



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 114 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-38

ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC.

WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT 3

DOCKET NO. 50-382

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By application dated June 22, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated June 28, 1995, and August 22, 1995, Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee), submitted a request for changes to the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, Technical Specifications (TSs). The requested changes would allow the control room radiation monitor setpoint (CRRMS) to be increased to a fixed value of  $5.45E-6$   $\mu\text{Ci/cc}$  instead of being set at two times the background.

The June 28, 1995, and August 22, 1995, letters provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

2.0 EVALUATION

The staff has completed its evaluation of the potential radiological consequences of the increased radiation monitor setpoint at Waterford 3, based upon the conditions of the proposed TS changes and telephone discussions held with the licensee on July 17, 1995. As committed in the followup letter dated August 22, 1995, the licensee reduced its CRRMS from  $4.09E-5$   $\mu\text{Ci/cc}$  to  $5.45E-6$   $\mu\text{Ci/cc}$ . Based on our review, we conclude that the proposed request to increase the (CRRMS) from two times background to a fixed value of  $5.45E-6$   $\mu\text{Ci/cc}$  will not result in radioactive material concentrations exceeding the control room operator dose guidelines. The staff reviewed the licensee's submittal and, in addition, the staff performed an independent analysis to determine conformance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 100 and GDC 19 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50. The proposed value is approximately 10 times the current background noise levels and is a factor of 10 below the calculated maximum setpoint value that would prevent radioactive material concentrations in the control room from exceeding the Derived Air Concentration (DAC) occupational values listed in 10 CFR Part 20 Appendix B, Table 1, Column 3.

Based on the staff's review of the licensee's analysis and independent assessment of the radiological consequences of increasing the control room radiation monitor setpoint, the staff concludes that the radiological

consequences associated with this increase are within the acceptance criteria set forth in 10 CFR Part 100 and the control room operator dose criteria specified in GDC-19 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50 and are, therefore, acceptable.

### 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Louisiana State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

### 4.0 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. 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 (59 FR 39586). 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: D. Carter

Date: September 27, 1994