



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 110 TO DPR-65

NORTHEAST NUCLEAR ENERGY COMPANY, ET AL.

MILLSTONE NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-336

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated May 28, 1985, the licensee requested an amendment to the Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit No. 2 Technical Specifications. The proposed changes concern:

1. Adding fire detectors which have recently been installed and changing certain action statements and surveillance requirements for fire detectors;
2. Changing the wording of the surveillance requirements for the diesel driven fire pump to reflect the as-built design;
3. Adding sprinkler systems which have recently been installed;
4. Adding fire hose stations which have recently been installed and changing the operability requirements for fire hose stations in Containment; and
5. Revising the technical specifications pertaining to penetrations of fire barriers.

At our request, by letter dated October 1, 1985, the licensee revised the original proposal to be more consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications.

2.0 EVALUATION

2.1. Fire Detectors

The licensee had installed additional fire detectors in several locations to conform with our fire protection guidelines and the requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50. These additional detectors are being added

8603030468 860204
PDR ADDCK 05000336
P PDR

to Table 3.3-10, which identifies all detectors that require surveillance. The changes in wording in the action statements and surveillance requirements reflect the unique requirements for fire detectors installed in containment. Because the licensee's proposed changes are consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications, we find them acceptable.

2.2 Diesel Fire Pump Battery Surveillance

The licensee's proposed change in wording for the surveillance requirement for the diesel fire pump batteries reflects the as-built design of the pump starting system, which features two independent 12-volt batteries. This wording change does not change the surveillance requirement for the batteries and is, therefore, acceptable.

2.3 Sprinkler/Water Spray Systems

The licensee had also installed sprinkler/water spray systems in several plant locations to conform with our fire protection guidelines and the requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50. The proposed change adds these systems to the list of spray/sprinkler systems that are subject to surveillance. It conforms to the Standard Technical Specifications and is, therefore, acceptable.

2.4. Fire Hose Stations

The licensee had installed additional fire hose stations in the Auxiliary & Turbine Buildings and Containment to conform with our fire protection guidelines. The proposed change adds these new hose stations to the list of stations in Table 3.7-2 that require surveillance. It conforms with the Standard Technical Specifications and is, therefore, acceptable. The licensee also proposes to locate the equipment for the Containment hose stations (i.e., hose and nozzles) outside of Containment during Modes 1 thru 4 and to demonstrate operability of the Containment hose stations in Mode 5 when required to support maintenance activities and in Mode 6. This change is consistent with ALARA considerations, it assures operability of the hose stations during operational modes where the possibility of fire in Containment is greater, and it is consistent with the intent of the Standard Technical Specifications which require that hose stations which are "accessible" during plant operations be subject to surveillance. We, therefore, conclude that the licensee's proposed change is acceptable.

2.5. Fire Barrier Penetrations

The licensee proposes to revise the Technical Specifications for fire barrier penetrations. The changes include a revision to paragraph 3.7.10 to identify, more specifically, the barriers and penetrations that are covered by this specification. In addition, the Applicability Statement is changed to account for different equipment requirements during various plant operating modes. The licensee proposes to change the Action Statement to allow the implementation of an hourly fire watch when an operable fire detection or suppression system is available. Also, the licensee proposes to change the surveillance requirements of fire barrier penetration seals to permit these seals to be done on the basis of a 10% sample.

Except for the proposal to take credit for an operable fire suppression system in conjunction with an hourly fire watch patrol, all of the above-referenced technical specifications modifications are consistent with the Standard Technical Specifications (STS) and are, therefore, acceptable. The STS states that when a fire-rated assembly is inoperable, an hourly fire watch could be established, in lieu of a continuous fire watch, when it is verified that an operable fire detection system is available on at least one side of the barrier. The licensee proposes to establish an hourly fire watch if it can also be demonstrated that an operable fire suppression system exists on at least one side of the barrier. Because an automatic fire suppression system would be able to mitigate the effects of a fire as well as transmit an alarm automatically to the control room, we conclude that when the suppression system is located at the degraded barrier, the licensee's proposed change is equivalent to the provisions of the Standard Technical Specifications and is, therefore, acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

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 has previously published a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. 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.

4.0 CONCLUSION

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.

Date: February 4, 1986

Principal Contributor:
D. Kubicki