

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 14 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE DPR-3
(CHANGE NO. 119 TO THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS)

YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC COMPANY

YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER STATION (YANKEE-ROWE)

DOCKET NO. 50-29

Introduction

By letter dated January 3, 1974, Yankee Atomic Electric Company (the licensee) requested an amendment to the operating license for Yankee-Rowe that would incorporate a complete revision to the existing Technical Specifications to utilize present-day format and content. Part of these new technical specifications would be the specification of a surveillance interval for calibration of instrumentation channels. By letter dated July 1, 1975, the licensee requested our consideration of this particular part of their January 3, 1974 submittal.

Description

Presently, the Technical Specifications require that the instrumentation channels be calibrated during scheduled shutdown periods but they do not include a limitation on the time interval between succeeding calibrations. In the January 3, 1974 request, the licensee proposed that this interval be defined as every refueling shutdown. In the July 1, 1975 letter, the licensee further proposed that this limit be defined as 18 months.

Evaluation

A maximum 18 month calibration interval has been found acceptable for Westinghouse pressurized water reactors, including Yankee-Rowe, and is currently being incorporated in technical specifications of newly licensed facilities. This surveillance frequency is sufficient to assure that the overall functional capability of the instrumentation channels is maintained comparable to the original design standards. This proposed change will improve the effectiveness of the present Yankee-Rowe Technical Specifications by placing a specific time limit (18 months) on this surveillance interval. The change does not affect the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed for Yankee-Rowe and does not decrease any margin of safety.

8011200169

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that:
(1) because the change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the change does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: JUL 23 1975

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						