



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-86

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SEABROOK STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-443

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 19, 1990, the Public Service Company of New Hampshire (the licensee) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-86 for the Seabrook Station. The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements 4.8.2.1d, 4.8.2.1e and 4.8.2.1f by deleting the phrase "during shutdown" from these Surveillance Requirements.

EVALUATION

The design of the Class 1E 125 volt battery system at Seabrook consists of four independent and physically separated batteries. Each Class 1E battery can be aligned to the other electrical Class 1E DC bus within its electrical train. The design incorporates mechanically interlocked manual circuit breakers which will permit the connection of two DC supply buses within the same train to a single battery, but prevents paralleling the two batteries in the train. Each battery has sufficient capacity to serve as the source, for the required duration, for two load groups of the same train during the period when one battery is out of service. The current Technical Specifications allow one battery bank in one train to be inoperable for up to 30 days. The existing Surveillance Requirements 4.8.2.1d, 4.8.2.1e and 4.8.2.1f require that these tests be performed during shutdown. These surveillance requirements are related to the battery service test and battery discharge test.

The staff has reviewed the proposed change and concludes that since one battery in each train has sufficient capacity to handle the full 100% load requirements of both Class 1E DC buses within its electrical train, performance of the surveillance testing at power with one battery removed from service will not decrease the functional capability of the Seabrook DC system below the level currently allowed by the Technical Specifications. With a battery bank removed from service, the affected train continues to meet assumed 100% capacity. Surveillance testing takes about seven days. In accordance with Technical Specification requirements, the alternate battery and charger in the same train and both battery banks and charges in the opposite train will be operable during the performance of a surveillance test. Therefore, the proposed change does not reduce the margin of safety. Based on the above, the staff finds the proposed change to delete the phrase "during shutdown" from Surveillance Requirements 4.8.2.1d, 4.8.2.1e and 4.8.2.1f to be acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change in 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 and/or changes to the surveillance requirements. The 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 published a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this 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 this amendment.

CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (55 FR 46593) on November 5, 1990 and consulted with the State of New Hampshire. No public comments were received and the State of New Hampshire did not have any comments.

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.

Principal Contributor: O. Chopra

Dated: December 6, 1990