



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 86 TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-21  
NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY  
MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1  
DOCKET NO. 50-245

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

By letter dated October 16, 1980, as supplemented December 9, 1981, March 9, 1982, October 15, 1982 and November 2, 1982, Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) requested changes to the Appendix A Technical Specifications for the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1. These changes would modify the Technical Specification provisions to provide surveillance requirements and limiting condition for operation for Scram Discharge Volume. The changes are necessary since all of the modifications described in a W. G. Council letter to D. G. Eisenhower, dated March 20, 1981 have been completed. The major modifications consist of (1) installing a second instrumented volume tank (IVT) for the south scram discharge volume (SDV), thereby having two separate SDV's and associated piping, (2) replacing the 2" piping connecting the SDV with the IVT with 6" piping, (3) installing redundant vent and drain valves, and (4) increasing the SDV to allow for 3.34 gallons per control rod drive. The Technical Specification changes, and plant modifications, will improve plant safety.

As a result of events involving common cause failures of Scram Discharge Volume (SDV) limit switches and SDV drain valve operability, the NRC staff issued IE Bulletin 80-14 on June 12, 1980. In addition, the staff sent a letter dated July 7, 1980 to all operating BWR licensees requesting that they propose Technical Specification changes to provide surveillance requirements for SDV vent and drain valves and LCO/surveillance requirements on SDV limit switches. Model Technical Specifications were enclosed with this letter to provide guidance to licensees for preparation of the requested submittals.

The proposed changes would also replace the interim license conditions imposed by the Commission's Order dated October 2, 1980, issued by the Office of Inspection and Enforcement.

2.0 EVALUATION

The enclosed Technical Evaluation Report (TER-C-5506-61) was prepared by Franklin Research Center (FRC) as part of the NRC's technical assistance contract program. FRC's report provides its technical evaluation of the compliance of the licensee's submittal with NRC provided criteria.

FRC has concluded that the licensee's response does not meet the explicit requirements of Paragraph 4.3-6 and Table 4.3.6-1 of the NRC staff's Model Technical Specifications (TS) for control rod withdrawal block SDV scram trip bypassed "Instrument Functional Test." However, the FRC report concludes that the proposed surveillance requirements for control rod withdrawal block SDV scram trip bypassed are acceptable, since the licensee is installing a second instrument volume containing six additional limit switches. The model TSs were developed for plants which have only one instrument volume. Therefore, the second instrument volume significantly improves the design and reliability of the SDV. Taking this into account, we conclude that these technical bases justify a deviation from the explicit requirements of the model TSs.

FRC has concluded that the licensee's proposed TS revisions (as modified by subsequent discussions) meet our criteria without the need for further revision. We have, since FRC's evaluations, revised the scram trip setting from gallons of water to inches of water in the Scram Discharge Volume Tank for consistency with plant level sensor indication.

### 3.0 SUMMARY

Based upon our review of the contractor's report of its evaluations, we conclude that the licensee's proposed TS satisfy our requirements for surveillance of SDV vent and drain valves, and for LCOs and surveillance requirements for SDV limit switches. Consequently, we find the licensee's proposed TS (as modified by subsequent discussions with the licensee) acceptable.

### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

### 5.0 CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the amendment 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.

#### 6.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

K. Eccleston and J. Shea prepared this evaluation.

Attachment:

TER dated August 31, 1982

Dated: November 12, 1982