3.7.A.2, "Drywell to Suppression Chamber Differential Pressure," of the TS requires the licensee to maintain a differential pressure between the drywell and suppression chamber equal or greater than 1.0 psid. In order to achieve this pressure differential, the licensee employed an open system of pressurization and venting. In an effort to minimize purging and venting, the licensee devised a scheme whereby a pump would take suction from the suppression pool airspace and discharge to the drywell to maintain the pressure differential. This issue was evaluated by the licensee and reviewed by the staff as Topic 2.32 of the Integrated Safety Assessment Program. The licensee has since installed this system.

Since the drywell pumpback system suction and discharge lines penetrate primary containment the licensee has installed isolation valves. The TS requires that primary containment automatic isolation valves be periodically tested. Those specific valves requiring testing are listed on TS Table 3.7.1.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's TS change request and concurs that the four drywell pumpback system isolation valves fall under the surveillance requirements of TS Section 3/4.7.D, "Primary Containment Isolation Valves," and therefore should be listed in TS Table 3.7.1. The staff finds the licensee's proposed TS change to be acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment changes 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. We have 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 staff has previously published a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the 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 the 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 (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: November 7, 1989

Principal Contributor: M. Boyle