



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 56

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-49

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY, ET AL.

MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3

DOCKET NO. 50-423

INTRODUCTION

By application for license amendment dated July 10, 1990, Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al. (the licensee), requested changes to Millstone Unit 3 Technical Specifications (TS).

The proposed amendment would modify Millstone Unit 3 Technical Specification (TS) Table 3.3-9, "Remote Shutdown Instrumentation," to correct an editorial error and TS Table 4.3-6, "Remote Shutdown Monitoring Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements," to provide a note of clarification concerning the source range count rate.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

An editorial error has been identified in TS Table 3.3-9 which resulted in the column headings for "Readout Location," "Total No. of Channels" and "Minimum Channels Operable" being misaligned. The proposed change to TS Table 3.3-9 would result in the column headings being correctly aligned. While the licensee has identified only two columns as being effected, all three columns would be changed.

The proposed change to Table 3.3-9 corrects the editorial error and does not otherwise change the requirements stated therein. Accordingly, the proposed change to TS Table 3.3-9 is acceptable.

The proposed change to TS Table 4.3-6 would add a footnote to the surveillance requirements for source range count rate channel check. At the present time TS Table 4.3-6 specifies a monthly interval for the source range count rate channel check. Since power to the source range detectors is removed in the intermediate neutron range (above the P-6 interlock) the source range detectors are effectively inoperable during power operation. Accordingly, a channel check of the source range count rate is meaningless during power operation. The licensee has proposed that the following footnote be added to the source range count rate channel check: When below P-6 (intermediate range neutron flux interlock setpoint).

9010100169 900926  
PDR ADOCK 05000423  
P PNU

The proposed footnote would have the effect of eliminating the requirement to perform a channel check on the source range count rate when the reactor is operating at power levels above the P-6 interlock.

The TS defines a "Channel Check" as follows:

"1.6 A CHANNEL CHECK shall be the qualitative assessment of channel behavior during operation by observation. This determination shall include, where possible, comparison of the channel indication and/or status with other indications and/or status derived from independent instrument channels measuring the same parameter."

Since power is removed from the source range channels above the P-6 interlock, a "Channel Check" of the source range channels would not provide a "... qualitative assessment of channel behavior during operation by observation." Accordingly, the subject surveillance is meaningless and its elimination from the TS would not effect the availability of the source range monitors. Accordingly, the proposed change to the TS, which involves adding a footnote to TS Table 4.3-6 is acceptable.

#### 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 and changes surveillance requirements. 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: September 26, 1990

Principal Contributor:

D. Jaffe