



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 142 T.J. FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-35  
BOSTON EDISON COMPANY  
PILGRIM NUCLEAR POWER STATION  
DOCKET NO. 50-293

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated April 8, 1992, Boston Edison Company (the licensee) requested an amendment to the Technical Specifications (TS) appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-35 for the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. The amendment would remove the words "each operating cycle" from TS sections 4.7.A.2.a(1) and 4.7.A.2.a(2) regarding reduced pressure local leak rate tests of main steam isolation valves (MSIVs) and personnel air lock door seals.

Pilgrim TS Section 1.V defines "operating cycle" for the purposes of determining surveillance intervals as 18 months with a 25% margin. The licensee's operating cycle is currently scheduled for 24 months. The licensee has requested, therefore, to remove the words "each operating cycle" from the specified TS to allow testing at intervals corresponding to those specified in Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50.

A discussion of the proposed changes and the NRC staff evaluation and findings relative to each are addressed in Section 2 of this Safety Evaluation.

2.0 EVALUATION

2.1 Main Steam Isolation Valves

The licensee requested to remove the words "each operating cycle" from TS Section 4.7.A.2.a(1). As currently written, this TS, in conjunction with the definition in TS Section 1.V, would require local leak rate testing of the MSIVs at least once every 22.5 months. Following removal of the words as requested, the TS would require that the test be performed "during each reactor shutdown for refueling but in no case at intervals greater than 2 years" pursuant to 10 CFR 50, Appendix J.

The staff concludes that this change is acceptable because the surveillance is required to be performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50 Appendix J with the exception that the test pressure will be less than Pa. This exception was previously approved by the staff in an exemption issued on July 2, 1984.

## 2.2 Personnel Air Lock Door Seals

The licensee requested to remove the words "each operating cycle" from TS Section 4.7.A.2.a(2). As currently written, this TS, in conjunction with the definition in TS Section 1.V, would require local leak rate testing of the personnel air lock door seals at least once every 22.5 months. Following removal of the words as requested, the TS would require that the test be performed "at least once every 3 days during...period[s] of frequent openings" when containment integrity is required. Conduct of the test at reduced pressure is authorized by Appendix J provided that the test pressure is specified in the TS.

The staff concludes that this change is acceptable because the surveillance is required to be performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50 Appendix J. The reduced test pressure is specified in the TS as required by Appendix J.

## 3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the Massachusetts 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 facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and 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 20509). 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 staff 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. Dorman

Date: July 15, 1992