

March 23, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO: Biweekly Notice Coordinator

FROM: John L. Minns, Project Manager **/RA/**
Decommissioning Section
Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning
Division of Licensing Project Management

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION IN BIWEEKLY FR NOTICE -
NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT
TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND PROPOSED NO
SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND
OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING (TAC NOS. MA8323 AND MA8447)

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-003, 50-247 Indian Point
Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Buchanan, New York

Date of application for amendment: February 14, 2000

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment to the Indian Point Nuclear
Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Environmental Technical Specifications (ETS) would
change Section 5.4.1, eliminating the discussions of Section 4.2. Specifically, in ETS
Section 5.4.1, Routine Reports, the proposed change seeks to delete the reference to and
discussions about Section 4.2, which was deleted from the Unit 2 Operating License as part
of Amendment #90. The change is administrative in nature and improves the clarity of the
ETS by eliminating the reference to a section that no longer exists.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a),
the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration,
which is presented below.

- 1) Does the proposed license amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

No. The proposed change is administrative in nature. The change involves deleting, in Section 5.4.1, the reference to and the discussions about Section 4.2, which no longer exists. The monitoring requirements specified in the current Environmental Technical Specifications remain unchanged. Therefore, the proposed changes would not involve a significant increase in the probability or in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

- 2) Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No. The proposed changes are administrative in nature. The safety analysis of the facility remains complete and accurate. There are no physical changes to the facility and the plant conditions for which the design basis accidents have been evaluated are still valid. The operating procedures and emergency procedures are unaffected. Consequently no new failure modes are introduced as a result of the proposed change. Therefore, the proposed changes would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

- 3) Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No. The proposed changes are administrative in nature. Since there are no changes to the operation of the facility or the physical design, the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) design basis, accident assumptions, or Technical Specification Bases are not affected. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for Licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, Esq., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place-1830, New York, NY 10003.

NRC Section Chief: Mike Masnik.

No. The proposed change is administrative in nature. The change involves deleting, in Section 5.4.1, the reference to and the discussions about Section 4.2, which no longer exists. The monitoring requirements specified in the current Environmental Technical Specifications remain unchanged. Therefore, the proposed changes would not involve a significant increase in the probability or in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

- 2) Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

No. The proposed changes are administrative in nature. The safety analysis of the facility remains complete and accurate. There are no physical changes to the facility and the plant conditions for which the design basis accidents have been evaluated are still valid. The operating procedures and emergency procedures are unaffected. Consequently no new failure modes are introduced as a result of the proposed change. Therefore, the proposed changes would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

- 3) Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

No. The proposed changes are administrative in nature. Since there are no changes to the operation of the facility or the physical design, the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) design basis, accident assumptions, or Technical Specification Bases are not affected. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for Licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, Esq., Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place-1830, New York, NY 10003.

NRC Section Chief: Mike Masnik.

DISTRIBUTION:

File Center PDIV-D r/f OGC Slittle

To receive a copy of this document, indicate "C" in the box							
OFFICE	PDIV-D/PM	C	PDIV-D/LA	C	PDI-1/PM	C	PDIV-D/SC
NAME	JMinns:sp		DJohnson		JHarold		MMasnik
DATE	3/20/00		3/20/00		3/21/00		3/22/00