

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20655

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 20 TO PROVISIONAL OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-22

NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-263

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated April 21. 1976, Northern States Power Company (NSP) requested an Amendment to Provisional Operating License No. DPR-22 for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant. The amendment involves changes to the Technical Specifications which incorporate more specific Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO's) for the Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (APLHGR), Linear Heat Generation Rate (LHGR), and Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR).

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

By letter dated February 25, 1976, the NRC requested NSP to include in the Monticello Technical Specifications for APLHGR, LHGR, and MCPR, explicit remedial actions to be taken in the event the specification is exceeded. The proposed specifications would require, upon exceeding a limit, the initiation of remedial action within 15 minutes to restore operation to within the prescribed limits. If operation is not within prescribed limits within two hours, the proposed specifications would require that the reactor be placed in Cold Shutdown within 36 would require that the reactor be placed in Cold Shutdown within 36 hours. Current Monticello Technical Specifications for APLHGR, LHGR, and MCPR do not specify such time limits for remedial action. The APLHGR, LHGR, and MCPR limits themselves are not sodified.

The NRC staff has reviewed NSP's proposed technical specification changes regarding remedial action for APLHGR, LHGR, and MCPR limits. We have concluded that the proposed specifications, as modified by the staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 850.36 staff, are in accordance with the provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, 8

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

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

CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that:

(1) because the changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the changes do 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: June 18, 1976