

BOSTON EDISON COMPANY
800 BOYLSTON STREET
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02199

WILLIAM D. HARRINGTON
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
NUCLEAR

March 20, 1984
BECO 84-045
Proposed Change 84-02

Mr. Domenic B. Vassallo, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #2
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

License No. DPR-35
Docket No. 50-293

Proposed Technical Specification
Change to Allow Increased Core Flow

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to 10CFR50.90, Boston Edison Company hereby proposes the attached modification to Appendix A of Operating License No. DPR-35. This modification will allow the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station to operate at core flows above the rated flow. The filing fee for this proposed modification was submitted by letter from W.D. Harrington to R.M. Diggs, dated January 11, 1984 (BECO 84-008).

Very truly yours,

W.D. Harrington

DMV/kmc

Attachment
One original and 39 copies

cc: Mr. Robert M. Hallisey, Director
Radiation Control Program
Massachusetts Dept. of Public Health
600 Washington Street, Room 770
Boston, MA 02111

Commonwealth of Massachusetts)
County of Suffolk)

Then personally appeared before me W. D. Harrington, who, being duly sworn, did state that he is Senior Vice President - Nuclear of the Boston Edison Company, the applicant herein, and that he is duly authorized to execute and file the submittal contained herein in the name and on behalf of the Boston Edison Company and that the statements in said submittal are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

My Commission expires: *October 25, 1988*

Peter M. Kuhler
Notary Public

8403270010 840320
PDR ADOCK 05000293
P PDR

Ado!
1/20

Proposed Technical Specification Change to Allow Increased Core Flow

Proposed Change

The proposed change involves the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Technical Specifications, Appendix A, Sections 3.2 and 3.11, Protective Instrumentation and Reactor Fuel Assembly, respectively. Specifically, the proposed change is shown on attached Technical Specification Pages 55 and 205H, and is described below.

1. It is proposed that an additional restriction be made to require the rod block monitor maximum trip level setting to be set at 107% power for core flows of 100% rated or greater. This restriction is to be added to Footnote 2 of Table 3.2.C, Instrumentation that Initiates Rod Blocks, on Technical Specification Page 55.

In addition to the above, it is proposed that Technical Specification Page 55 be revised to correct a typographical error on the third line of Note 1.

2. It is proposed that the Pilgrim Power/Flow Map, Technical Specification Figure 3.11-9 (Page 205H), be expanded to include the region bounded by the points (power, flow): (100%, 100%), (100%, 107.5%), (80%, 112.5%), (50%, 112.5%), and (50%, 100%).

Reason for Change

With the exception of correction of the typographical error, the proposed changes are requested to allow increased core flow at Pilgrim. The use of increased core flow would permit greater flexibility in operation and result in increased energy output at Pilgrim. For example, time would be saved during startup maneuvers when pre-conditioning interim operating management recommendation (PCIOMR) limitations are greatest.

The additional restriction proposed for the rod block monitor mitigates the effects of a rod withdrawal error during power operation at core flows greater than 100% rated. At core flow greater than 100% rated, the rod withdrawal error becomes the limiting transient. But by removing the flow dependence of the rod block trip for flows greater than 100% (i.e., installing a constant 107% trip at such flows), the effects of this transient are mitigated. For flows greater than 100% rated, the proposed constant 107% power rod block trip is more conservative than the presently required flow-biased setpoint.

Safety Considerations

This change does not present an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10CFR50.59. It has been reviewed and approved by the Operations Review Committee and reviewed by the Nuclear Safety Review and Audit Committee.

Significant Hazards Considerations

It has been determined that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the NRC's regulations in 10CFR50.92, this means that operation of the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether license amendments involve significant hazards considerations by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One example of an amendment that is considered not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration is "... (iv) A relief granted upon demonstration of acceptable operation from an operating restriction that was imposed because acceptable operation was not yet demonstrated. This assumes that the operating restriction and the criteria to be applied to a request for relief have been established in a prior review and that it is justified in a satisfactory way that the criteria have been met." Relief is requested from the operating restriction placed by the Pilgrim Power/Flow Map, Technical Specification Figure 3.11-9. The demonstration of acceptable operation for this requested relief is provided by the attached General Electric Safety Review of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1 at Core Flow Conditions Above Rated Flow Throughout Cycle 6, NEDO-30242, dated August, 1983, including Supplement 1 and Errata Sheet. The demonstration of acceptable operation for this requested relief for Cycle 7 operation at Pilgrim is provided by the General Electric Boiling Water Reactor Supplemental Reload Licensing Submittal for Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Unit 1, Reload 6, 22A1694, October 1983. This reload licensing submittal was transmitted to the NRC by letter dated December 28, 1983. The results of these analyses show that the current technical specifications with incorporation of the additional rod block monitor restriction on Technical Specification Page 55 are adequate to preclude the violation of any safety limits during operation of Pilgrim within the extended power/flow map in revised Technical Specification Figure 3.11-9.

Schedule of Change

This change will be put into effect upon Boston Edison's receipt of approval by the Commission.

Fee Determination

Pursuant to 10CFR170.12, Boston Edison proposes that this is a Class III change. The filing fee for this proposed Class III change was submitted by letter from W. D. Harrington to R. M. Diggs, dated January 11, 1984 (BECo 84-008).