Docket No. 50-247

December 26, 1984

DISTRIBUTION
Docket File
NRC PDR
L PDR
OELD
Gray File 4
ORB#1 Rdg
DEisenhut
CParrish
~~PRolk~~
ACRS 10
TBarnhart 4
EJordan
JNGrace
RDiggs
WJones
DBrinkman
LHarmon
CMiles
SECY
RBallard
MSlosson
JDNeighbors

Mr. John D. O'Toole
Vice President
Nuclear Engineering and Quality Assurance
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
4 Irving Place
New York, New York 10003

Dear Mr. O'Toole:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 91 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-26 for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2. The amendment consists of changes to the Technical Specifications in response to your application dated February 14, 1983, as supplemented June 29, 1984.

The amendment to the Technical Specifications modifies the definition of the term "Operable" as it applies to the single-failure criterion for safety systems. Certain editorial and format changes have also been made. The proposed change was initiated in response to an NRC request to revise the definition consistent with guidance issued by NRC. The proposed amendment conforms to the NRC request and provides for a revised definition that is more restrictive in that it extends the definition to include systems that are associated with the system in question.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's next regular monthly Federal Register notice.

Sincerely,

/s/JDNeighbors

Joseph D. Neighbors, Project Manager
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 91 to DPR-26
2. Safety Evaluation

cc: w/enclosures
See next page

ORB#1:DL	ORB#1:DL	ORB#1:DL	ORB#1:DL	OELD	AD:OR:DL
CParrish	MSlosson	JDNeighbors;ps	SVarga	no legal objection S. Ruby	GLainas
12/11/84	12/11/84	12/11/84	12/17/84	12/20/84	12/24/84

ORB #4
S. MINER
12/17/84

8501080574 841226
PDR ADOCK 05000247
P PDR

Mr. John D. O'Toole
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.

Indian Point Station, Unit 1
Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit 2

cc: Mayor, Village of Buchanan
236 Tate Avenue
Buchanan, New York 10511

Michael Blatt
Director Regulatory Affairs
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
Braodway and Bleakley Aveunues
Buchanan, New York, 10511

Robert L. Spring
Nuclear Licensing Engineer
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
4 Irving Place
New York, New York 10003

Senior Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Post Office Box 38
Buchanan, NY 10511

Brent L. Brandenburg
Assistant General Counsel
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
4 Irving Place - 1822
New York, NY 10003

Regional Administrator - Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Carl R. D'Alvia, Esquire
Attorney for the Village of
Buchanan, New York
395 South Riverside Avenue
Croton-on-Hudson, New York 10520

Ms. Ellyn Weiss
Sheldon, Harmon and Weiss
1725 I Street, N.W., Suite 506
Washington, D.C. 20006

Regional Radiation Representative
EPA Region II
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007

Director, Technical Development
Programs
State of New York Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Dr. Lawrence R. Quarles
Apartment 51
Kendal at Longwood
Kennett Square, PA 19346

Mr. Charles W. Jackson
Vice President, Nuclear Power
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
Broadway and Bleakley Avenues
Buchanan, New York 10511

Mr. Frank Matra
Resident Construction Manager
Consolidated Edison Company
of New York, Inc.
Broadway and Bleakley Avenues
Buchanan, New York 10511

Ezra I. Bialik
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Protection Bureau
New York State Department of Law
2 World Trade Center
New York, New York 10047

Mr. Jay Dunkleberger
Division of Policy Analysis
and Planning
New York State Energy Office
Agency Building 2, Empire
State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

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

CONSOLIDATED EDISION COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

DOCKET NO. 50-247

INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 91
License No. DPR-26

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment by Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (the licensee) dated February 14, 1983, as supplemented June 29, 1984, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Facility Operating License No. DPR-26 is hereby amended to read as follows:

8501080576 841226
PDR ADOCK 05000247
P PDR

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 91 , are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: December 26, 1984

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 91 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-26

DOCKET NO. 50-247

Revise Appendix A as follows:

Remove Pages	Insert Pages
1-2	1-2
3.1-1	3.1-1

1.2.5 Refueling Operation Condition

Any operation involving movement of core components when the vessel head is completely unbolted.

1.3 **Operable-Operability**

A system, subsystem, train, component or device shall be operable or have operability when it is capable of performing its intended safety function(s). Implicit in this definition shall be the assumption that necessary instrumentation, controls, electrical power sources, cooling or seal water, lubrication or other auxiliary equipment that are required for the system, subsystem, train, component, or device to perform its safety function(s) are also capable of performing their related support functions.

1.4 Protective Instrumentation Logic

1.4.1 Analog Channel

An arrangement of components and modules as required to generate a single protective action signal when required by a plant condition. An analog channel loses its identity where single action signals are combined.

1.4.2 Logic Channel

A group of relay contact matrices which operate in response to the analog channels signals to generate a protective action signal.

1.5 Degree of Redundancy

The difference between the number of operable channels and the number of channels which when tripped will cause an automatic system trip.

1.6 Instrumentation Surveillance

3 LIMITING CONDITIONS FOR OPERATION

3.0.1 In the event a Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) and/or associated action requirements cannot be satisfied because of circumstances in excess of those addressed in the specification, the unit shall be placed in at least hot shutdown within the next 7 hours, and in at least cold shutdown within the following 30 hours unless corrective measures are completed that restore compliance to the LCO within these time intervals as measured from initial discovery or until the reactor is placed in a condition in which the LCO is not applicable. Exceptions to these requirements shall be stated in the individual specifications.

3.0.2 A system, subsystem, train, component or device shall not be considered inoperable solely because its normal power source is inoperable, or solely because its emergency power source (i.e., diesel, battery) is inoperable. In such instances the equipment served by the inoperable power source shall be considered operable for purposes of compliance with their individual equipment LCOs and only the LCO for the inoperable power source shall apply.

3.1 REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM

Applicability

Applies to the operating status of the Reactor Coolant System.

Objective

To specify those limiting conditions for operation of the Reactor Coolant System which must be met to ensure safe reactor operation.

Specification

A. OPERATIONAL COMPONENTS

1. Coolant Pumps

a. At least one reactor coolant pump or one residual heat removal pump in the Residual Heat Removal System when connected to the Reactor Coolant System shall be in operation when a reduction is made in the boron concentration of the reactor coolant.

b. When the reactor is critical and above 2% rated power, except for natural circulation tests, at least two reactor coolant pumps shall be in operation.

c. Reactor power shall not be increased above 60% of rated power with only three pumps in operation unless the overtemperature

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 91 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-26

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-247

Introduction

An NRC letter to all power reactor licensees, dated April 10, 1980, presented the staff's concern about the possible misunderstanding regarding the use of the term "OPERABLE" as it applies to the single failure criterion for safety systems in power reactors. The purpose of the NRC letter was to clarify the meaning of the term and to request that the licensee take specific action to assure that it is appropriately applied. The letter noted that the single failure criterion is preserved by specifying Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO's) that require all redundant components of safety related systems to be OPERABLE. If redundant components are not OPERABLE due to equipment failure or maintenance outage, action is required within a specific time to shut down the plant. The specified time to take action, usually called the equipment out-of-service time, is a temporary relaxation of the single failure criterion, which, consistent with overall system reliability considerations, provides a limited time to fix equipment or otherwise make it OPERABLE. By letter February 14, 1983, supplemented by letter dated June 29, 1984 the Consolidated Edison Company of New York (the licensee) responded to NRC concerns related to the term "OPERABLE" and proposed relevant changes to the Technical Specifications.

Evaluation

The proposed change is the same as that provided as the model Technical Specifications with NRC letter dated April 10, 1980 except for the parts relating to limiting conditions for operation. It was not the staff's intention that the limiting conditions for operation at IP-2 be changed to conform verbatim with the Standard Technical Specifications. The licensee's submittal meets the intent of our April 10, 1980 letter since the proposed change is in accordance with the NRC guidance provided with respect to the definition of OPERABLE. The licensee's submittal is acceptable. Revisions to the submittal page numbers have been made to conform to the page numbers in the current IP-2 Technical Specifications.

8501080581 841226
PDR ADOCK 05000247
P PDR

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 occupation 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 Sec 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 this amendment.

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 this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated: December 26, 1984

Principal Contributor:

P. Polk