

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

# SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE UFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

# SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 28 TO FACILITY OPERATING

# LICENSE NO. DPR-22

### NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY

### MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT

### DOCKET NO. 50-263

### 1.0 Introduction

By letter dated August 17, 1984 Northern States Power Company (the licensee) proposed to change the Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant to reflect the use of hybrid design hafnium control rod assemblies. Another change in the same proposal pertaining to control rod assemblies is being handled by a separate action.

### 2.0 Evaluation

The licensee has proposed converting the new control rods that have been developed by General Electric. These new control rods contain 12 hafnium absorber rods in place of 12 B<sub>A</sub>C rods, and the remaining B<sub>A</sub>C rods have improved cladding material. These new improved rods are referred to as Hybrid I Control Rod (HICR) assemblies. The HICR weight is the same as the present control rod assemblies, and the mechanical and nuclear properties are similar to the present control rod assemblies. A description of the HICR blades is found in the approved topical report NEDE-22290-A.

The use of the HICR assemblies in boiling water reactors (BWRs) has been reviewed and approved by the staff (Letter from C. O. Thomas (NRC) to J. F. Klapproth (GE), "Safety Evaluation of GE Hybrid-1," dated August 22, 1983). Since the use of Hybrid I Control Rod Assemblies for BWRs has been previously approved as described above, we conclude that their use is acceptable in the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant. A Technical Specification change has been made to reflect the use of HICR assemblies and we find the change acceptable.

#### 3.0 Environmental Considerations

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The 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

8411190163 841102 PDR ADOCK 05000262 PDR PDR has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuart to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

#### 4.0 Conclusions

We have 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and 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: A. M. Gill

Dated: November 2, 1984