



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 67

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-49

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY, ET AL.

MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 3

DOCKET NO. 50-423

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 11, 1991, the Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, (the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3 Technical Specifications (TS). The requested changes would (1) revise Technical Specification Figure 3.1-2 to correct a drafting inaccuracy, and make the curve consistent with the data points, (2) revise Technical Specification Table 3.3-4 so that it is consistent with previously approved changes, and (3) revise Technical Specification Section 3/4.6.3 to delete an obsolete reference to Table 3.6.2.

The December 11, 1991 submittal also proposed changes to Technical Specification Section 3/4.7.7 which we have denied, because we believe that these changes are unnecessary and could possibly introduce confusion.

2.0 EVALUATION

Figure 3.1-2, which gives required shutdown margin with three loops in operation, was added with Amendment 30. The curve plotted in the existing Technical Specifications does not accurately reflect the data points. The proposed change provides a redrawn curve which accurately reflects the data points. Because the change corrects an error, it is acceptable.

Table 3.3-4, Item 4d gives setpoints for low steam line pressure for steam line isolation. The values for these setpoints were changed in Amendment 60 for safety injection, and, in order to be correct and consistent should have been changed for steam line isolation. The proposed change corrects this error and is therefore acceptable.

Section 3/4.6.3 is being revised to delete a reference to a nonexistent Table 3.6-2 which was deleted by Amendment 28. This change corrects an error in the Technical Specifications and is therefore acceptable.

In the December 11, 1991 submittal the licensee proposed changes in wording for Technical Specification Section 3/4.7.7, Control Room Emergency

9207010329 920623
PDR ADOCK 05000423
PDR

Ventilation System. The proposed changes relate to the required action during Modes 5 and 6 when (1) one control room emergency air filtration system (CREAFS) is inoperable, and (2) the operable CREAFS is not powered by the operable emergency power source. The proposed change permits declaring the CREAFS inoperable and suspending all operations involving core alterations or positive reactivity changes, as does the existing Technical Specification, but the proposed Technical Specification states the requirement in a different manner intended to provide clarification. We can find no difference in meaning in the proposed Technical Specification and the existing Technical Specification describing required action during Modes 5 and 6. We do not see that clarity is enhanced with the proposed wording. To grant the requested change would result in a difference in wording between the Millstone 3 Technical Specifications and Standard Technical Specifications which could introduce confusion in the future if others erroneously sought to attribute a difference in meaning to the difference in wording between Millstone 3 and Standard Technical Specifications. We believe that this change is not warranted, because the existing wording is clear and is in fact the wording of the Standard Technical Specification guidelines, therefore there is no need for a custom Technical Specification change. Based on the foregoing evaluation, the request is denied.

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 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 (57 FR 712). 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: Vernon L. Rooney

Date: June 23, 1992