



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 41 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-22  
NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY  
MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT  
DOCKET NO. 50-263

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letters dated September 24, 1982 and August 17, 1984, Northern States Power Company (the licensee) requested Technical Specifications (TS) changes to amend Appendix A of Facility Operating License No. DPR-22. Two of these changes includes (a) revision of the station battery system Limiting Conditions for Operation and Surveillance Requirements to incorporate the new 250 VDC HPCI battery, and (b) revision of Section 5.1.A of the TS to more accurately define the property line at the site boundary. The other items requested in these two applications either have been resolved or will be addressed in separate licensing actions.

2.0 EVALUATION

The dc power system at Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant consists of two 125 volt and one 250 volt battery systems to power the dc loads. The plant 125 volt dc power is normally supplied by the two batteries, each with an associated charger. A spare third charger is available to supply either of the 125 volt battery. The plant 250 volt dc power is normally supplied by the one battery with two associated chargers. The two chargers associated with the 250 volt battery are active sources, each with capacity to supply the normal 250 volt requirements and supply the dc requirements during emergency conditions.

The licensee has added a second 250 volt battery to supply the HPCI loads and other station loads in the future, if needed. Most other station loads are supplied by the original 250 volt battery. Under the new configuration, each 250 battery is maintained fully charged by two associated chargers which also supply the normal dc requirements with the batteries as a standby source during emergency conditions.

Due to the addition of the new 250 volt battery system for HPCI loads, the HPCI and RCIC systems will receive power from two separate 250 volt battery systems. This will result in an improvement in the plant electrical system separation in the event of fires in certain areas of the plant. The addition of the second battery enhances the plant's capability to attain and maintain safe shutdown of the reactor in case one of the two 250 volt battery systems is inoperable for any reason. The proposed changes will add Limiting Conditions for Operation and

Surveillance Requirements for the new 250 volt battery and are similar to the existing TS. The staff has reviewed the proposed request and agrees with the licensee that the change will improve the safety of the plant due to the added redundancy in batteries and the surveillance of the added battery. The staff, therefore, finds the proposed changes acceptable.

Section 5.1.A. of the TS describes the location of the reactor vessel, site boundary and the property line. The proposed change defines a more up-to-date property line as a result of acquisition of a small portion of land at the site boundary. The additional property is in the SE and NW sections of the plant site. The fence line (site boundary for dose calculations and the exclusion area boundary for Part 100) has not changed. The staff has reviewed the proposed change and concludes that the change is administrative in nature and does not affect the operation of the plant or the safety of the public and, therefore, finds it acceptable.

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes to the surveillance requirements. 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 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). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement nor environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

### 4.0 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security nor to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: P. Gill and R. Auluck.

Dated: March 24, 1986.