

General Offices . Selden Street, Berlin, Connecticut

P.O. BOX 270 HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06141-0270 (203) 665-5000

November 22, 1989

Docket No. 50-213 B13402

Re: 10CFR50.90

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Attention: Document Control Desk Washington, DC 20555

Gentlemen:

## Haddam Neck Plant Revised Technical Specifications

Pursuant to 10CFR50.90, Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCO) submitted a proposed amendment to Operating License DPR-61 by incorporating changes identified in References (1) through (11) into the Technical Specifications of the Haddam Neck Plant. Those submittals represent an improved set of Technical Specifications for the Haddam Neck Plant.

The purpose of this letter is to submit additional changes on the previously submitted Technical Specification sections primarily to incorporate the NRC Staff's comments to the proposed revised Technical Specifications (RTS). In general, most of the changes are either administrative or will make the proposed RTS consistent with the existing Technical Specifications. Along with this amendment request, supporting documentation is provided as follows:

- o Attachment 1 forwards the proposed RTS pages.
- Attachment 2 provides a description of the proposed changes. CYAPCO has reviewed the proposed RTS changes in accordance with 10CFR50.92 and has determined that the changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is discussed in Attachment 2.

Moreover, the Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10CFR50.92 by providing certain examples (March 6, 1986, 51FR7751) of amendments that are considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration. Although the changes proposed herein are not enveloped by a specific example, the changes would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed. In general, most changes are either administrative or will make the RTS consistent with the existing Technical Specifications. In addition, the changes provide more restrictive requirements than the originally submitted base document.

Based upon the information in this submittal, there are no significant radiological or nonradiological impacts associated with the proposed changes, and the proposed license amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

8912070224 891122 PDR ADOCK 05000213 PDR PDC

A001

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission B13402/Page 2 November 22, 1989

The Haddam Neck Nuclear Review Board has reviewed and approved the proposed changes and has concurred with the above determinations.

In accordance with 10CFR50.91(b), CYAPCO is providing the State of Connecticut with a copy of this proposed amendment.

We believe the information contained in this letter, along with the information provided in References (1) through (11), provides a complete basis for approval of the requested amendment. CYAPCO intends to fully implement the RTS within 60 days of its issuance by the NRC.

Should you have any questions on the attached amendment request and/or feel a meeting would help clarify the attached material, please contact our licensing representative directly.

Very truly yours,

CONNECTICUT YANKEE ATOMIC POWER COMPANY

Senior Vice President

cc: Mr. Kevin McCarthy, Director Radiation Control Unit Department of Environmental Protection Hartford, CT 06116

W. T. Russell, Region I Administrator

A. B. Wang, NRC Project Manager, Haddam Neck Plant

J. T. Shedlocky, Senior Resident Inspector, Haddam Neck Plant

STATE OF CONNECTICUT)
) ss. Berlin
COUNTY OF HARTFORD

Then personally appeared before me, E. J. Mroczka, who being duly sworn, did state that he is Senior Vice President of Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, a Licensee herein, that he is authorized to execute and file the foregoing information in the name and on behalf of the Licensees herein, and that the statements contained in said information are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

My Commission Expires March 31, 1993

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission B13402/Page 3 November 22, 1989

## References

- (1) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications Sections 1.0, 3/4.2, 3/4.9, 3/4.10, 3/4.11, 5.0, and 6.0, dated October 26, 1988.
- (2) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications, Section 3/4.2, dated March 6, 1989.
- (3) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications Sections 3/4.4, 3/4.6, 3/4.7, dated June 2, 1989.
- (4) E. J. Mroczka to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications Section 2.0 and 3/4.3, dated June 23, 1989.
- (5) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications Section 3.0/4.0, and 3.4.6.2, dated July 28, 1989.
- (6) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications Section 3.6.2, 3.9.11, and 3.9.12, dated August 4, 1989.
- (7) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications, RPS/NIS Upgrade, dated July 28, 1989.
- (8) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications, Electrical Power Systems, dated August 1, 1989.
- (9) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications, Cycle 16 Reload, dated July 28, 1989.
- (10) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications, Fire Protection Systems, dated July 31, 1989.
- (11) E. J. Mroczka letter to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Revised Technical Specifications, ECCS, dated August 2, 1989.