



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 72

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-21

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY

MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-245

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 14, 1994, Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO) submitted a request for changes to the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes would correct an editorial error. Specifically, the reference in Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.4.D would be changed from "3.3.A through C" to "3.4.A, 3.4.B, and 3.4.C." The amendment would also change the associated bases to clarify the LCO minimum solution concentration requirement of 11 weight percent and would update the excerpt from 10 CFR 50.62 to reflect the current text of the regulation.

2.0 EVALUATION

The requirement in TS LCO 3.4.D, "Standby Liquid Control System, Shutdown Requirement," states that if TS 3.3.A through C are not met, an orderly shutdown shall be initiated. The reference to TS 3.3.A through C is incorrect. TS 3.4.D should refer to the operating requirements in Section 3.4 (i.e., 3.4.A through C). Referencing TS 3.3.A through C was not the original intent of Section 3.4.D, since Section 3.3 already has specific shutdown requirements. The proposed change will correct Section 3.4.D so that it limits the conditions under which a plant shutdown must be initiated to the LCOs of the standby liquid control system. The NRC staff finds this change acceptable.

NNECO also proposed to include the specific chemical formula for sodium pentaborate in the standby liquid control system bases. NNECO is adding the full chemical formula to the bases since different solutions containing sodium pentaborate may have different concentrations. NNECO is also updating the standby liquid control system bases to include the new wording of 10 CFR 50.62. The NRC staff finds no objection to the change in the bases.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Connecticut State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The NRC 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (59 FR 7693). 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.

### 5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has 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, (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.

Principal Contributor: J. Andersen

Date: March 24, 1994