



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 156 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-65
NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY, ET AL.
MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2
DOCKET NO. 50-336

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application for license amendment dated February 7, 1992, Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (the licensee) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) for Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2. The amendment would change the TS Sections by extending the surveillance requirements of TS 4.6.1.2.a to allow the second Type A Containment Integrated Leakage Rate test (ILRT), within the second 10-year service period, to be conducted during the Cycle 11 refueling outage scheduled to commence in May 1992. The TS change is a one time extension for Cycle 11 only. Consistent with this change, the amendment would also add a Surveillance Requirement 4.6.1.2.h which states the provisions of Technical Specification 4.0.2 are not applicable.

2.0 EVALUATION

The existing TS 4.6.1.2.a, "Containment Leakage Surveillance Requirements," states that three Type A tests (Overall Integrated Containment Leakage Rate) shall be conducted at 40 ± 10-month intervals during shutdown at Pa (54 psig) during each 10-year service period. The third test of each set shall be conducted during the shutdown for the 10-year plant inservice inspection. The 50-month time limit (April 8, 92) for the second Type A test within the second 10-year service period would be extended to approximately 56 months due to the number of in-cycle shutdowns which have extended the time period for the next refueling outage to begin in May 1992, and continue until a projected startup in October 1992.

On February 8, 1988, Millstone Unit No. 2 successfully conducted a Type A test, which was the first Type A test in the second 10-year service period, and passed both the "as-found" and "as-left" ILRTs. Since then, there have not been any modifications made to the plant which could adversely affect the test results. Type B and C tests have also been completed during the 1989 and 1990 refueling outages and are scheduled to be performed during the upcoming 1992 refueling outage. The upcoming fuel outage will be an extended outage to accommodate the replacement of steam generators. Demonstrated operability of the components and penetrations, with the local leak rate test program, provides additional assurance that containment integrity has been maintained. The leakage condition of the containment determined from the ILRT of

9204140 7.38

February 8, 1988, was 36.8% of the TS limit and, as indicated above, no operations are known to have occurred which would suggest a significant degradation of this value.

Since the licensee has planned to conduct the second ILRT during the scheduled shutdown for next refueling and because the licensee has justified the leaktight integrity of the containment based on previous leakage test results, the staff concludes that a one time delay of approximately 6 to 7 months beyond the maximum permitted test interval will not have a significant safety impact. The staff, therefore, concludes that the licensee's requested test interval TS changes for delay in conducting the second ILRT of the second 10-year service period are acceptable.

Technical Specification 4.0.2 allows a 25% increase of a surveillance interval. Since the existing and proposed Millstone Unit 2 Technical Specifications provide for an explicit time interval for Type A test, it is not necessary for TS 4.0.2 to apply. Therefore, we find it acceptable to provide the proposed TS 4.6.1.2.h which states that the provisions of Specification 4.0.2 are not applicable.

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 surveillance requirements. 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 (57 FR 7812). 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: G. S. Vissing

Date: April 8, 1992